

# EVOLUTION AND SCIENCE

**David Cloud**

*Way of Life Literature*

[www.wayoflife.org](http://www.wayoflife.org)

*Copyright 2015*

**These studies are from *An Unshakeable Faith: An Apologetics Course*, 2015 edition.**

## **Outline**

Introduction  
History of Evolution  
Darwin Skeptics Today  
Natural Selection  
Mutations  
Billions of Years  
Ape Men  
Fossil Record

## **Introduction**

### **THE FIERCE BATTLE**

Churches are losing the youth. An Answers in Genesis survey found that two-thirds of children and teens who regularly attend “conservative” churches are gone by college age. According to an email survey I took in 2010 the average number of youth who drop out of churches that responded is 50%.

Titus 1:9-12; we must shut the mouths of the skeptics by refuting their error.

### **THE OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE**

#### ***To protect you***

The first use of apologetics not to convince the unbeliever but to protect the believer, his family, and fellow believers.

When we are grounded in apologetics, we are not confused when we hear arguments by evolutionists, atheists, new agers, and cultists, either in person, in print, on the radio or television, or on the Internet. When we visit natural history museums we can see through the error of the displays.

Churches must prepare the people to face the onslaught of end-time skepticism and apostasy, but most churches aren't doing this. There are two common failings: (1) churches not careful enough about salvation; (2) churches not serious enough about training and discipleship. It is time to put away more of the games and get serious about these things.

### ***To prepare you to help other believers***

Every believer is to be a teacher (Heb. 5:12-14). We are to exhort one another (Heb. 10:25).

### ***To prepare you to challenge unbelievers***

We must be ready to give an answer to the unbeliever (1 Peter 3:15)

Paul's practice was to dispute with both Jews and Gentile (Acts 17:17). He reasoned and persuaded (Acts 18:4). His message on Mars Hill in Athens was a masterly example of the use of biblical apologetics in evangelism (Acts 17:18-34).

Dr. Richard Lumsden, dean of doctoral training in medical biology at Tulane Medical School, trained 30 Ph.D.s. He was challenged by a student who simply asked questions. As a result, he began investigating the evidence for evolution for himself and starting reading the Bible. He eventually received Christ as Lord and Saviour.

## **THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST VS. THE GOSPEL OF EVOLUTION**

Science has become a religion in modern society, but it cannot answer any of the important questions of life, such as the following:

Where did the universe come from?  
Where did life come from?  
What is man?  
Why is man so different from the other creatures?  
What is human consciousness and where did it come from?  
Why does man have a sense of morality?  
Is there a purpose to human life?  
Is there a God?  
If so, who is He?  
How can we know Him?  
What lies beyond death?

David Berlinski, a Jewish agnostic, understands that modern science does not hold the answers to life:

“If science stands opposed to religion, it is not because of anything contained in either the premises or the conclusions of the great scientific theories. ... We do not know how the universe began. We do not know why it is there. Charles Darwin talked speculatively of life emerging from a ‘warm little pond.’ The pond is gone. We have little idea how life emerged, and cannot with assurance say that it did. We cannot reconcile our understanding of the human mind with any trivial theory about the manner in which the brain functions. Beyond the trivial, we have no other theories. We can say nothing of interest about the human soul. We do not know what impels us to right conduct or where the form of the good is found” (David Berlinski, *The Devil’s Delusion*, pp. xiv, xv).

Evolutionists want the whole world to believe their doctrine. They are trying to destroy Christianity. But what do they have to offer? They reject the gospel of Jesus Christ, but what is the evolutionist’s gospel? *In a nutshell, it is the gospel of no God, no purpose, no eternal life.* It is the gospel that the complex universe originated from some mysterious Big Bang, that everything came from nothing, that life sprang from non-life without a creator, that all living creatures, including man, are mere accidents of blind chance, that there is no God, no purpose to life, no heaven, no hell, man has no eternal soul and when he dies his existence ends.

Richard Dawkins: “... we live in a universe which has no design, no purpose, no evil and no good, nothing but blind, pitiless indifference” (*River Out of Eden*, 1995).

William Provine, biology professor at Cornell University: “Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear. ... There are no gods, no purposes, no goal-directed forces of any kind. There is no life after death. ... There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning to life, and no free will for humans, either” (*Origins Research*, 1994, quoted from *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 379).

On the other hand, we have the lovely gospel of Jesus Christ. Creation by an amazing God; redemption by an amazing God; eternity with an amazing God!

On the other hand, we have the beautiful gospel of Jesus Christ.

It makes no sense for an atheist to fight for his view, because it has no meaning and no future. Even his very thoughts are meaningless, since they are mere random chemical processes in the brain.

**THE EVIDENCE FOR A CREATOR IS CLEAR, BUT MEN ARE SPIRITUALLY BLIND**  
(Rom. 1:16-20).

### **Five Lessons**

***First, there is powerful evidence for God.*** The evidence is the creation (Rom. 1:20) and man’s own conscience (Rom. 1:19; 2:14-15).

The evidence is everywhere. Even evolutionists speak of things such as the human body as “miraculous.” PBS’s series on human reproduction is called “The Miracle of Life” and the sequel was called “Life’s Greatest Miracle.”

A miracle of design means there is a Designer and Builder. This is the law of cause and effect. Every effect must have a sufficient cause to explain it. This law is described in the Bible as follows: “every house is built by someone, but He who built all things is God” (Heb. 3:4).

The genius fathers of modern science understood this.

ISAAC NEWTON, discoverer of the law of gravity: “This most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being. ... Atheism is so senseless. When I look at the solar system, I see the earth at the right distance from the sun to receive the proper amounts of heat and light. This did not happen by chance” (*Principia*).

ROBERT BOYLE, the father of modern chemistry: “The vastness, beauty, orderliness, of the heavenly bodies, the excellent structure of animals and plants; and the other phenomena of nature justly induce an intelligent and unprejudiced observer to conclude a supremely powerful, just, and good author” (*Works*, vol. IV, p. 25).

***Second, God gives enough evidence to prove that the Bible is true, but man is responsible to believe*** (Heb. 11:6).

God gave man a will and a choice. We see this in Adam and Eve, and we see it throughout human history.

Compare Matthew 13:10-16. Jesus spoke in parables in order to hide the truth from those who did not want to believe, those who had already rejected the light.

Consider the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:27-31). No amount of evidence will convince the willful skeptic.

Renowned Harvard law professor Simon Greenleaf: “Christianity does not profess to convince the perverse and head-strong, to bring irresistible evidence to the daring and profane, to vanquish the proud scorner, and afford evidences from which the careless and perverse cannot possibly escape. This might go to destroy man’s responsibility. All that Christianity professes, is to propose such evidences as may satisfy the meek, the tractable, the candid, the serious inquirer” (*The Testimony of the Evangelists Examined by the Rules of Evidence*).

***Third, men suppress the truth because they love sin*** (Rom. 1:18).

This teaches that the main battleground is the heart and the will rather than the mind.

***Fourth, spiritual blindness is the reason why men cannot see the evidence for God*** (2 Cor. 4:4; Eph. 2:1-2).

It is like a blind man who cannot see the beauty of creation. The only hope is the gospel of Jesus Christ. When the sinner receives the gospel, he is born again and he has spiritual wisdom (1 Cor. 2:14-16; 2 Cor. 3:15-17).

***Fifth, spiritual enlightenment comes by salvation*** (Rom. 1:16).

Only by salvation are we brought out of darkness into light (2 Cor. 4:6; 1 Pet. 2:9). Only by salvation is the veil removed from the heart (2 Cor. 3:15-16). Only by salvation do we receive the Spirit of God as our Teacher (1 John 2:20, 27).

Many young people who grow up in Christian homes are not born again. This is why their faith is easily overthrown. They are like the crowd that “believed in Jesus” in John 2:23-24 and then turned from Him in John 6:66. In contrast, we have the example of Peter who refused to turn from Christ because he had saving faith (John 6:67-69).

### **YOU DO NOT HAVE TO BE A SCIENTIST TO REFUTE DARWINISM.**

The believer should not be intimidated by scientists.

Dr. Lowell Ponte, former science and technology editor for *Reader's Digest*:

“Scientists often become intoxicated with the notion that knowledge in one field empowers them to speak with the authority of gods in all fields” (“Science Wars,” *FrontPage* magazine, Feb. 27, 2004).

Phillip Johnson, a law professor who has critiqued Darwinism:

“Being a scientist is not necessarily an advantage when dealing with a very broad topic like evolution, which cuts across many scientific disciplines and also involves issues of philosophy. Practicing scientists are of necessity highly specialized, and a scientist outside his field of expertise is just another layman” (*Darwin on Trial*, p. 13).

Every believer can be his own “scientist” by investigating things for himself, by learning the Bible well and testing everything by it.

We must not forget that divine truth has been revealed to the weak rather than to the mighty (Mat. 11:25; 1 Cor. 1:26-28). The “poor man” who has understanding can examine the “rich man” who is wise in his conceit (Prov. 28:11).

The believer has everything he needs to test the doctrine of evolution: We have God's Word (2 Tim. 3:16-17), and we have God's Spirit (1 John 2:27).

Every philosophy must be tested by God's Word (Acts 17:11; 2 Cor. 10:5; Col. 2:8; 1 Tim. 6:20-21).

We must learn to think, to test. We live in a world of lies and false teaching. We must not be simple (Prov. 14:15).

### **MANY SCIENTISTS DO NOT BELIEVE IN EVOLUTION.**

Richard Dawkins - “Evolution is a fact. Beyond reasonable doubt, beyond serious doubt, beyond sane, informed, intelligent doubt. ... No reputable scientist disputes it” (*The Greatest Show on Earth*).

Actually, thousands of scientists have rejected evolution. We give many examples in the book *Scientists Who Believe the Bible*, available as a free eBook from [www.wayoflife.org](http://www.wayoflife.org)

Consider Raymond Damadian, biophysicist; M.D; inventor of the MRI. In an interview with Dr. Shem Dharampaul in 2012, Damadian said, “If you take the trouble to examine the evidence supporting the Bible and evolution, from my perception, the evidence is overwhelmingly in support of the biblical record. The evidence for evolution is non-existent. In my opinion, evolution is science fiction.”

### **THERE ARE MANY BENEFITS OF CREATION SCIENCE MATERIAL.**

Creation science is a relatively new field and we should not take it for granted.

*Creation science materials are helpful in protecting God’s people, particularly young people, from the devil’s lies* (Titus 1:9-11).

*Creation science materials teach analytical thinking and sound argumentation* (Heb. 5:14).

*Creation science materials lift the believer’s heart to God and teach lessons about His character and power* (Romans 1:20). God made the universe for revelation (Psa. 19).

*Creation science materials are useful in evangelism.* Creation science has been called “pre-evangelism.”

John Cimbala

“I was raised in a Christian home, believing in God and His creation. However, I was taught evolution while attending high school, and began to doubt the authority of the Bible. If evolution is true, I reasoned, the Bible cannot also be true. I eventually rejected the entire Bible and believed that we descended from lower creatures; there was no afterlife and no purpose in life but to enjoy the short time we have on this earth. My college years at Penn State were spent as an atheist, or at best as an agnostic. Fortunately, and by the grace of God, I began to read articles and listen to tapes about scientific evidence for creation. Over a period of a couple of years, it became apparent to me that the theory of evolution has no legitimate factual evidence, and that scientific data from the fossil record, geology, etc. could be better explained by a recent creation, followed by a global flood. Suddenly I realized that the Bible might actually be true! It wasn’t until I could believe the first page of the Bible that I could believe the rest of it. Once I accepted the fact that there is a creator God, it was an easy step for me to accept His plan of salvation through Jesus Christ as well” (John Cimbala, Ph.D. in aeronautics from California Institute of Technology, *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose to Believe in Creation*, edited by John Ashton, pp. 200, 201).

Beware of the New Evangelical philosophy that controls most creation science ministries (playing 1 string of 12-string guitar). See “Creation Science Ministries: Why the New Evangelical Principle Is Dangerous,” [www.wayoflife.org](http://www.wayoflife.org).

**THE TEACHING OF EVOLUTION IS A FULFILLMENT OF BIBLE PROPHECY AND THEREFORE IS EVIDENCE OF THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF SCRIPTURE (2 Peter 3:3-7).**

**Ten Lessons**

**First, there will be scoffers.** This is a perfect description of atheists and agnostics. They are not satisfied merely to reject God and the Bible.

**Second, the scoffers will come in the last days.**

The scoffing began in earnest in the 19th century. Before that, most men in the West believed in divine creation. That century witnessed the following: an explosion of skepticism; the birth of theological modernism, humanistic philosophy, textual criticism, Unitarianism, Marxism, Darwinism, Mormonism, Jehovah's Witness, Seventh-day Adventism, Psychology, New Age.

"The flood-gates of infidelity are open, and Atheism overwhelming is upon us" (George Romanes, 1878, cited from Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 371).

"Attendance at places of worship is declining and reverence for holy things is vanishing. We solemnly believe this to be largely attributable to THE SCEPTICISM WHICH HAS FLASHED FROM THE PULPIT AND SPREAD AMONG THE PEOPLE" (C.H. Spurgeon, *Sword and Trowel*, November 1887).

**Third, the scoffers are willfully ignorant** (2 Pet. 3:5).

**Fourth, the scoffers are motivated by the desire to throw off God's law and to walk after their own lusts** (2 Pet. 3:3).

**Fifth, the scoffers hold a uniformitarian view** ("all things continue as they were," 2 Pet. 3:4).

**Sixth, the scoffers deny supernatural creation** (2 Pet. 3:5). At the heart of this prophecy is a reference to creation from Genesis 1:9.

**Seventh, the scoffers deny the worldwide flood** (2 Pet. 3:6).

**Eighth, the scoffers deny God's supernatural Word.** The Word of God is mentioned four times in this passage (2 Pet. 3:2, 5, 7, 16). The birth of Darwinian evolution was accompanied by theological liberalism, which was an attack upon the Bible.

**Ninth, the scoffers deny Christ's second coming** (2 Pet. 3:4). The world today laughs at the doctrine of Christ's return; outright rejection. Among Christians, there is spiritualizing of the prophecies.

**Tenth, the scoffers deny God's judgment** (2 Pet. 3:7).

**THEISTIC EVOLUTION IS NOT A VIABLE OPTION.**

Most professing Christians believe in theistic evolution, from Pope Francis to Billy Graham.

"Either at a certain moment in evolution God breathed into one particular ape-man who was Adam, or God could have taken a handful of dust and created a man just like that" (Billy Graham, *United Church Observer*, July 1966).

“[T]hat man is physically descended from animals, I have no objection ... For centuries God perfected the animal form which was to become the vehicle of humanity and the image of Himself ... The creature may have existed for ages in this state before it became man ... [I]n the fullness of time, God caused to descend upon this organism ... a new kind of consciousness which could say ‘I’ and ‘me,’ ... which knew God ... [and] could make judgments of truth, beauty, and goodness” (C.S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain*).

Consider six reasons why the Bible and evolution cannot be reconciled:

***First, the early chapters of Genesis are written as history rather than poetry or allegory.***

“an evening and a morning” is repeated 10 times (Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31).

“There exists however a vague suspicion after all that the beginning of Genesis is a vision, or an allegory, or a parable. It is hard to imagine why. If there be a book in the whole Bible which purports to be a plain historical narrative of actual events, that book is the book of Genesis. ... A week is described. Days are spoken of,—each made of an evening and a morning. ... You may not play tricks with language plain as this, and elongate a week, until it shall more than embrace the span of all recorded Time” (John Burgon, *Interpretation and Inspiration*, Oxford, 1860).

***Second, the Genesis account of creation is cited as history by Jesus.*** He mentions the first man and woman as historical people (Mat. 19:4-6). In Matthew 19:5 Jesus quotes Genesis 2:24. Christ always treats Genesis as history, and it is impossible to honor Him as Lord and Saviour and disregard His teaching. In Matthew 19:4-5, Christ mentions both “accounts” of creation in Genesis 1 and 2. These are not two contradictory accounts of creation. They are two accounts of the same creation viewed from different perspectives.

***Third, Genesis 1-11 is cited as history by seven of the New Testament writers.*** The first eleven chapters of Genesis are quoted from or referred to 100 times in the New Testament, and Genesis is always treated as historical. Adam is named nine times in the New Testament (Lk. 3:38; Rom. 5:14; 1 Cor. 15:22, 45; 1 Tim. 2:13-14; Jude 14).

***Fourth, Genesis 1-3 forms the foundation of the gospel of Jesus Christ*** (1 Cor. 15:3-4).

***Fifth, Jesus’ human genealogy is traced from Adam*** (Luke 3:23-38).

***Sixth, the Bible’s account of creation cannot be reconciled with the teaching of evolution.***

- a. *Genesis says God created the world and everything in it in six days.* The days of creation in Genesis 1 were regular 24-hour days, days with an evening and a morning (Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31). This is repeated in Exodus 20:10-11.
- b. *Genesis says everything was made to reproduce after its kind.* The statement “after their kind” is repeated ten times in Genesis chapter one (Gen. 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25).
- c. *Genesis says the first man was created directly by God (Genesis 2) and was not the product of gradual evolution from the animal kingdom.* The Bible says Adam was the first man (1 Cor. 15:45). And Eve is the mother of all men (Gen. 3:20).
- d. *Genesis says man is made in God’s image and is not a part of the animal kingdom* (Gen. 1:27).
- e. *Genesis says the world was created perfect, then fell under sin and has been deteriorating ever since.* This is consistent with everything we can observe. This is what the Second Law of

Thermodynamics describes. Darwin and Huxley believed that the universe would eventually perish in a final “universal winter.” But that’s not evolution!

- f. *Genesis says everything was designed to fulfill God’s purposes.* Everywhere we see evidence of a purpose and a design rather than evidence for no purpose. The study of discerning a cause by its effect is called teleology.

### **SCIENTISTS ARE MOTIVATED NOT TO CRITICIZE EVOLUTION.**

Darwinian evolution is the religion of modern science, and it is not acceptable to question it. By even questioning evolution, many have lost jobs and promotions. They have been denied degrees, awards, and grants.

Ben Stein’s video *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed* documents the persecution of scientists and professors who dare to question evolution.

### **EVOLUTION IS MORE ABOUT REJECTING GOD THAN IT IS ABOUT SCIENCE.**

In 2000, Dr. Michael Ruse wrote, “Evolution is a religion.”

“Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion: a full-fledged alternative to Christianity, with meaning and morality. Evolution is a religion” (*The National Post*, May 13, 2000).

Dr. Ruse is an evolutionist. He was one of the main witnesses for the evolutionists in the 1981 federal court trial in Little Rock, Arkansas, where he argued that creationism is religion, whereas evolution is science, but by 2000 he had reversed himself and acknowledged that evolution is also a religion.

Charles Lyell, the father of geological uniformitarianism, hated the book of Genesis and hoped his doctrine would drive men “out of the Mosaic record” (*Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, I, pp. 253, 256, 328).

Charles Darwin said that the Bible “was no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the Hindoos, or the beliefs of any barbarian” (*Autobiography*, p. 85). He called the doctrine of eternal torment a damnable doctrine (p. 87).

Thomas Huxley, “Darwin’s Bulldog,” called the Bible a myth and claimed that Jehovah God was an invention of man. In his correspondence Huxley viciously said of Bible believers who resisted Darwinism, “I should like to get my heel into their mouths and scr-r-unch it round” (Lord Ernie, “Victorian Memoirs and Memories,” *The Quarterly Review*, 1923; cited from Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 363).

Thomas Huxley’s grandson, Julian, said, “Darwin’s real achievement was to remove the whole idea of God as the Creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion” (Julian Huxley, keynote address, Darwin Centennial meeting, 1959).

Richard Lewontin: “We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, in spite of its failure to fulfill many of its extravagant promises of health and life, in

spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated just-so stories, because **WE HAVE A PRIOR COMMITMENT, A COMMITMENT TO MATERIALISM.** ... Moreover, that materialism is an absolute, for **WE CANNOT ALLOW A DIVINE FOOT IN THE DOOR**" (Richard Lewontin, "Billions and Billions of Demons," *The New York Review*, Jan. 9, 1997, p. 31; Lewontin was reviewing Carl Sagan's *The Demon-Haunted World*).

It is to avoid the implications of biblical creationism and the God of the Bible that scientists like Fred Hoyle and Francis Crick and Richard Dawkins believe in space aliens. Michael Behe says, "The primary reason Crick subscribes to this unorthodox view [life was seeded on earth by aliens] is that he judges the undirected origin of life to be a virtually insurmountable obstacle, but he wants a naturalistic explanation" (*Darwin's Black Box*, chapter 11).

### **SCIENCE IS FALLIBLE AND HAS ERRED COUNTLESS TIMES.**

Juan Arsuaga rightly advises,

"... those seeking absolute truth or an immutable dogma should look in a field other than science" (*Neanderthal's Necklace*, p. 17).

Consider the case of Ignaz Philipp Semmelweis:

"In his work at the Vienna General Hospital, Ignaz saw many victims of the highly contagious and often deadly puerperal fever. Slowly he began to suspect an increased risk for anyone having contact with fever victims. In time his suspicions became firm convictions. He reasoned that physicians in the hospital were somehow carrying the disease from the autopsy room and transmitting it to women in the maternity ward. Therefore, Ignaz ordered all of the physicians to wash their hands thoroughly in a solution of chlorinated lime before examining patients.

"This was a radical and controversial move, and it resulted in big trouble for the young doctor.

"Keep in mind that Ignaz took this stand years before Louis Pasteur, with his microscope, scientifically documented the danger of infectious bacteria. At the time in which Ignaz lived, such a radical position was not accepted by the medical field. As a result, great pressure was brought to bear on the young man. He was ridiculed. His character was attacked.

"He stood his ground, entirely alone, one man against the entire scientific establishment of his day. No one agreed with him. But in the end, the pressure got to him. Ignaz had a mental breakdown, and he died on August 1, 1865, at age 47.

"Shortly thereafter, Joseph Lister performed his first antiseptic operation, and Ignaz, dead less than a year, was on his way to a full vindication" ("When Science Errs: The Oft Times Lonely Stand for Truth," [ChristianAnswers.net](http://ChristianAnswers.net)).

A recent example of how science has erred is the so-called junk DNA. The term was introduced in 1972 by Susumu Ohno. It refers to the alleged “non-coding” part of DNA that is left over from evolution. A 1980 article by Leslie Orgel and Francis Crick said non-coding DNA “has little specificity and conveys little or no selective advantage to the organism.”

Gretchen Vogel said, “The term ‘junk DNA’ is a reflection of our ignorance” (“Why Sequence the Junk?” *Science*, Vol. 291, Feb. 16, 2001).

John Mattick observed, “The failure to recognize the importance of introns [so-called junk DNA] **may well go down as one of the biggest mistakes in the history of molecular biology**” (quote from “The Unseen Genome,” *Scientific American*, Vol. 289, Nov. 2003).

**WE MUST LEARN HOW TO DEAL WITH CRITICS** (2 Timothy 2:15-26).

***First, the believer must study the Bible and learn how to interpret it*** (v. 15).

***Second, do not get entangled in debates with unbelievers who only want to argue*** (2 Tim. 2:15-18, 23).

Foolish questions are questions asked without sincerity by people who only want to argue and spout their opinions. Compare Titus 3:9-11; heretics have a heart problem; they are subverted.

Jesus said do not cast pearls before swine (Mat. 7:6). Dogs and swine are those who have no interest in knowing the truth, who do not value it (“trample under feet”) and who hate those who preach it (“turn again and rend you”).

- Consider Paul’s example (Acts 17:32-34; 19:9)

- Heresies are dangerous (2 Tim. 2:17-18; 1 Tim. 6:20-21; Rom. 16:17-18). Consider our mother Eve.

***Third, separation is necessary to know the truth*** 2 Tim. 2:19-22).

Peter warns that fleshly lusts war against the soul (1 Pet. 2:11).

Paul warned that the carnal believer cannot understand the meat of God’s Word (1 Cor. 3:1-2).

Separation from the world is required to know God’s will (Romans 12:1-2).

***Fourth, pursuing Christ and His will is necessary to know the truth*** (2 Tim. 2:22).

***Fifth, godly associations are necessary to know the truth*** (“with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart,” 2 Tim. 2:22).

***Sixth, the believer must be a teacher*** 2 Tim. 2:24). Compare Hebrews 5:12-14. You don’t know a truth well enough until you can teach it to someone else. Parents must teach their children (Ephesians 6:4). Older women must teach the younger women (Titus 2:3-5). Older children

should teach the younger children. Believers should teach unbelievers (2 Cor. 5:20). Church members should teach other church members (Heb. 10:25).

***Seventh, the believer must be gentle, meek, and patient*** (2 Tim. 2:24-25).

***Eighth, the believer must understand that he is dealing with the devil*** (2 Tim. 2:26). Compare Ephesians 6:12-13.

***Ninth, the believer must understand that God gives men a choice*** (“that they may recover themselves,” (2 Tim. 2:26).

***Tenth, the believer must have faith in God*** (2 Tim. 2:25-26). God is the only One who can give repentance to the unbeliever and rescue him from the snare of the devil.

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON EVOLUTION INTRODUCTION

1. What is the gospel of evolution in a nutshell?
2. What book and chapter in the New Testament says that men are without excuse for not believing in God?
3. What are the two evidences that God has given of Himself and what book of the Bible describes these evidences?
4. What is the law of cause and effect?
5. What verse in the Bible describes this law?
6. In what book and chapter of the Bible does Abraham say that if a man will not believe the Scripture he will not believe even if we witness a resurrection?
7. Who was Simon Greenleaf?
8. Greenleaf said, “Christianity does not profess to convince the \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_.”
9. According to Romans 1, why do men suppress the evidence for God?
10. What verse says that the devil blinds the minds of unbelievers?
11. What verse says that before salvation men are dead in trespasses and sins?
12. What verse says that before salvation men walk according to the prince of the power of the air?
13. What book and chapter says that when man’s heart turns to God the veil of darkness is taken away?
14. What book and chapter teaches that the believer has an indwelling unction or teacher?
15. What verse says that we must prove all things?
16. What verse commends the Bereans for proving all things by God’s Word?
17. Who is the inventor of the MRI?
18. According to this man, how much evidence is there for evolution?
19. What does this man call evolution?
20. In what way is evolution a proof that the Bible is the divinely-inspired Word of God?
21. What book and chapter of the Bible contains a prophecy of the coming of scoffers in the end times?
22. According to this prophecy, what kind of ignorance are these scoffers guilty of?
23. According to this prophecy, what motivates these scoffers?
24. What phrase in Genesis 1 indicates that it is speaking of literal 24-hour days?

25. How many times are Genesis 1-11 cited in the New Testament?
26. How many times is Adam named in the New Testament?
27. Who said, "We cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door"?
28. According to this man, what is the evolutionist's "prior commitment"?
29. What is a recent example of how science has erred?

# A History of Evolution

☛ A PowerPoint presentation of this material on the history of evolution is included in *An Unshakeable Faith* apologetics course package. It is basically a graphical edition of this text, and the student and teacher are strongly advised to go through the PowerPoints, as the graphics are an important part of the instruction.

## BEFORE THE 19TH CENTURY

The doctrine of evolution is an ancient heresy.

Anaximander (611-546 BC) taught that man evolved from fish (“Evolution and Paleontology in the Ancient World,” <http://www.ucmp.berkeley.edu/history/ancient.html>).

Xenophanes (d. 490 BC) believed that life arose from the “primordial mud.”

Empedocles of Acragas (d. 432 BC) taught that the earth gave birth to living creatures that were first disembodied organs, which eventually joined into whole organisms.

The Greek Epicureans believed that the universe evolved through naturalistic mechanisms apart from God or the supernatural. The Roman philosopher Titus Lcretius Carus (95-55 BC) described the Epicurean view in the influential poem *On the Nature of Things*.

The Taoists (founded in the 4th century B.C. by Chuang Tzu) denied the fixity of species. Taoism regards nature as existing in a state of “constant transformation” known as the tao (James Miller, “Taoism and Nature,” Royal Asiatic Society, Jan. 8, 2008).

In the late 1700s, evolutionary thinking began to spread in Europe, England, and America.

Evolution was promoted by the same men who rejected the Bible. This thinking is called “liberalism” or “modernism” or “humanism.” Having rejected God’s Word, they were led by the same spirit as the ancient Greeks.

Liberalism has been likened to ivy. First it sleeps; then it creeps; then it leaps. Liberalism slept in the 18th century. It began small among a few men, and at first it didn’t have much influence or popularity. Liberalism crept in the first half of the 19th century, slowly gaining adherents. Finally, in the last half of the 19th century liberalism leapt, rapidly spreading through churches, schools, and society at large.

It was a fulfillment of Bible prophecy (2 Pet. 3:3-7).

## ERASMUS DARWIN

Erasmus (1731-1802) was Charles Darwin’s paternal grandfather.

Erasmus (1731-1802) was a materialist who “discarded the Bible and Jesus” and “adored in the Temple of Nature.” For him “Reason was divine, and Progress its prophet” (Adrian Desmond, *Darwin*, pp. 5, 9).

Erasmus was a tremendously influential man, a pioneering medical doctor, inventor, poet, philosopher, and naturalist. He invented a speaking machine, a copying machine, and the steering mechanism used in modern cars. His close friends consisted of men such as Benjamin Franklin; John Michell, the father of seismology; John Whitehurst, inventor of the factory time clock; John Baskerville, famous printer and type font designer; James Watt, perfecter of the steam engine; and James Brindley, creator of England’s canal system.

Erasmus’ wife, Polly, the mother of Charles Darwin’s father, Robert, was non-religious in a religious age, and she “faced death calmly without supernatural assistance” (Desmond King-Hele, *Erasmus Darwin*, p. 94).

Erasmus was a moral scoundrel who was “fond of sacrificing to both Bacchus and Venus” (King-Hele, p. 18), meaning he loved alcohol and women. After the death of Polly, Erasmus bore two daughters out of wedlock with his live-in governess, who was 22 years his junior. He also composed lush erotic verse” (Desmond, p. 6).

Erasmus worshiped “a distant Deity ... the vast Unknown.” In student years at Cambridge, he was deeply influenced in Deism by Albert Reimarus, the son of German philosopher Hermann Reimarus. Deism has been described as the Clockwork universe “theory,” in which God builds the universe and then lets it run on its own.

Erasmus believed in the evolution of life from an original microscopic biological speck to man. His family coat of arms consisted of three scallop shells with the motto *E conchis omnia* or “everything from shells,” referring to his belief in the evolution of life from the sea.

Erasmus proclaimed his doctrine of evolution in a popular two-volume set of books entitled *Zoonomia; or, the Laws of Organic Life* (1794-96). *Zoonomia* promotes the same concepts later popularized by Charles Darwin: natural selection, survival of the fittest, sexual selection, homology, and vestigial organs.

Erasmus believed that everything has risen from an original “living filament” which was formed by “spontaneous vitality” in “the primeval ocean.”

Erasmus Darwin’s book *The Temple of Nature* was published the year following his death. It presents the doctrine of evolution under the guise of lessons he supposedly learned from the goddess Urania, Priestess of Nature.

Ere Time began, from flaming Chaos hurl’d  
Rose the bright spheres, which form the circling world ...  
Nurs’d by warm sun-beams in primeval caves,  
Organic Life began beneath the waves. ...

Hence without parent by spontaneous birth

Rise the first specks of animated earth;  
From Nature's womb the plant or insect swims,  
And buds or breathes, with microscopic limbs. ...

New powers acquire, and larger limbs assume;  
Whence countless groups of vegetation spring,  
And breathing realms of fin, and feet, and wing.

In the second volume of *Zoonomia*, Erasmus labeled religion by various psychological diseases.

He called religious hope of salvation and an afterlife “*spes religiosa*” or “superstitious hope.” He called this a “*maniacal hallucination*.”

He called fear of divine judgment “*orci timor*” or “the fear of hell.”

Erasmus was a close associate of Unitarian Christ-denier Joseph Priestley, the French Deist Voltaire, and other skeptics who rejected divine Revelation. One of Erasmus' closest friends was the Unitarian Josiah Wedgwood, the grandfather of Charles Darwin's wife.

Erasmus died seven years before Charles' birth, but the grandson read *Zoonomia* twice in his youth (*The Autobiography of Charles Darwin*, p. 49).

“Belief in evolution, passed on to his son Robert and reincarnated in his grandson Charles, can be seen as the finest of Erasmus's legacies” (Desmond King-Hele, p. 363).

## CHARLES DARWIN

Charles Darwin (1809-82) is books are considered pivotal in popularizing the evolutionary doctrine. The most important was *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (1859).

Kimball's high school biology textbook (1965) said that *On the Origin of Species* “ranks second only to the Holy Bible in its impact on man's thinking.”

**Charles' mother, Susannah**, was a Unitarian, following in the footsteps of her father Josiah Wedgwood. Susannah attended High Street Chapel in Shrewsbury, which had become a full-blown Unitarian congregation during the pastorate of George Case (1797-1831). Unitarians deny the Trinity, the deity of Christ, and the infallible inspiration of Scripture.

**Charles' father, Robert**, was also a skeptic. His “disbelief extended to the borders of atheism” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 113). He adopted his father Erasmus' motto *E Conchis Omnia* (“all things out of shells”). Erasmus Darwin's biographer says that Robert “never abandoned his belief in evolution and that he deserves much credit for bringing up Charles in an evolution-friendly atmosphere.” (Desmond King-Hele, *Erasmus Darwin*, p. 359).

**Darwin's elder brother Erasmus Alvey**, named after their famous grandfather, was a radical skeptic in his own right. His crowd promoted German biblical criticism.

**At Edinburgh University** Charles his lot with the most radical, skeptical crowd. He was elected to the Plinian Society in 1826, at a time when “it had been penetrated by radical students--fiery, freethinking democrats who demanded that science be based on physical causes, not supernatural forces” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 31). Darwin’s membership was sponsored by William Browne, who “had no time for souls and saints.”

Darwin’s closest friend at Edinburgh was professor **Robert Edmond Grant**, “an uncompromising evolutionist,” a man for whom “nothing was sacred,” who he was “savagely anti-Christian” (pp. 34, 40).

Darwin studied for the Anglican ministry at **Cambridge University**. “The Anglican Church, fat, complacent, and corrupt, lived luxuriously on its tithes and endowments ... Desirable parishes were routinely auctioned to the highest bidder” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 47). If Darwin obtained a country rectory he could live the leisurely and respected life of a gentleman.

Many biographers have noted that Darwin enjoyed **William Paley’s** writings in his student days. Paley’s “watchmaker” argument is famous. (If you find a watch lying in the woods, you would assume it was made by an intelligent being; likewise, the design of creation points to an intelligent creator.) Paley, a senior Anglican clergyman, did not believe that the Bible is divinely inspired. His God was “Aristotle’s God--a master designer but now remote from his creation” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, pp. 115, 349).

In 1831, Darwin began his famous five-year journey on the *H.M.S. Beagle*, which had the objective of mapping coast lines for the British navy. The captain, Robert Fitz-Roy, a Bible believer, concluded that the findings of the journey substantiated the book of Genesis. Darwin saw the same evidence and rejected the Bible.

Darwin claims that he was “quite orthodox” during the Beagle journey, but he was grossly abusing the term “orthodox.”

“Whilst on board the Beagle I was quite orthodox ... But I had gradually come, by this time, to see that the **Old Testament from its MANIFESTLY FALSE HISTORY of the world, with the Tower of Babel, the rainbow as a sign, etc., etc., and from its attributing to God the feelings of a revengeful tyrant, was NO MORE TO BE TRUSTED THAN THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE HINDOOS**, or the beliefs of any barbarian. ... By further reflecting that the clearest evidence would be requisite to make any sane man believe in the miracles by which Christianity is supported,--that **the more we know of the fixed laws of nature the more incredible do miracles become**,--that the men at that time were ignorant and credulous to a degree almost incomprehensible by us,--that **the Gospels cannot be proved to have been written simultaneously with the events ...**” (*Autobiography*, pp. 85, 86).

Like his grandfather Erasmus, Charles Darwin especially hated the doctrine of eternal torment.

“I can indeed hardly see how anyone ought to wish Christianity to be true; for if so the plain language of the text seems to show that the men who do not believe, and this would include my Father, Brother, and almost all my best friends, will be everlastingly punished. And **this is a damnable doctrine**” (*Autobiography*, p. 87).

Darwin was “destitute of faith, yet terrified at scepticism” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 268). He felt like he was committing murder. “When Darwin did come out of his closet and bare his soul to a friend, he used a telling expression. He said it was ‘like confessing a murder’” (Desmond, p. xviii). The title to Adrian Desmond’s biography is *Darwin: The Life of a Tormented Evolutionist*.

Darwin suffered much of his life from debilitating sickness, so much so that he was largely a recluse during his last 30 years. He sought relief through a variety of quack cures — brass and zinc wires around his neck and waist, vinegar baths, ice packs, crash diets, and water (hydropathic) spas.

By 1871, at age 62, Darwin was “a confirmed invalid” who “sat engulfed in fog, downhearted, drawing up his will” (Desmond, *Darwin*, p. 597).

Darwin claimed that he came to his evolutionary theories “quite independently.” But it was a lie.

There is a popular myth that Darwin was converted on his deathbed. Charles’ daughter (Henrietta Litchfield) stated in *The Christian*, dated February 23, 1922, “I was present at his deathbed. ... He never recanted any of his scientific views, either then or earlier.”

## **THOMAS HUXLEY**

Thomas Huxley (1825-1895) was called “Darwin’s Bulldog” because he was the main public defender of Darwinian evolution in Darwin’s day.

Huxley played a large part in the change that came to England in his times. He was a revolutionist. His biographer describes him as an “evolutionary propagandist and proselytizer of a new scientific authority” (Desmond, p. 617).

Huxley witnessed a technological revolution. It appeared that science would conquer every human problem and carry men into a glorious millennium.

Huxley also witnessed a spiritual revolution; skepticism was in the air, and he was prominent voice in England for the overthrow of the Christian faith.

When his first son died at age four, the grieving Huxley rejected the idea that he needed “the hope and consolation” of Christ and considered the temptation to turn to such a hope “a scoffing devil.” When the preacher read from 1 Corinthians 15 at the funeral, Huxley said, “I could have laughed with scorn” (Desmond, pp. 287, 288).

Huxley counted radical God-hating skeptics such as Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, and George Eliot as his best friends. “Secularity” was their watchword.

They wanted “a hammer to break the creationist shackles” (Desmond, p. 186), and Darwinism became that hammer.

They also described evolutionary science as “a cleansing solvent, dissolving the dross” of biblical faith (p. 306).

Huxley called Darwinism the “New Reformation.”

He wanted to “see the foot of Science on the necks of her Enemies” (p. 253).

Huxley claimed that Jehovah God was a product of evolution.

Huxley called the account of Jesus casting out the demons in Gadarene “preposterous and immoral.”

He claimed that Jesus was just another orthodox Jewish teacher.

Huxley’s largest book, *Essays upon Some Controverted Questions*, was on Biblical criticism.

Huxley loved “trashing reputations and received wisdom” (Desmond, p. 227).

He said, “There is no doubt I have a hot bad temper. If I hate a man, I despise him” (p. 213)/

He was a “parson hater.”

Huxley said of scientists who resisted Darwinism, “I should like to get my heel into their mouths and scr-r-unch it round” (Lord Ernie, “Victorian Memoirs and Memories,” *The Quarterly Review*, 1923, cited from Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 363).

Of anyone who attempted to defend the Bible or even tried to reconcile it with evolution, Huxley said that if he “were Commander in Chief in their universe” he would dump them in a “hot locus in the lower regions” (p. 505).

Huxley intended to take control of science in England and he was largely successful. He founded the secretive X-Club, which was dedicated to “science, pure and free, untrammled by religious dogmas.” “Opponents were locked out, ignored, and mocked” (Wiker, *The Darwin Myth*, p. 105). From X-Club ranks came three presidents of the Royal Society and five presidents of the British Association (Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 35).

The X-Club published its own periodical called *Nature* as part of their aggressive campaign of selling Darwinism to the public. In January 2009, *Nature* published free online packet “for those wishing to spread the good news about Darwinism.”

Pope Huxley and his fellow bishops in the Church of Science brought back the inquisition. St. George Mivart started out as an ardent evolutionist, but he was savaged when he had the audacity to publish a book debunking Darwinism and warning that it would destroy morality and produce despair (Desmond, p. 455). The Huxley inquisitors had Mivart’s membership in the prestigious Athenaeum Club nixed. Mivart was shunned as a leper by the Darwinian elite, and he wasn’t even a Bible believer; he was a liberal Roman Catholic who held to theistic evolution.

Mivart was only the first victim of the Darwinian inquisition, a phenomenon that has broadened in scope and intensity in our day.

This persecution is going on today in every field of science. In 1995, Phillip Johnson, a law professor, observed:

“Darwinian theory is the creation myth of our culture. ... So we have the priesthood of naturalism, which has great cultural authority, and of course has to protect its mystery that gives it that authority--that's why they're so vicious towards critics” (*In the Beginning: The Creationist Controversy*, PBS documentary, May 30-31, 1995).

The video documentary *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed* examines the persecution of scientists and professors who dare to question Darwinism.

At best, the scientist who questions evolution is treated as an idiot and a fool. Dr. Michael Behe, Ph.D. in biology and a top geneticist, is depicted with a dunce cap on the Internet. He is not a creationist, but he has written books debunking evolution by mutations.

Some evolutionists even call themselves howler monkeys because of their fierce opposition to those who dare question their doctrine.

Huxley coined the term “agnostic” to describe the state of supposedly not knowing whether there is a God and glorifying a skeptical mindset. The word means “no knowledge.” Huxley’s biographer said, “Agnosticism was to become the new faith of the West.”

That era was a great turning point in Western history. The Bible’s authority was greatly diminished by the attacks of theological liberalism and evolution.

Charles Spurgeon described those times in these words: “Attendance at places of worship is declining and reverence for holy things is vanishing. We solemnly believe this to be largely attributable to the skepticism which has flashed from the pulpit and spread among the people” (C.H. Spurgeon, *Sword and Trowel*, Nov. 1887).

This was also when modern textual criticism came to the fore and it was promoted by the same skeptical crowd.

In 1860, John William Burgon preached what was probably the last sermon series on the verbal inspiration of Scripture at Oxford University. That year he had been appointed the Select Preacher of the University.

The series was subsequently published under the title *Inspiration and Interpretation*.

The occasion was the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, a series of modernistic articles by Anglican clergymen.

John Burgon was a unique man for that hour. He was one of England's greatest Biblical scholars. He was a keen student of the history of the text of Scripture, having traveled across Europe to examine ancient manuscripts.

He was a true spiritual warrior.

He stood against the Roman Catholic influence which was flooding into the Anglican Church through the Tractarian Movement.

He also stood against both theological liberalism and modern textual criticism, recognizing the intimate association between the two.

When the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament was published in 1881, Burgon replied with *The Revision Revised*.

Burgon had great understanding of the fundamental issues of the age.

Following are excerpted from Burgon's 1860 Oxford sermon series:

"At the root of the whole mischief of these last days lies disbelief in the Bible as the Word of God. This is the fundamental error."

"I am weary of the dignified conventionalities under which scepticism loves to conceal itself. ... In such a cause I will not so far give in to the smooth fashion of a supple and indifferent age."

"There was a time, then—and it was certainly less than 6,000 years ago,—when 'the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.'"

"Apart from Revelation, we could really have known nothing at all about the works of the days of the first Great Week."

"There exists however a vague suspicion after all that the beginning of Genesis is a vision, or an allegory, or a parable. It is hard to imagine why. If there be a book in the whole Bible which purports to be a plain historical narrative of actual events, that book is the book of Genesis."

"A week is described. Days are spoken of,—each made of an evening and a morning. ... You may not play tricks with language plain as this, and elongate a week, until it shall more than embrace the span of all recorded Time."

"Natural science has lately woke up from her long slumber ... She is impatient to measure her crude theories against the sure revelation of God's Word. Where the two differ, she assumes that of course the inspired oracles are wrong, and her own wild guesses right."

"Destroy my confidence in the Bible as an historical record, and you destroy my confidence in it altogether. For by far the largest part of the Bible is an historical record."

"Either, with the best and wisest of all ages, you must believe the whole of Holy Scripture; or, with the narrow-minded infidel, you must disbelieve the whole. There is no middle course open to you."

"We constantly find Science and Theology opposed to one another: just as if Theology were not a science! ... What have other sciences to boast of which Theology has not? ... The express Revelation of the Eternal is that whereon Theological Science builds her fabric of imperishable Truth."

“Or sirs ... it must suffice to have warned you against the men who resort to the armory of Natural Science for weapons wherewith to assail God’s Truth. Regard them as the enemies of your peace; and learn to reject their specious, yet most inconsequential reasonings, with the scorn which is properly their due.”

“He who surrenders the first page of his Bible surrenders all.”

“The Bible (be persuaded) is the very utterance of the eternal;—as much God’s Word, as if high heaven were open, and we heard God speaking to us with human voice.”

“The Bible is none other than the voice of him that sitteth upon the throne! Every book of it,—every chapter of it,—every verse of it,—every word of it,—every syllable of it,—every letter of it—is the direct utterance of the most high!”

“The Bible is none other than the Word of God: not some part of it more, some part of it, less; but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne;—absolute,—faultless,—unerring,—supreme!”

We have documented this important history in *For Love of the Bible*, which is available from [www.wayoflife.org](http://www.wayoflife.org).

By 1882, 22 years later, the condition of the Anglican Church was evident by the fact that **Charles Darwin was buried with highest honors in Westminster Cathedral**. Choristers hypocritically sang “I am the resurrection.” A special hymn composed for the occasion was taken from the book of Proverbs. It began, “Happy is the man that findeth wisdom, and getting understanding.” As the coffin was lowered into the grave, the choristers sang, “His body is buried in peace, but his name liveth evermore.”

Huxley realized that **education** was the key to the promotion of evolution. He called for the removal of the Bible from public school classrooms (Desmond, p. 580).

Huxley understood the power of **the printed page**. The skeptics used the new steam presses to pump out cheap books and tabloids promoting their unbelief. Huxley’s lectures sold by the thousands.

Huxley and Darwin believed that a moral code can be maintained even if one rejects God, but they were wrong to think that the doctrine of evolution would not destroy morality. If there is no law-giving creator God, there is no basis for absolute morality. If man is a product of the blind chance; if he is an animal; if there is no purpose to life, there is no ultimate reason why he should live according to absolute morals.

Both Darwin and Huxley were moralists who believed in traditional marriage. But no-fault divorce, homosexual rights, legalized abortion, and the pornography revolution are direct products of their evolutionary doctrine and religious skepticism.

Huxley lived to despise the culture that he helped create. Darwin biographer Jacques Barzun said, “He was trying to lay the ghost he had raised, but lacked the formula” (*Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 103). One evening the flamboyant homosexual Oscar Wilde came to the sixty-year-old Huxley’s house with a coterie of his daughter Nettie’s “self-obsessed hedonist” friends. Wilde projected all

the “petulances and flippancies of the decadence, the febrile self-assertion, the voluptuousness, the perversity of the new Hedonism” (Desmond, p. 540). Huxley responded, “That man never enters my house again.”

Huxley “died heavyhearted with forebodings of the kind of future he had helped to prepare” (Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, p. 64). “A death shroud descended over Huxley’s philosophy” (Desmond, p. 560).

He and Darwin believed that mankind was destined to perish in a final “universal winter” when the universe ceased to sustain life.

Huxley’s wife, Nettie, who professed to believe the Bible and was a church goer, “was lapping on the edges of agnosticism herself” (p. 516). She had ignored the warning of God’s Word (1 Cor. 6:14; 15:33).

Before he died, Huxley said he would rather be in hell than be annihilated. “I find my dislike to the thought of extinction increasing as I get older and nearer the goal. It flashes across me at all sorts of times with a sort of horror ... I had sooner be in hell ... at any rate in one of the upper circles, where the climate and company are not too trying” (Desmond, p. 506).

Insanity and depression run deeply in the skeptical Huxley family.

Thomas had many bouts with deep depression, when “a deadness hangs about me.” He was said to carry “a strain of madness in him” and to carry on “lengthy conversations between unknown persons living within his brain” (Desmond, p. 555).

Huxley’s father died in an asylum.

His two brothers suffered “extreme mental anxiety” and “near madness.”

Huxley’s daughter Mady was “prey to gloom and horrors,” before her death in her mid-twenties. She “hardly knew her three-year-old.” She died in despair, “desperately wanting to believe in another happier world” (p. 558).

One of Huxley’s grandsons, Noel Trevelyan, committed suicide at age 25; another, Julian Huxley, suffered six mental breakdowns.

The Darwinian gospel is a pathetic substitute for the gospel of Jesus Christ. Atheists are whistling in the dark.

## REVIEW QUESTIONS ON A HISTORY OF EVOLUTION

1. Name an ancient philosopher or philosophy that taught evolution.
2. What was Erasmus Darwin’s family symbol?
3. What did this symbol mean?
4. Who is the father of geological “uniformitarianism”?

5. This man wanted to “drive men out of the \_\_\_\_\_ record.”
6. In what year did Charles Darwin die?
7. Charles’ mother was what religion?
8. What religious view did Charles’ father hold?
9. Charles said the Bible was “no more to be trusted than the sacred books of the \_\_\_\_\_.
10. What did Charles Darwin call the doctrine of eternal torment?
11. What was the name of Charles’ most influential book?
12. What year was this book published?
13. Thomas Huxley was called Darwin’s \_\_\_\_\_.
14. What preacher said that skepticism was flashing from the pulpits of his day?
15. What man preached in defense of the verbal inspiration of the Bible at Oxford University in Huxley’s day?
16. This man saw a connection between theological liberalism and what?
17. Where was Charles Darwin buried?
18. What video documentary describes Darwinian persecution today?
19. What term did Huxley coin to describe his view of religion?
20. What does this term mean?

## DARWIN SKEPTICS TODAY

☛ A PowerPoint presentation of this material on Natural Selection is included in the *Unshakeable Faith* apologetics course package. It is basically a graphical edition of this text, and the student and teacher are strongly advised to go through the PowerPoints, as the graphics are an important part of the instruction.

In spite of the 150 years of onslaught of Darwinism, by God’s grace the rejection of Darwinism is still widespread.

I believe we can explain this by the fact that there are two parallel programs operating in the world.

### THE DEVIL’S PROGRAM

“For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way” (2 Thes. 2:7).

### GOD’S PROGRAM

“But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth” (Acts 1:8).

According to recent research, **there are an estimated 113,000 Darwin skeptic scientists and academics in the United States alone** (Neil Gross and Solon Simmons, *How Religious Are America’s College and University Professors?*, Working paper Harvard University, Oct. 5, 2006).

A Gallup poll in **America** in 2012

46% - youth-earth creation  
32% - Theistic evolution  
15% - Darwinian naturalistic evolution

A poll in **Britain** in 2006

Less than half believe in evolution  
40% believed that intelligent design should be taught in schools

A poll in **Israel** in 2006 by the Samuel Neaman Institute found that 59% believe in creation as stated in the Torah, while only 28% believe in evolution

Jewish organizations that hold to creation include the Association of Orthodox Jewish Scientists. Jewish Ph.D.s who hold to creation include

Morris Goldman, parasitologist  
Edward Simon, biology  
Nathan Aviezer, physics  
Lee Spetner, biophysicist  
Yaacov Hanoka, solid state physics  
Gerold Schroeder, nuclear physics

Dr. Jerry Bergman has compiled a public list of 3,000 “Darwin Skeptics,” including about a dozen Nobel Prize winners.

<http://www.rae.org/pdf/darwinskeptics.pdf>

Bergman also has a private list of about 1,000 names of persons who don't want their names on a public list “because of real concerns over possible retaliation or harm to their careers.”

There is “A Scientific Dissent from Darwinism” web page published by the Discovery Institute.  
<http://www.discovery.org>

As of December 2014, it has been signed by about 840 scientists who agree with the following statement: “We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged.”

The Christian Research Society membership consists of more than 600 men and women who hold advanced degrees and who are committed to biblical creationism.

The Korea Association of Creation Research membership includes 450 scientists, 150 of them with Ph.D.s.

Our book *Scientists Who Believe the Bible* contains the testimonies of 84 Ph.D. scientists who hold to a six-day creation.

## NATURAL SELECTION

☛ A PowerPoint presentation of this material on Natural Selection is included in the *Unshakeable Faith* apologetics course package. It is basically a graphical edition of this text, and the student and teacher are strongly advised to go through the PowerPoints, as the graphics are an important part of the instruction.

In this section and the next, we will see that evolution has two different mechanisms that are supposed to drive the process: *natural selection* and *mutations*.

Natural selection is the major concept developed in Charles Darwin. The full title of his 1859 book was *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*.

Natural selection refers to “survival of the fittest.” It says that traits that improve a creature’s chance for survival are preserved for future generations, and in this way small beneficial changes direct evolution. Over millions of years, tiny changes produce new structures and new creatures. Darwin called this “descent with modification.”

“Natural selection is the process whereby organisms better adapted to their environment tend to survive and produce more offspring. The theory of its action was first fully expounded by Charles Darwin, and it is now regarded as being the main process that brings about evolution. (Oxford Dictionary).

For example, a drought on the Galapagos Islands in 1977 caused a shortage of small seeds which finches prefer and they were forced to eat larger and tougher ones. In one generation the average size of the birds increased slightly because the smaller ones did not survive. Only the “fittest” survived, and according to Darwinism this slight environment-induced change would eventually produce not only different types of birds but also different types of creatures.

Darwin, a pigeon breeder, used artificial selection to prove natural selection. To Darwin, the variety of pigeons are evidence that environmental pressures can produce change through “natural selection” and that eventually the accumulation of small changes over great periods of time would produce new limbs, organs, and creatures.

**Darwin emphasized the word “natural.”** Darwin rejected any idea of design by an outside intelligence. He said, “There seems to be no more design in the variability of organic beings and the action of natural selection, than in the course which the wind blows” (*Autobiography*).

Darwin’s objective was to provide a mechanism to explain life apart from God. Darwinian natural selection is a blind, non-intelligent process.

Consider the following statements by prominent Darwinists:

Darwinism is the “theory of random, purposeless variations acted on by blind, purposeless natural selection” (Douglas Futuyma, *Evolutionary Biology* textbook).

“Natural selection, the blind, unconscious, automatic process which Darwin discovered ... has no purpose in mind and no mind’s eye. It does not plan for the future. It has no vision, no foresight, no sight at all. If it can be said to play the role of watchmaker in nature, it is the blind watchmaker” (Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 5).

“If the history of life teaches us any lesson, it is that human beings arose as a kind of glorious accident ... surely a kind of glorious cosmic accident resulting from the catenation [linking] of thousands of improbable events” (Stephen Jay Gould, April 22, 1984, *60 Minutes* television program).

“Man is the result of a purposeless and natural process that did not have him in mind” (George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution*, 1949, p. 344).

“Science has no need of purpose ... all the extraordinary, wonderful richness of the world can be expressed as growth from the dunghill of purposeless interconnected corruption” (Peter Atkins, cited from T. Schick Jr., *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*, p. 351).

Natural selection remains the major mechanism of evolution. Stuart Kauffman says, “Biologists now tend to believe profoundly that natural selection is the invisible hand that crafts well-wrought forms. ... If current biology has a central canon, you have now heard it” (*At Home in the Universe: The Search for the Laws of Self-organization and Complexity*, 1995).

In answering Darwinian natural selection, we observe:

1. Natural selection can only explain minor variations.
2. Natural selection can only “select”; it cannot build
3. Natural selection cannot see the future or work toward a goal, so it would not select something that would not be helpful for the creature’s immediate survival
4. Natural selection requires competition for “survival of the fittest,” but nature shows more symbiosis than fighting

### **1. Natural selection can only explain minor variations within a species.**

Natural selection might explain something like the size of a finch’s beak, but it has never proven to be a mechanism for the supposed transmigration of species.

Charles Darwin did not give *any* evidence of how one type of animal could evolve into another.

The apple maggot is offered under the evidence section of the British Natural History Museum’s web site. The maggot changed from eating apples to eating hawthorn fruit, but it’s still the same maggot.

Consider bird evolution as an example of what would be required if evolution were true. According to evolution, the bird evolved from a small dinosaur. Some of the miraculous changes necessary for this to happen are as follows.

- *A heavy earth-bound body would have to evolve into a light-weight, aerodynamic one.*
- *Solid bones would have to evolve into hollow bones that are light but incredibly strong.*

- *Scales would have to evolve into complex flight feathers.*
- *Bellows-like lungs would have to evolve into the avian sac-like lungs.*
- *An egg with a leathery cover would have to evolve into an egg with a hardened calciferous shell.*
- *A land-bound reptile brain would have to evolve into an avian brain capable of thriving in a completely different environment.*
- *A creature that can only grunt or squeal or croak would have to evolve the ability to sing pretty songs.*
- *A creature that lives and dies in one place would have to evolve the ability to migrate long distances.*

And this amazing reptile-to-bird evolutionary process, which is blind and non-intelligent and directionless, would have to produce 24 orders of birds from eagles to woodpeckers to swans to penguins to hummingbirds!

The process that produces minor adaptive changes in a creature and the isolation of various inherent genetic traits has never been demonstrated to be a process that can change one type of animal or plant into another.

## **2. Natural selection can only “select,” as its name implies; it cannot build or create.**

Natural selection cannot produce new creatures because it has no creative power to add information to the creature’s DNA.

DNA stands for DeoxyriboNucleic Acid. It is obtained from the mother and father and passed from generation to generation. It contains all of the information that builds our bodies.

In 1962, James Watson and Francis Crick were awarded a Nobel Prize for their discovery of the shape and structure of DNA.

Each living cell has a copy of the DNA. If stretched out the DNA in one cell would be about three feet long, but it is brilliantly packed into 46 packages called chromosomes.

Humans have 10 to 100 trillion cells.

The body forms 300 billion new cells every day, 200 million per minute!

Each cell is far more complicated than a modern city. In fact, a living cell is similar to a city in many ways. It has a command center, gates, roads, cargo carriers, power generators, power transmission lines, factories, waste disposal, and much more.

The DNA in one cell holds information equivalent to at least 1,0000 large books and probably much more, because scientists are continually finding new information in the DNA.

DNA is like a blueprint that contains the instructions for making a building.

DNA has the instructions to make the person. The cell reads the instructions and makes the various parts of your body.

If the DNA in each cell in your body were stretched out, it would reach to the sun and back at least four times, and the sun is 93 million miles away.

The DNA contains the information to build the living creature, whether it is a worm or a rose or a man.

Not only does each cell contain the information to build the body, but it also has the machinery to make the body from that information. It does this by making proteins and other things, and using those to build the living body.

The DNA information is passed on from generation to generation, and it never results in a different kind of living thing.

To build something new, such as growing feathers and wings on a dinosaur, would require huge amounts of new information in the DNA, but natural selection has no power to do this.

Darwin believed in Jean Lamarck's theory that the giraffe got its long neck by stretching to reach higher branches of trees.

Fredrich Weismann disproved Lamarckianism with his experiments with mice. He cut off the tails of 901 mice for 19 generations. But the baby mice always had full tails.

**3. Natural selection, not being able to see or work toward a future goal, would not select something that would not be helpful for the creature's immediate survival.**

Charles Darwin wrote:

“On the other hand, we may feel sure that **any variation in the least degree injurious would be rigidly destroyed**” (*On the Origin of Species*, p. 502)

This means that partly-formed and therefore presently-useless structures such as a “developing” wing or leg or flipper or lung or heart would *not* be preserved.

Take the example of the bird's marvelous flying wing. A part wing would provide no benefit and would, in fact, be a definite hindrance. If scales somehow gradually lost their hardness on the way to somehow becoming feathers, the protective benefit of the scale would be lost eons before any benefit of flight was achieved.

Consider whale evolution. Evolutionists say that the whale evolved from a wolf-like creature. Here is how *National Geographic* describes it:

“The whale's ascendancy to sovereign size apparently began sixty million years ago when hairy, four-legged mammals, in search of food or sanctuary, ventured into the water. As eons passed, changes slowly occurred: hind legs disappeared, front legs changed into flippers, hair gave way to a thick, smooth blanket of blubber,

nostrils moved to the top of the head, the tail broadened into flukes, and in the buoyant water world the body became enormous” (*National Geographic*, Dec. 1976).

How could this “just so” story happen? If a wolf started growing a flipper, what would happen to that creature? It would simply be a crippled monster.

#### **4. Natural selection requires competition for “survival of the fittest,” but nature shows more interrelatedness.**

Darwin described nature as being everywhere “red in tooth and claw,” because this was required for his theory of natural selection, but this is not what we see.

The universe is a massive, interrelated system which is evident everywhere, from the far galaxies to the living cell to the atom.

*Consider the laws of physics.* Charles Townes, Nobel Prize Laureate, is not a biblical creationist, but he says, “This is a very special universe: it’s remarkable that it came out just this way. If the laws of physics weren’t just the way they are, we couldn’t be here at all. The sun couldn’t be there. The laws of gravity and nuclear laws and magnetic theory, quantum mechanics, and so on have to be just the way they are for us to be here” (*UCBerkeley News*, June 17, 2005).

Astronomer Paul Davies says, “On the face of it, the universe does look as if it has been designed by an intelligent creator expressly for the purpose of spawning sentient beings. Like the porridge in the tale of *Goldilocks and the Three Bears*, the universe seems to be ‘just right’ for life” (*The Goldilocks Enigma*, pp. 3, 5).

There are interconnections everywhere. Biologists call this mutualism, environmental community, biosphere, biosystems, ecosystems, holism.

*Consider humans and intestinal bacteria.* Bacteria are not a part of the human body, but they do things that the human body cannot do for itself, but which are necessary for its survival. They synthesize vitamins essential for nutrition, such as vitamin K, niacin, and B-complex vitamins. “Friendly” bacteria kill harmful bacteria. Bacteria synthesize niacin to make NAD which is necessary for energy conversion in the cell’s mitochondria.

*Consider the snapping shrimp and the goby fish.* The shrimp has poor eyesight and is dependent on the goby for protection. The shrimp builds the system of tunnels that he and the goby live in. When the shrimp goes outside, it keeps one antenna on the goby. If danger approaches, the goby signals and disappears inside the burrow with the shrimp right behind him.

*Consider pollination.* The pollination system is a finely-tuned symbiotic process that involves countless different types of flowers, insects, and birds, all perfectly integrated to maintain life.

In flowers, the process usually involves transferring the pollen grains from the stamen to the stigma. The result is the formation of a seed. There are a bewildering number of different systems for pollination.

Among orchids alone, there are hundreds of different methods.

**NECTAR.** Many orchids produce sweet nectar to attract insects. The nectar itself is complex, being composed of sugar, amino acids, lipids, organic acids, minerals, vitamins, enzymes, antioxidants, ions, and metabolites (me-tab'-o-lites).

**ODOR.** Different orchids use different types of odors to attract pollinators. The stench of *Bulbophyllum beccarii* is said to smell like “a herd of dead elephants”!

**COLOR.** Other orchids use color to attract pollinators.

**MIMICRY.** The moth orchid (*Phalenopsis*) has blooms that look like moths, and the wind makes it flutter like a moth, attracting real moths. The *Ophrys* family of orchids look like the female of the bee species that pollinates them or like flies.

**SEXUAL DECEPTION.** Some orchids attract a specific type of male insect by producing a chemical odor that imitates the sex pheromones of the female. There is also sexual deception when the plant imitates the appearance of a female insect. The lip of the looking glass orchid is surrounded by a fringe of red hairs just like those on the body of the female wasp, and there is a bluish mirror-like patch in the center of the lip which looks like her shimmering wings.

**TRAPS.** The bucket orchid has a little bucket of nectar. Above it is a rounded pad that is saturated with a fragrant oil that male bees like to pack into the sacks on their back legs to use in courting females. It “happens” to smell like the pheromones bees use to attract mates. Since the surface of the flower is slippery, a bee often slips into the bucket. The only way to escape drowning is through a narrow channel at the base of the lip, and as the bee squeezes out, two grains of sticky pollen are deposited on his back.

**ROADS.** Some orchids (*Phragmipedium*) produce long petals that trail to the ground to make a road for crawling insects that leads right to their pollen.

**SHOOTING POLLEN.** The *Catasetum* orchid has a little hair trigger mechanism that when touched fires a sticky pollen at the insect. High speed photography has found that the amazing trigger fires at 1.3 meters per second. And this is a plant! The trigger mechanism is tuned only to be set off when the right-size bee lands on it. Things like wind or falling water or lighter insects do not affect it.

Evolutionists speak of “co-evolution.” The concept was invented by Alfred Wallace, who published a report on evolution by natural selection before Darwin. He had this insight while practicing witchcraft in jungles in South American, Borneo, and elsewhere.

Here is a typical statement about co-evolution:

“In virtually all cases the orchid and pollinator have evolved together” (“Orchids and Their Pollinators,” Brooklyn Botanic Garden, April 1, 2004).

A vast amount of perfect genetic information and processes are involved in producing an orchid and a moth that operate in such perfect harmony. No “naturalistic” Darwinian process accounts for such a thing.

This is simply circular reasoning. They assume that evolution happened, so they conclude that these amazing things must have co-evolved! Without the assumption, there is no evidence.

*Consider the earth's eco system.* Modern science has disproven evolution by learning that we live in a fantastically complex, interrelated system.

*There is the oxygen cycle.* Plants take in carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. Animals take in oxygen and breathe out carbon dioxide.

*There is the water cycle,* consisting of vaporization, buoyancy, condensation, precipitation, soil permeating, and distribution.

*Consider plants and their ecosystem.*

“[There] is interconnectedness between soil, microbes, plants, pests, and human health. Once you start to connect all the dots, you begin to understand the depth of nature’s intelligence, which always strives to maintain balance” (“Plants Can Hear Themselves Being Eaten,” Mercola.com, Oct. 11, 2014).

This description by a non-creationist nevertheless speaks of the earth in terms of intelligence.

Dr. Suzanne Simard of the University of British Columbia, who has studied the large trees of British Columbia, says, “We think of these individuals [trees] as just competing with each other, and that’s really led a lot of the thinking, and we have long ignored a lot of the other interactions other than competition. But at the same time there is a community effect that we haven’t understood, and we are just starting to re-look at this and understand that this is a system; it’s not just a bunch of individuals competing against each other. They are working together to make this system work” (“What Plants Talk About,” Nature, PBS).

Plants communicate with other plants through the air via chemical signals and by connections made underground via fungi.

Mycelial networks are fungi below ground which have a symbiotic relationship with plants. They colonize roots and act as root extensions. There is communication between the fungi and plants.

Mycorrhizae (my-cor-eye’-ze) refers to the fungi-root system. *Myc*o is fungus, and *rhizo* is roots. Over 90% of plants have a symbiotic relationship with mycorrhizae. One thimbleful of healthy soil contains several MILES of living fungal filaments. The fungi get carbon from the plants. In turn, the fungi assist the plant in absorption of water and nutrients, increasing absorption by 100 to 1,000 times. They act as an immune system to protect plants from pathogens, herbivores, and parasitic plants. They sound alarm against invaders.

Natural selection cannot explain the interconnectivity of life. In fact, the interconnectivity absolutely refutes Darwinian evolution!

### **SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE AGAINST NATURAL SELECTION**

Natural selection is the main mechanism of evolution as proposed by Charles Darwin. It refers to survival of the fittest, which is supposed to result in change to creatures that leads to evolution.

Natural selection can only explain small variations in creatures, such as different beak sizes of a finch. It cannot explain how creatures came into being.

Natural selection cannot build, because it cannot add new information to the DNA.

Natural selection would not preserve something that would not be helpful for the creature's immediate survival, such as a partial wing.

Natural selection requires struggle everywhere, but life shows interconnectivity. The fact that life is a giant system refutes natural selection.

### **REVIEW QUESTIONS ON NATURAL SELECTION**

1. What is another term for natural selection?
2. Describe natural selection.
3. Richard Dawkins said natural selection is the \_\_\_\_\_, unconscious process.
4. Dawkins says we live in a universe with no \_\_\_\_\_ and no \_\_\_\_\_.
5. What are four reasons why we reject the doctrine of natural selection?
6. Why is the title to Darwin's famous book a false statement?
7. Why do evolutionists say that the apple maggot proves evolution?
8. Why does the apple maggot *not* prove evolution?
9. According to evolution, the bird evolved from what?
10. What does DNA stand for?
11. What is DNA?
12. What did Charles Darwin know about DNA when he wrote his famous book?
13. What two men received a Nobel Prize for the discovery of the structure of DNA?
14. In what year did they receive this prize?
15. Where does the DNA reside in the living cell?
16. The DNA is packed into packages called what?
17. About how many cells does a human have?
18. The DNA in each cell contains information equivalent to how many large books?
19. The child receives its DNA from its \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_.
20. If a man builds big muscles, why is this trait not passed on to his sons?
21. What is the name of the man who experimented with mice to test the theory of evolution?
22. What experiment did he perform and what was the result?
23. What man had a theory about how the giraffe got its long neck?
24. How did the mice experiments disprove this?

25. According to evolution, how did the whale evolve?
26. If a land creature starting growing a flipper in the place of one of it's legs, what would happen to that creature?
27. What is mycorrhizae?
28. One thimbleful of healthy soil contains how much living fungal filaments?

## MUTATIONS

☛ A PowerPoint presentation of this section on Mutations is included in the *Unshakeable Faith* apologetics course package. It is basically a graphical edition of this text, and the student and teacher are strongly advised to go through the PowerPoints, as the graphics are an important part of the instruction.

Charles Darwin claimed that the major mechanism of evolutionary change is “natural selection.” As genetic research advanced in the 20th century, it became obvious even to Darwinists that natural selection could not account for evolution. Natural selection can only “select”; it cannot build. The information for the creature is in the DNA, and natural selection cannot add information to the DNA.

Evolutionists decided that new genetic information comes from mutations. This was called “Neo-Darwinism” or “the new synthesis.” It is a synthesis of Darwin’s natural selection and the mutation theory.

Mutations are mistakes that are made in the genetic and biological processes.

“Mutations result from unprepared DAMAGE to DNA ... or ERRORS in the process of replication...” (“Mutations,” *Wikipedia*).

Evolutionists claim that some mutations are favorable to the plant or creature and gradually build up new organs, structures, and creatures.

“The theory proposes that there is the infrequent appearance of a mutation where by chance the individual is more favorably suited to its environment. While admitted to be rare, the mutant then finds an exactly matching mate. Then, since they are slightly better fitted to the environment, it is supposed they tend to have more offspring than the normal variants. This chance process is repeated over countless generations, and the small mutant changes accumulate and eventually lead to the appearance of an entirely new species” (Ian Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, p. 159).

Richard Dawkins says:

“... mutation is, ultimately, **THE ONLY WAY** in which new variation enters the species. All that natural selection can do is accept certain new variations, and reject others” (*The Blind Watchmaker*, p. 125).

Following are the arguments against evolution by mutations:

1. Known mutations are either neutral or harmful.

2. Mutations do not add information to the DNA.
3. There are repair mechanisms within the cell that stop mutations.
4. Fruit fly experiments disprove the mutation theory.
5. Mutations will eventually be discarded as an explanation of evolution.

### **1. Known mutations are either neutral in their effect or harmful.**

Duane Gish, Ph.D. in biochemistry:

“The genes are ordinarily very stable. A particular gene (in the form of its successors) may exist many thousands of years without alteration in its structure. Very rarely, however, the chemical structure of a gene does undergo a change. Such a change is called a mutation. Mutations may be caused by chemicals, X-rays, ultraviolet light, cosmic rays, and other causes. Some may occur during cell reproduction due to copying errors. **Very often a mutation proves to be lethal, and they are almost universally harmful**” (*The Fossil Record Still Says No*, p. 37).

Mutations are the result of different types of errors in the genetic process in our cells and in other parts of our bodies. They can be caused by misreading the DNA, by wrong placement of amino acids in proteins, by wrong folding of proteins, and countless other things.

### CONSIDER PROTEINS

There are about 100,000 types of proteins that make up the human body, such as keratin that makes up the fingernails.

Proteins are made up of strings of amino acids, and large proteins can have hundreds of thousands of amino acids (which are made up of atoms). If just one amino acid is skipped or wrongly placed, that is a mutation and it can have dire consequences.

Proteins must also be folded in exactly the right shape, and any tiny mistake in the folding is a mutation that can cause great problems.

Just *one protein* can be compared to the most complicated manmade machine ever built: the Space Shuttle. It was designed for a specific purpose: to carry men and supplies to the International Space Station. It was made up of 2.5 million parts, and each one had to be made correctly and placed correctly and had to work together perfectly with every other part. A space shuttle was destroyed in 1983 when one of those 2.5 million parts (a seal on one of its boosters) failed and hot gas burned through the external tank.

Consider the mutation that produces **SICKLE-CELL ANEMIA**. Sickle-cell is a blood cell that is mis-shaped. The normal blood cell carries oxygen to every part of the body. It is shaped like a little dish.

Sickle cell is caused by a single tiny error in the hemoglobin protein in the red blood cell. Just one amino acid in the string is wrong.

The normal blood cell is a perfect shape to allow the blood with its life-giving oxygen to travel throughout the body in the blood vessels.

The body has an amazing system of large arteries, smaller veins, and tiny capillaries that transport the blood from the heart to every part of the body. The blood cells have to travel through the tiniest capillaries, and their shape allows them to do this. They can bend easily and then recover their shape.

The mutated hemoglobin proteins stick to each other, making the sickle cell stiff and sticky so it doesn't flow through the blood vessels properly.

It can cause pain, tiredness, infection, organ failure, and death.

Since sickle cell anemia can provide some defense against malaria in some cases, it is actually used by evolutionists as an example of a beneficial mutation. But overall it is a harmful thing that can cause early death. It's not the type of thing you want to pass on to your children!

Dr. Michael Behe, Ph.D. biology, argues in his 2007 book *The Edge of Evolution* that sickle cell is really about de-evolution. It is not the kind of process that could construct new, complex processes and structures. Behe describes mutations other than sickle cell that can provide resistance to malaria, but in every case the normal functioning of proteins is corrupted, which results in damage rather than benefit.

Mutations are explained by man's fall and the subsequent corruption of God's good creation.

"For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Romans 8:22).

Consider the mutation that causes **CYSTIC FIBROSIS**.

It is caused by the incorrect folding of a protein, which happens because of the deletion of *a single amino acid*.

The protein is cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR). It allows chloride ions (salt) to pass through the outer membrane of cell and this keeps the outer membrane clean of mucus.

If this protein isn't working properly, a thick, sticky mucus builds up in the lungs and digestive organs, causing difficult breathing and infections, and results in death by age 37, but often much earlier. Before modern medicine, the expectancy was much younger.

Consider the mutation that causes **PROGERIA**.

It means "prematurely old." It causes rapid aging. Sam Berns died at age 17, but he looked like an old man.

In 2003, scientists identified the mutation. It is a mistake in the protein LMNA (lamin-a), which forms the structural scaffolding that holds the cell together.

The mutated protein is called progerin. Everyone has a little progerin, which builds up over time and is one of the things that causes us to die.

Death is a result of sin. The process of death works in every person (Rom. 6:23).

Mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) is the source of many mutations. mtDNA are organelles in the cell that contain DNA. They produce ATP, which is the cell's energy source. All of the mtDNA is inherited from the mother, since the father's mtDNA in the sperm cell dies after fertilization.

The mtDNA doesn't have the error correcting mechanisms that the DNA in the cell's nucleus has, so it is more prone to mutations.

Some of these are cancer (breast, colon, stomach, liver, kidney, leukemia, lymphoma), Leigh syndrome (a progressive brain disorder), maternally inherited diabetes, maternally inherited deafness, myoclonic epilepsy, and progressive external ophthalmoplegia (loss of muscle control in the eyes, drooping eyelids). A buildup of mtDNA mutations is associated with increased risk of heart disease, Alzheimer's, and Parkinson disease.

Mutations are bad! It should be obvious that they are not the path toward higher evolution.

## **2. Mutations do not add information to the DNA.**

For mutations to create new structures, organs, and creatures, they would need to add information to the genetic code. In fact, a VAST amount of new information would be required to turn a "simple" ameba into a man or even a wolf into a whale. But in fact mutations either subtract from the existing genetic code or modify it.

Dr. Ian Macreadie, principal research scientist at the Bimolecular Research Institute of Australia and one of the top AIDS researchers, says:

"All you see in the lab is either gene duplications, reshuffling of existing genes, or defective genes (with a loss of information) that might help a bug to survive--say by not being able to fight the drug as effectively. But **you never see any new information arising in a cell**. Sometimes a bacterium can 'inject' information into another one, so it's 'new' to that bacterium--but that information had to arise somewhere, and we just don't observe it happening. It's hard to see how any serious scientist could believe that real information can arise just by itself, from nothing" ("Creation in the Research Lab," *The Genesis Files*, edited by Carl Wieland, p. 36).

Dr. Lee Spetner, a biophysicist who worked at Johns Hopkins University, says:

**"Not even one mutation has been observed that adds a little information to the genome. That surely shows that there are not the millions upon millions of potential mutations the theory demands. There may well not be any. The failure to observe even one mutation that adds information is more than just a failure to find support for the theory. It is evidence against the theory"** (*Not By Chance*, 1997, pp. 131, 132, 159, 160).

Dr. Werner Arber is a pioneer in DNA research. He received a Nobel Prize in Physiology in 1978 for the discovery of restriction enzymes in DNA. He is not a biblical creationists, but he knows that his work in genetics has disproven Darwinian evolution.

Of mutations causing evolutionary changes he says: “We have *in vain* spent much time in search for such evolutionary changes.” He stated that “the deeper we penetrate in the studies of genetic exchange the more we discover a multitude of mechanisms” involved in human genetics that falsify the mutation plus natural selection core of macroevolution. (“Werner Arber: Nobel Laureate, Darwin Skeptic” by Jerry Bergman).

Evolutionists claim **bacterial resistance to antibiotics** is evidence for their mutation doctrine.

For example, the *Staphylococcus* bacterium builds resistance to penicillin. In fact, though, *there is no addition of genetic information* and therefore no support for creature to creature evolution. Elements of the genetic code can be deleted, modified, and reshuffled to some degree, but this is not the addition of information that would be required for the evolution of creatures. The *Staphylococcus* bacterium remains a *Staphylococcus* bacterium.

This is another example of the evolutionist’s bait and switch tactic. They use the term “evolution” to describe simple adaptability within a species, and then use this to prove that kind-to-kind “evolution” is possible. The first can be proven, while the second is presumption.

Consider two of the major ways that bacteria achieve immunity to antibiotics.

*First, some of the bacteria within a certain strain already have immunity to a certain antibiotic.* These bacteria therefore survive and multiply, while those lacking this immunity die out.

“The acquisition of antibiotic resistance in this manner ... is not the kind that can serve as a prototype for the mutations needed to account for Evolution. ... The genetic changes that could illustrate the theory must not only add information to the bacterium's genome, they must add new information to the biocosm. The horizontal transfer of genes only spreads around genes that are already in some species” (“Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue,” 2001, [www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp](http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp)).

A few years ago the bodies of three Arctic explorers who died in 1845 were recovered. “Samples of bacteria were taken from their intestines and it was found that some of the bacteria were indeed resistant to modern-day antibiotics. This is just as the creation scientist would predict. There have always been some populations of bacteria that have had genes conferring a resistance to antibiotics” (Alan Gillen, M.D., *Body by Design*, p. 141).

The *Staphylococcus* bacterium isn’t “evolving.” It isn’t turning into something else. It is simply responding to the environment of a fallen world with the tools that God gave it.

*Second, some bacteria gain immunity by a loss of genetic information.* Dr. Lee Spetner gives the example of bacteria that become immune to streptomycin by the decomposition of the ribosome in its cell due to a destructive mutation.

“This change in the surface of the microorganism's ribosome prevents the streptomycin molecule from attaching and carrying out its antibiotic function. It turns out that this degradation is a loss of specificity and therefore a loss of information. The main point is that Evolution ... cannot be achieved by mutations of this

sort, no matter how many of them there are. Evolution cannot be built by accumulating mutations that only degrade specificity” (“Lee Spetner/Edward Max Dialogue,” 2001, [www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp](http://www.trueorigin.org/spetner2.asp)).

Mutations of this sort are the path toward degradation of the creature rather than the path of upward evolution.

The million-dollar question remains: where does genetic information come from? Evolution has no answer. Top geneticists say that it does not come through mutations, and obviously it doesn't come through natural selection. The Bible believer has a simple and effective reply which fits all the evidence. The information in the living cell was placed there by the Creator. Each plant and animal has the exact genetic information needed for its operation survival, and reproduction. There is a certain elasticity within the genetic code to allow the entity to adapt to a changing environment, but there is no change or “evolution” beyond genetic boundaries.

### **3. There are amazing repair mechanisms within the cell to thwart the distribution of mutations.**

Biologists have identified more than 50 different types of repair enzymes.

Lowell Coker, Ph.D. in microbiology and biochemistry, wrote:

“Numerous repair mechanisms have been found which ensure the accuracy of the replication process by correcting any errors that occur, even those that occur after replication in the complete DNA molecule. Please observe that these repair mechanisms work against the hypothesized mechanism of mutation as a principal means for operation in the theory of evolution. ... Each cell continuously monitors and repairs its genetic material. ... **The universal existence of repair mechanisms in DNA not only ensures faithful replication of this master blueprint of life, but also ensures stasis in its function in the manner intended in continuing generations.** This strong evidence falsifies the mechanism of evolution which requires multiple and continued mutation or change over vast periods of time in the DNA molecule, the blueprint of life, to effect the kinds and diversity of life that we see” (Lowell Coker, *Darwin's Design Dilemma*, pp. 120, 121).

James Shapiro, Ph.D. in genetics from Cambridge, of the University of Chicago, says the cell even has the ability to modify and fine tune its repair systems:

“It has been a surprise to learn how thoroughly cells protect themselves against precisely the kinds of accidental genetic change that, according to conventional theory, are the sources of evolutionary variability. By virtue of their proofreading and repair systems, living cells are not the passive victims of the random forces of chemistry and physics. They devote large resources to suppressing random genetic variation and **have the capacity to set the level of background localized mutability by adjusting the activity of their repair systems**” (Shapiro, “A Third Way,” *Boston Review*, Feb.-Mar. 1997, p. 33).

Even “simple” bacteria have complex error-correcting systems. Shapiro writes:

“When an *E. coli* cell divides every 20 minutes, exquisitely reliable coordination has been achieved for hundreds of millions of biochemical reactions and biomechanical events. ... This incredible precision is accomplished not by rigid mechanical precision but rather by using **two layers of expert error monitoring and correction systems**: (1) exonuclease proofreading in the polymerase itself, which catches and corrects over 99.9% of all mistakes as soon as they are made (Kunkel & Bebenek, 2000), and (2) the methyl-directed mismatch repair (MMR) system, which subsequently detects and fixes over 99% of any errors that escaped the

exonuclease (Modrich, 1991). **Together, this multilayered proofreading system boosts the 99.999% precision of the polymerase to over 99.9999999%** (Shapiro, “Bacteria are small but not stupid,” Exeter Meeting, 2006).

In commenting on these facts, the blog Truthmatters.info says:

**“All cells on planet earth are working very hard to prevent the very thing that supposedly created them!!** [e.g. genetic mutations]” (“Did DNA Copying Errors Create Systems for Preventing DNA Copying Errors?” Truthmatters.info, Sept. 12, 2010).

#### **4. The fruit fly experiments prove that mutations do not produce positive change in species.**

The fruit fly has been used in genetic experiments since the early 1900s. The experiments were invented by evolutionists who wanted to prove that mutations can change a creature into something else.

Since the fruit fly’s life cycle is only a few days, scientists can experiment with many generations quickly.

The fruit fly experiments have proven the following things:

- \* Mutations do not produce anything helpful.
- \* Mutations do not create new organs.
- \* Mutations do not change the fruit fly into anything else.
- \* Mutations either have no practical effect or they produce crippled things.

What about the four-winged fruit fly?

The wings are not functional! They lack flight muscles. Not only do they not help the creature fly better, they are a hindrance to flying.

The extra “wings” are actually a distortion of the insect’s “halteres” (hal’-ti-ere), which are appendages behind the wings. The loss of the use of the halteres is a serious handicap. They are very complicated organs that keep the insect balanced in flight.

Dr. Jonathan Wells summarizes the result of the fruit fly experiments as follows:

“No matter what we do to the genes of a fruit fly, there are only three possible outcomes:

- \* a normal fruit fly
- \* a defective fruit fly
- \* a dead fruit fly”

In fact, the fruit fly experiments prove that the Bible is true when it says that God made every thing to reproduce *after its kind* (Genesis 1).

Luther Burbank was a pioneer in agricultural science. Called “the Wizard of Horticulture,” he developed more than 800 new strains and varieties of plants, including the Burbank or Idaho

potato. Burbank observed that while there is great room for variety within plant species, there are also clear boundaries.

“There is a law of which I have not yet spoken that is useful to plant-breeders, as well as being a limitation on them. It is called the ‘**Law of the Reversion to the Average.**’ I know from experience that I can develop a plum half an inch long or two and a half inches long, with every possible length in between, but I am willing to admit that it is hopeless to try to get a plum the size of a small pea, or one as big as a grapefruit. ... **In short, there are limits to the development possible.** ... Experiments carried on extensively have given us scientific proof of what we have already guessed at by observation; namely, that plants and animals all tend to revert, in successive generation, toward a given mean or average. ... **there is undoubtedly a pull toward a mean which keeps all living things within some more or less fixed limitations**” (Burbank, *Partner of Nature*, 1939, p. 92).

Francis Hitching is not a creationist, but he admits that there are limitations in the genetic code:

“The genetic code in each living thing has its own **built-in limitations.** ... Every series of breeding experiments that has ever taken place has established a finite limit to breeding possibilities. Genes are a strong influence for conservatism, and allow only modest change” (*The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 39).

## 5. Mutations will eventually be discarded as an explanation of evolution.

I. L. Cohen, mathematician, member of the New York Academy of Sciences, called evolution by mutation a “metaphysical theory.”

“Micro mutations do occur, but the theory that these alone can account for evolutionary change is either falsified or else it is an unfalsifiable, hence metaphysical, theory. I suppose that nobody will deny that it is a great misfortune if an entire branch of science becomes addicted to a false theory. But this is what happened in biology ... **I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science**” (Cohen, cited in *Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth*, 1987, p. 422).

“To propose and argue that mutations even tandem with ‘natural selection’ are the root causes for 6,000,000 viable, enormously complex species is to mock logic, deny the weight of evidence, and reject the fundamentals of mathematical probability” (Cohen, *Darwin Was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities*, 1984, p. 81).

In the 1970s, Dr. Pierre-Paul Grassé, who held the Chair of Evolution at the Sorbonne in Paris for 20 years, called the hypothesis of evolution by mutation “day dreaming.” He was an evolutionist, but he understood that mutations cannot explain the living creatures.

“No matter how numerous they may be, **mutations do not produce any kind of evolution.** ... A single plant or a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with infinitesimal probability could no longer fail to occur. ... There is no law against **DAY DREAMING**, but science must not indulge in it” (*Evolution of Living Organisms*, 1977, pp. 88-103, 170).

Since the late 1990s, Dr. James Shapiro, professor of microbiology at the University of Chicago, has proposed “**a third way**” between Darwinism and creationism. Shapiro believes that he has found an evolutionary mechanism beyond mutations, and he calls it “natural genetic engineering.” He claims that newly discovered genetic mechanisms might explain how creatures evolve. (He assumes they did.) These things include symbiogenesis, horizontal DNA transfer, lateral gene transfer, genome doubling, interspecific hybridization, and gene duplication.

The Darwinian icon of evolution by mutation will disappear from the biology textbooks, but skeptics won't give up on evolution. They will find some other way to explain life without God. They will believe in space aliens, as Francis Crick and Richard Dawkins, or a pantheistic higher power as Stephen Gould, or a New Age Noosphere as Teilhard, or Gaia and the Temple of Nature as Erasmus Darwin did, or self-organization, autoevolution, a multiverse, or an indeterminate sea of potential. (See "Darwinian Gods" at [www.wayoflife.org](http://www.wayoflife.org).) For the Christ rejector, anything is preferable to Jehovah God.

In concluding the section on mutations, **we would warn our readers to beware of the Darwinist's citation of genetic research.**

Thankfully, there are qualified scientists who are skeptical of Darwinism and who are capable of analyzing the new claims and courageous enough to speak out.

There are biblical creation geneticists such as Georgia Purdom, Ph.D. genetics, who works with Answers in Genesis, and Joseph Francis, Ph.D. biology, who heads up the department biology and physical sciences at Master's College. They keep with the latest claims and are able to answer them. I consider the work of such people invaluable.

### **SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE AGAINST MUTATIONS**

Mutations are damages to the DNA or mistakes that are made in the genetic process of making the creature.

Mutations are usually harmful. An example is the sickle cell.

There are no helpful mutations that could account for evolution.

Mutations don't add information to the DNA that would build new creatures.

Repair mechanisms in the cell fight against mutations and would not allow mutations to build new creatures.

Fruit fly experiments prove that mutations cannot make new creatures or helpful organs. After hundreds of thousands of experiences, the only result is a normal fruit fly, a defective fruit fly, or a dead fruit fly.

This proves that the Bible is true when it says that God made the creatures to reproduce after their own kind. It says this 10 times in Genesis 1.

### **REVIEW QUESTIONS ON MUTATIONS**

1. What did evolutionists learn in the 20th century that made them understand that natural selection cannot explain evolution of creatures?
2. What are two names for the new evolutionary theory?
3. What are mutations?

4. What are the first three reasons why we believe that mutations cannot cause evolution?
5. Dr. Duane Gish says that mutations are “almost universally \_\_\_\_\_.”
6. Proteins are made up of what components?
7. Large proteins can have how many of these components?
8. What is the most complicated man-made machine ever made and how many parts did it have?
9. What does sickle cell anemia do to the blood cell?
10. What verse says the whole creation groaneth and travails in pain?
11. What does mtDNA stand for?
12. What is the function of mtDNA?
13. Why is mtDNA more prone to mutations?
14. Mutations either \_\_\_\_\_ the existing genetic code or \_\_\_\_\_ it.
15. Who is Dr. Ian Macreadie?
16. Dr. Macreadie says, “You \_\_\_\_\_ see any \_\_\_\_\_ information arising in a cell.”
17. Where did Dr. Lee Spetner work?
18. According to Dr. Spetner, “All mutations .... turn out to \_\_\_\_\_ the genetic information.”
19. Who is Werner Arber?
20. How has Arber’s work in genetics disproven Darwinian evolution?
21. What is the evolutionist’s bait and switch tactic?
22. What are two ways that bacteria achieve immunity to antibiotics?
23. What mechanisms does the living cell have to stop mutations from happening or from being distributed?
24. How have the fruit fly experiments disproven evolution?
25. How have the fruit fly experiments proven that the Bible is true?
26. What are the extra two wings on the four-winged fruit fly?
27. Dr. Jonathan Wells summarizes the result of the fruit fly experiments by saying there are only what three possible outcomes?
28. Who was Luther Burbank?
29. Burbank said, “There are \_\_\_\_\_ to the development possible.”

## **BILLIONS OF YEARS**

☛ A PowerPoint presentation of this study on evolutionary dating methods is included in the *Unshakeable Faith* apologetics course package. It is basically a graphical edition of this text, and the student and teacher are strongly advised to go through the PowerPoints, as the graphics are an important part of the instruction.

The idea that the universe is billions of years old is probably the major evolutionary doctrine that is used to “prove” evolution and to contradict the Bible’s teaching on origins.

Before Darwin published *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, doubt had been cast on the Bible’s young earth teaching through Charles Lyell’s uniformitarian “theory” of geology with its claim that the earth is millions of years old.

As we have seen, Lyell was as much a Bible hater as he was a geologist. His objective was to destroy the authority of the Genesis record. He hoped to use his uniformitarian “theory” to drive men “out of the Mosaic record” (*Life, Letters, and Journals of Sir Charles Lyell*, I, pp. 253, 256, 328).

Darwin and his fellow evolutionists loved Lyell’s uniformitarian doctrine because it provided them with the eons of time needed to make evolution seem feasible.

Radiometric dating was invented in the early 20th century and is alleged to provide “absolute” results.

W.F. Libby received a Nobel Prize in chemistry in 1960 for his discovery of carbon-14 dating.

Radiometric dating is based on the principle that the unstable isotope of an atomic element decays at a set rate to form a stable element. The original isotope is called a parent and the ending one is called a daughter.

An isotope is the form of an element, such as carbon and oxygen, that has a different number of neutrons. Each chemical element consists of atoms that are made up of three parts: protons, neutrons, and electrons.

Carbon, one of the most common elements in the universe, has 6 protons, 6 neutrons, and 6 electrons. But carbon-14 has eight neutrons and is therefore an isotope.

With too many neutrons, carbon-14 is unstable, so it “decays” or adjusts to become stable, turning into carbon-12 by losing its two extra neutrons. The rate of decay can be measured.

Unstable isotopes are radioactive, meaning they eject neutrons and protons. This process can be measured by a Geiger counter. The adjusting process is called “radioactive decay.”

A measurable amount of carbon-14 is in the earth’s atmosphere. Plants take it in to produce energy through photosynthesis. Animals take in carbon-14 by eating plants or other plant-eating animals.

When plants and animals are alive, the C-14 to C-12 ratio is steady at one part per trillion. When they die, they stop taking in carbon-14 and the amount of carbon-14 begins to decrease through the process of decay, a process scientists can measure.

Assuming all variables are known, carbon-14 can therefore be used to date things that were once composed of living plant or animal matter, such as coal.

Carbon-14 has a half-life of 5,730 years, meaning that in that time half of it will convert to carbon-12. After 2,865 years half of the remainder will be converted, and after 1,432 years half of the remainder will be converted, etc. In 100,000 years or less, there should be no carbon-14 left.

Since most rocks don’t contain carbon, geologists use other isotopes to date them:

Uranium-238 (decays to lead-206)  
Uranium 235 (decays to lead-207)  
Potassium-40 (decays to argon-40)  
Rubidium-87 (decays to strontium-87)  
Samarium-147 (decays to neodymium-143)

These isotopes are found in igneous rocks, which refers to rocks made of the cooling of magma (in the earth) or lava (on the earth).

The following facts provide an important background for interpreting evolutionary dating systems:

We will consider the following things:

1. Every evolutionary dating method is built on evolutionary assumptions.
2. Evolutionary dating has been refuted by carbon-14 testing.
3. Evolutionary dating methods give widely different results.
4. Evolutionists are selective in choosing dates.
5. Most dating methods point to a young earth.

### **1. Every evolutionary dating method is built upon evolutionary assumptions.**

A fundamental fact about radiometric dating methods that makes them undependable is that they are built on evolutionary assumptions that have not been proven.

Three major assumptions as listed by Andrew Snelling, Ph.D. in physics, in his two-volume work *Earth's Catastrophic Past*.

1. *The original number of unstable atoms can be known.* Scientists assume how many unstable (parent) atoms existed at the beginning based on how many parents and daughter atoms are left today, though this cannot be known with certainty.
2. *The rate of change was constant.* Scientists assume that radioactive atoms have changed at the same rate throughout time, ignoring the impact of creation or changes during Noah's Flood.
3. *The daughter atoms were all produced by radioactive decay.* Scientists assume that no outside forces such as flowing groundwater contaminated the sample.

Scientists try to remove variables as best they can, but it is impossible for them to know conditions that existed in the distant past. The assumptions remain unproven, so the science remains uncertain.

### *The Burning Candle*

“Many scientists claim to have nearly infallible methods for determining the age of the earth and its various formations. But all of these methods are built upon two basic and unprovable assumptions: (1) the assumption

of starting point or original condition and (2) the assumption of a uniform rate of change from that starting point to the present. Consider a burning candle in an abandoned house. It is now burning at the rate of one inch an hour. Question: How long has it been burning and, thus, how long ago was the house abandoned? Answer: No one can know until it can be shown how high the candle was when it was last lit and how fast it was burning originally! Question: How old is the earth? Answer: No one can know unless it can be shown what it was like when it began and how rapidly it has changed since then!" (John Whitcomb, *The World That Perished*).

### *The Hourglass*

The following illustration is from *The New Answers Book* by Ken Ham:

Radioisotope dating can be better understood using an illustration with an hourglass. If we walk into a room and observe an hourglass with sand at the top and sand at the bottom, we could calculate how long the hourglass has been running. By estimating how fast the sand is falling and measuring the amount of sand at the bottom, we could calculate how much time has elapsed since the hourglass was turned over. All our calculations could be correct (observational science), but the result could be wrong. This is because we failed to take into account some critical assumptions.

1. Was there any sand at the bottom when the hourglass was first turned over (initial conditions)?
2. Has any sand been added or taken out of the hourglass?
3. Has the sand always been falling at a constant rate?

Since we did not observe the initial conditions when the hourglass time started, we must make assumptions. All three of these assumptions can affect our time calculations. If scientists fail to consider each of these three critical assumptions, then radioisotope dating can give incorrect ages (*The New Answers Book*, 2006, p. 117).

The evolutionist assumes that he knows the conditions that existed at the formation of the rocks he is testing. He assumes a uniformitarian process since then, and other things. These are things he does not know and things that have not been scientifically proven, but without such knowledge it is impossible to ascertain whether the dating results are accurate.

## **2. Evolutionary dating has been refuted by carbon-14 testing.**

The carbon-14 dating system actually disproves evolution's millions of years doctrine.

This was proven by **the RATE project** (Radioisotopes and the Age of The Earth), which was conducted by a team of eight Ph.D. scientists between 1997 and 2005. The scientists tested various radiometric dating systems.

The project is summarized in the two volumes of *Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth*.

"Samples were taken from ten different coal layers, that, according to evolutionists, represent different time periods in the geologic column."

"The coal samples, which date to hundreds of millions of years based on standard evolution time estimates, all contained measurable amounts of C14. Since the half-life of C14 is 5,730 years, there should be no detectable C14 left after about 100,000 years."

Dr. Andrew Snelling says, “The best laboratories in the world, using the best equipment under the cleanest conditions over the last three decades, have been routinely finding measurable radiocarbon in coal, oil, natural gas, limestone, fossil bones, fossil shells, and even diamonds!” (*Earth’s Catastrophic Past*).

If these were millions of years old, then there should be no radiocarbon left in them. The fact is that all these materials yield radiocarbon dates of only thousands of years. All of this is documented in scientific literature, such as in the journal *Radiocarbon*.”

### **3. Evolutionary dating methods give widely differing results.**

This is known as **THE ANOMALY FACTOR**. Scientists have tried to eliminate this, but they have been unsuccessful.

Rock paintings in the South African bush in 1991 were dated by Oxford University’s radiocarbon accelerator as being 1,200 years old, which was significant because it would have been the oldest bushman paintings found in the open country. It turned out that they were painted by Joan Ahrens’ art class in Capetown a few years earlier and deposited in the bush by thieves (Milton, *Shattering the Myths of Darwinism*, p. 34).

Volcanic rocks in Hawaii were dated by potassium-argon at 160 million to 3 billion years old, when they were actually formed in an eruption in 1801 (Milton, p. 47)

Rocks formed between 1949 and 1975 by the Mount Ngauruhoe volcano in New Zealand were dated at between 270,000 and 3.5 million years old (Andrew A. Snelling, “The Cause of Anomalous Potassium-Argon ‘Ages’ for Recent Andesite Flows at Mt. Ngauruhoe,” *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Creationism*, edited by E. Walsh, 1998, pp. 503-525).

Louis Leakey’s *Zinjanthropus* skull was dated to 1.75 million years by the University of California using the potassium-argon method and to 10,100 years using carbon-14 (Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, pp. 240, 241).

A rock from Mount St. Helens’ 1986 volcanic eruption was dated at 350,000 years by the potassium-argon method (S. A. Austin, “Excess Argon within Mineral Concentrates from the New Dacite Lava Dome at Mount St. Helens Volcano,” *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 3, 1986).

A layer of volcanic ash at Lake Turkana, Kenya, was dated by three different radiometric dating teams (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, pp. 53-55). A Cambridge team obtained dates ranging from 0.5 to 17.5 million years. A team at Berkeley obtained dates ranging from 1.5 to 6.9 million years. A team of the Australian National University got a date of 1.88 million years.

Dr. Steve Austin, a member of the RATE group, had samples tested from the alleged oldest and youngest strata of the Grand Canyon. He used the isochron dating method, which is supposed to be infallible. The oldest rocks were dated at 1.07 billion years while the youngest were dated at

1.34 billion (*The New Answers Book*, p. 119). Thus, the infallible isochron dating method tells us that the *youngest* strata is 270 million years older than the *oldest* strata!

In another RATE study, rocks from various sites at the Grand Canyon were dated by four radioisotope methods using commercial laboratories. One set of rocks gave dates ranging from 841 million to 1.3 billion years (*The New Answers Book*, p. 121). The dates of rocks from the Beartooth Mountains of northwest Wyoming ranged from 1.5 billion to 2.6 billion years.

Dating methods that are this wildly variable and contradictory surely lack any element of real scientific authority.

#### 4. Evolutionists are highly selective in choosing dates.

Typically they select dates they prefer while ignoring those they find unacceptable.

“C14 dating was being discussed at a symposium on the pre-history of the Nile Valley. A famous colleague, Professor [John Otis] Brew, briefly summarized a common attitude among archaeologists towards it, as follows: **IF A C14 DATE SUPPORTS OUR THEORIES, WE PUT IT IN THE MAIN TEXT. IF IT DOES NOT ENTIRELY CONTRADICT THEM, WE PUT IT IN A FOOT-NOTE. AND IF IT IS COMPLETELY ‘OUT OF DATE,’ WE JUST DROP IT**” (T. Save-Soderbergh and Ingrid U. Olsson, “C14 dating an Egyptian chronology,” in *Proceedings of the Twelfth Nobel Symposium*, edited by Ingrid Olsson, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970).

“The chief tool employed to harmonize discordant dates is the simple device of labeling unexpected ages as anomalous and, in the future, discarding those rock samples that will lead to the ‘anomalous’ dates. This practice is the explanation of why many dating results seem to support each other--because **all samples that give ages other than expected values are rejected as being ‘unsuitable’ for dating. ... If all the rejected dates were retrieved from the waste basket and added to the published dates, the combined results would show that the dates produced are the scatter that one would expect by chance alone**” (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, pp. 49, 51).

This is admitted by Dr. Richard L. Mauger, associate professor of geology at East Carolina University:

“In general, dates in the ‘correct ball park’ are assumed to be correct and are published, but **those in disagreement with other data are seldom published** nor are discrepancies fully explained” (“K-Ar Ages of Biotites from Tuffs in Eocene Rocks,” *Contributions to Geology*, Vol. 15, no. 1, 1977, p. 37).

Professional pressures motivate scientists to conform to expected dating results:

“... there are powerful professional pressures on scientists to conform to a consensus. Dating geologists are offended by the suggestion that their beliefs can or would influence the dates obtained. Yet nothing could be easier or more natural. Take for example a rock sample from the late Cretaceous, a period which is universally believed to date from some 65 million years ago. **Any dating scientist who obtained a date from the same of, say, 10 million years or 150 million years, would not publish such a result because he or she will, quite sincerely, assume it was in error.** On the other hand, any dating scientist who did obtain a date of 65 million years would hasten to publish it as widely as possible. **Thus the published dating figures always conform to preconceived dates and never contradict those dates**” (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 51).

“It may come as a shock to some, but **fewer than 50 percent of the radiocarbon dates from geological and archaeological samples in northeastern North America have been adopted as *acceptable* by investigators**” (J. Ogden, director of a radiocarbon laboratory, *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, 1977, 288:167).

Ian Taylor, an engineer, observes,

“None of this is ever mentioned in popular magazines and textbooks, and the impression is left in the reader’s mind that ‘absolute’ chronology has been established by the radiocarbon method” (Taylor, *In the Minds of Men*, pp. 317, 318).

## **5. Most dating methods point to a young earth.**

Walt Brown, Ph.D. in mechanical engineering from MIT, lists 22 dating methods that point to a young earth. See *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*, pp. 37-41.

Andrew Snelling, Ph.D. in geology, lists several dating methods that point to a young earth. See *Earth’s Catastrophic Past*, Volume 2.

Following are some questions that evolutionists need to answer. These are by Mark Cadwallader, a chemical engineer working in product development and material failure investigations (*Creation Spelled Out*):

Why do the earliest civilizations and written history date back less than 10,000 years?

Why do the oldest trees happen to be just a few thousand years old?

Why is there so little helium in the atmosphere if such a quickly diffusing gas is escaping into the atmosphere from rocks at high rates?

Why are there radioactive halos preserved in granite rocks from elements with half-lives of only several minutes? The halos are like preserved bubbles which should have passed on out through molten rock that supposedly took millions of years to cool.

Why do polystrate fossils pierce through so many different layers of supposed “geologic time”?

Why are carbon-14 dating measurements continually finding mere thousands of years for fossilized trees, and why is C-14 being found in some diamonds and coal in which all the radioactive carbon with a relatively short half-life should be long gone because they are supposedly millions of years old?

Why are many gas and oil reservoirs under such high pressures, so that they become “gushers” and flow of their own accord, when rock porosity, permeability, and cracks are all around to relieve pressure over the supposed millions of years that the fossil fuels have been there?

Why is the earth’s magnetic field decaying so rapidly, extrapolating backwards to levels that would be destabilizing within approximately 10,000 years?

Why do we see so many comets in our solar system, since the comet tails are evidence of their volatile material boiling away as they pass by the sun? They should all have been consumed and invisible by now if the solar system is billions of years old.

Why haven’t the continents eroded nearly flat?

Why haven’t the oceans accumulated sediment thousands of feet deep if the earth is really billions of years old?

Why aren't the oceans much saltier at the rate they accumulate salt, at least like the Great Salt Lake and the Dead Sea, if they are so old?

## 6. Biomaterials in “ancient” fossils point to a young earth.

What explains the existence of biomaterials and soft tissue in fossils that are allegedly millions of years old?

A mosasaur fossil (a 40-foot-long marine reptile) at the Dinosaur Institute of the National History Museum of Los Angeles County, supposedly millions of years old, has retina pigment, dried blood residue, and “preservation of skin structures from all parts of the body” (J. Londgren, “Convergent Evolution in Aquatic Tetrapods: Insights from an Exceptional Fossil Mosasaur,” PLoS ONE, 5 (8): e1198, 2010, cited from Brian Thomas, “Extraordinary Mosasaur Fossil Reveals Soft Tissues,” *Acts & Facts*, 39 (11): 19, 2010).

In 2005, Mary Schweitzer and her colleagues published a paper in *Science* magazine describing the presence of soft tissue in the fossilized femur of a *Tyrannosaurus rex* unearthed in Montana.

In 2009, researchers reconstituted dried ink from a “150 million-year-old” fossil squid’s ink sac. They even used the ink to draw a picture of what the extinct squid looked like. Scientists were “stunned” that it “still looks as if it is modern squid ink” (“The 150 million-year-old squid fossil,” *Archaeology Daily News*, Aug. 18, 2009, [archaeologydaily.com](http://archaeologydaily.com)).

In 2008, *BBC News* reported on fossil feathers that have retained their pigment colors (“Fossil Feathers Reveal Their Hues,” July 8, 2008). The colors are created by biological melanosomes that have been preserved. The scientists who are studying the feathers have admitted they don’t know how it is possible that such biomaterial is present in fossils that are supposed to be millions of years old. Professor Mike Benton of the University of Bristol asks, “How do you square that with **the well-known fact that the majority of organic molecules decay in thousands of years?**”

Following are some helpful resources on the subject of evolutionary dating methods:

*Earth’s Catastrophic Past: Geology, Creation and the Flood* by Andrew A. Snelling, Ph.D. geology  
*In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order* by Ian T. Taylor

*Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth: A Young-Earth Creationist Research Initiative  
Results of a Young-Earth Creationist Research Initiative*

*Thousands Not Billions* by Don DeYoung, Ph.D. physics

*Starlight and Time* by Russell Humphreys, Ph.D. physics

*Taking Back Astronomy* by Jason Lisle, Ph.D. astrophysics

*Universe by Design* by Danny Faulkner, Ph.D. astronomy

*Dismantling the Big Bang* by John Harnett, Ph.D. physics

*The Young Earth* by John D. Morris, Ph.D. geological engineering

*In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood* by Walt Brown, Ph.D.  
mechanical engineering

## SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE AGAINST THE EVOLUTIONARY DATING SYSTEM

A fundamental fact about radiometric dating methods that makes them undependable is that they are built on evolutionary assumptions that have not been proven.

These assumptions are as follows.

“Assumption 1: The original number of unstable atoms can be known. Scientists assume how many unstable (parent) atoms existed at the beginning based on how many parent and daughter atoms are left today.

“Assumption 2: The rate of change was constant. Scientists assume that radioactive atoms have changed at the same rate throughout time, ignoring the impact of Creation or changes during Noah’s Flood.

“Assumption 3: The daughter atoms were all produced by radioactive decay. Scientists assume that no outside forces, such as flowing groundwater, contaminated the sample” (Snelling, “Radiometric Dating: Back to Basics,” Answeringenesis.org, June 17, 2009)

A burning candle illustrates how that radiometric dating methods are undependable. If one enters a room to find a candle burning, it would be impossible to judge how long it has been burning unless you knew how tall it was when it was lit and whether the rate of burn has remained constant.

Carbon-14 dating proves that fossils, coal, etc., are not millions of years old, since it shows that carbon-14 remains in the specimens. By 100,000 years all of the carbon-14 would be gone.

The RATE project proved this. RATE stands for Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth. It was conducted by eight Ph.D. scientists.

The anomaly factor proves that radiometric dating is undependable. The same samples are often given wildly different dates by different radiometric measurements.

Most dating methods point to a young earth, including tree dating, polystrate fossils, carbon-14, comet tails, continental erosion, and ocean sedimentation.

The presence of biomaterials in fossils points to a young earth.

### **REVIEW QUESTIONS ON BILLIONS OF YEARS**

1. When was radiometric dating invented?
2. What is the principle of radiometric dating?
3. Atomic elements are made up of what three parts?
4. What is an isotope?
5. Carbon-14 can be used to date what type of things?
6. How does carbon-14 get into animals?
7. What is the half-life of carbon-14?
8. After how many years should carbon-14 be completely gone?
9. What are igneous rocks?
10. What are three assumptions that evolutionists make about radiometric dating?

11. If you enter a room and find a burning candle, what are two reasons why you cannot measure the rate of burn at the present and thereby determine how long it has been burning?
12. If you find an hourglass running, what are two reasons why you cannot measure the rate of flow at the present and thereby determine how long it has been flowing?
13. What was the name of the project by eight Ph.D. scientists to test radiometric dating?
14. Why does the presence of carbon-14 in coal refute evolutionary dating?
15. That radiometric dating systems give widely different dates is called what?
16. According to radiometric dating, rocks from the Beartooth Mountains were from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_ billion years old.
17. The published dates always conform to \_\_\_\_\_ dates.
18. What are three dating methods that point to a young earth?
19. How do polystrate fossils point to a young earth?

## APE MEN

➡ A PowerPoint presentation of this study on evolutionary ape men is included in the *Unshakeable Faith* apologetics course package. It is basically a graphical edition of this text, and the student and teacher are strongly advised to go through the PowerPoints, as the graphics are an important part of the instruction.

Ever since Charles Darwin published *On the Origin of Species* in 1859, evolutionists have rushed to find the “missing link” in human evolution.

The history of this search is filled with lies and hoaxes. This has been exposed in many books, such as *Bones of Contention* by Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention A Creationist Assessment* by Martin Lubenow, *In the Minds of Men: Darwin and the New World Order* by Ian Taylor, *Adam and Evolution* by Michael Pitman, *Icons of Evolution* by Jonathan Wells, and *The Bone Peddlers: Selling Evolution* by William R. Fix.

Consider some statements by the evolutionists themselves

“The search for man’s past has been littered with vain hopes and invented hominids” (Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe*). (The word “hominid” refers to humans or “relatives to humans.”)

The study of human ancestry is a field of science “mainly concerned with conjecture and speculation” (Zolly Zuckerman, *From Apes to Warlords*).

The field of human anthropology is filled with self-seeking, deception, and carnal strife.

“The rivalry between teams of paleontologists has been described as “like a football match ... it wasn’t purely a group of disinterested scientists trying to get it right” (Virginia Morell, *Ancestral Passions*, p. 421).

We must understand that major “ape-man” discoveries result in fame and fortune. Louis Leaky was the first paleontology “rock star.” He enjoyed fame greater than any other scientist. He dined at the White House and was granted wealthy contracts to advertise Rolex watches.

## **HAECKEL'S APE-MEN**

The father of ape-man research is Ernst Haeckel, who was a German disciple of Charles Darwin.

Haeckel approved of an artist's drawing of an ape-man family.

Without a single shred of evidence, Haeckel had already named the creature *Pithacanthropus alalus* ("speechless ape-man")

He believed that the black man was the lowest form of "human," so he depicted the black man in a tree.

One chart showed apes becoming more human. Doctoring his drawings, he made the men look more like apes, and the apes look more like men.

## **JAVA MAN**

Eugene Dubois was a student of Ernst Haeckel who wanted to find evidence of the "ape-man."

He began his search on the island of Java when he was assigned there with the Dutch army. In 1891-92, he found a few bones. He found an ape skull in 1891 and in 1892 he found a human thighbone 50 feet away. He also found a couple of teeth.

There is no evidence that the skull and thighbone belonged to the same individual or even the same creature. Yet Dubois and Haeckel announced that they had found the missing ape-man and it had a small ape head and long human legs.

It was named *Pithecanthropus erectus*, which means "ape-man that walks upright."

Haeckel had a life-size model made of the mythical creature and exhibited it throughout Europe. Java Man appeared in books, magazines, newspapers, and museums as evidence for evolution, convincing multitudes of people that evolution had been proven.

Not only was there never any evidence that the skull and the thighbone belonged to the same creature, but Dubois had also found two other skulls in the same place as the "java man" skull and had kept this a secret. This is because the two skulls were obviously fully human! Dubois had not found an ape-man. He had found real men living in the same location as apes, just as men do today in places such as Africa, India, and Nepal.

## **PILTDOWN MAN**

Piltdown Man was presented as evidence for human evolution for 40 years.

In 1912, the British Natural History Museum said that bones of an ape man had been found in a gravel pit in Sussex, England. The bones had been discovered by Charles Dawson, an amateur fossil hunter, and by Arthur Woodward of the British Museum.

The gravel pit was at a place called Piltdown, so the bones were named Piltdown Man.

The bones were examined by renowned scientists who claimed that the creature was a “missing link.” These men included Arthur Woodward, Grafton Eliot Smith, Arthur Keith, Pierre Teilhard.

Piltdown was given the scientific name of *Eoanthropus dawsoni*, meaning “Dawson’s dawn man.”

The *New York Times* ran the headline, “Darwin theory proved true.”

The *London Illustrated News*, December 1912, published a drawing of Piltdown on its cover.

*Popular Science* magazine, October 1931, had a report about Piltdown Man “proving” evolution.

A model in the British Museum of Natural History was seen by tens of thousands of people during the 41 years that it was on display.

In 1953, the British Museum ran new tests on the bones and concluded that they were fake. Someone had taken an ape jawbone and part of a human skull and treated them with chemicals to make them look old.

## **NEBRASKA MAN**

In 1917, a single tooth was discovered in Nebraska by a rancher named Harold Cook. In 1922, he sent the tooth to Henry Osborn, one of America’s foremost fossil experts and the president of the American Museum of Natural History. Osborn and other experts said that it was the tooth of an ape-man.

They gave it the scientific name *Hesperopithecus*, which means “ape of the western world.”

In June 1922, the *Illustrated London News* published a drawing of Nebraska Man, his “wife,” and their tools.

That year Henry Osborn said the Nebraska Man “constitutes irrefutable evidence that the man-ape wandered over from Asia into North America.”

Osborn used Nebraska Man in his newspaper articles and radio broadcasts to cast doubt upon the Bible. In 1925, he published *The Earth Speaks to Bryan*, mocking William Jennings Bryan, a Christian politician who believed in creation.

Nebraska Man and Piltdown man were used at the Scopes Trial in 1925 as “evidence” that evolution is true and that it should be taught in public schools. The trial was a major turning point in American history. It convinced many people that evolution is true and the Bible is wrong. It became popular for the press to mock the Bible. It became acceptable for evolution to be taught in public schools.

But as we have seen, Piltdown Man turned out to be a hoax.

And after additional bones of the creature were found, Nebraska Man turned out to be a pig!

## NEANDERTHAL MAN

In 1860, one year after Darwin published *On the Origin of Species*, human fossil bones were found in the Neanderthal Valley in Germany.

In 1907, Ernst Haeckle claimed that Neanderthal was an ape-man.

In 1909, the *Illustrated London News* published a drawing of Neanderthal as a stooped, hairy ape-man with a club in his hand.

In 1919, the famous author H.G. Wells said Neanderthal “stooped forward and could not hold his head erect ... perhaps incapable of speech” (*The Outline of History*).

In 1930, the Field Museum in Chicago set up a display of a Neanderthal family living in a cave like animals. This model appeared in countless textbooks, encyclopedias, magazines, newspapers, and museums.

Since the 1960s, scientists have been re-examining Neanderthal. They now admit that he could talk and he did not walk like an ape. He buried his dead, made musical instruments, and in every other way lived like a normal human being. Neanderthal was reclassified as an “Homo sapien,” referring to a “real man” rather than an ape-man.

## LUCY

“Lucy” is a name given to the fossils of an ape that is supposed to be a missing link between apes and man.

The creature was given a human name for advertising purposes. The fossil bones were found in 1974 in Ethiopia by Donald Johanson. It was named Lucy because the Beatles song “Lucy in the Sky with Diamonds” was playing at the camp party that night.

The creature stood about 3.5 feet high, and its evolutionary name is *Australopithecus afarensis*.

*Australopithecus* is a name that evolutionists have given to apes that they believe were the predecessors to man.

Johanson and other scientists claim that Lucy walked upright, which was “the first step toward becoming human.”

Textbooks and museums depict Lucy as a short, hairy ape-woman. She has an ape-like head but human arms and hands and human legs and feet.

But even many evolutionists don’t believe that the creature walked upright.

Dr. Solly Zuckerman, for many years the head of the Department of Anatomy of the University of Birmingham in England, said of the *Australopithecus* family that “THEY ARE JUST APES” (Roger Lewin, *Bones of Contention*, p. 164). Zuckerman studied the fossils of this creature for 15 years in minute detail with a team of scientists. He said:

“For my own part, the anatomical basis for the claim that the australopithecines walked and ran upright like man is so much more flimsy than the evidence which points to the conclusion that their gait was some variant of what one sees in subhuman Primates, that it remains unacceptable” (*Beyond the Ivory Tower*, p. 93).

Zuckerman’s team was not working on the so-called *Australopithecus afarensis* (Lucy) but on fossils of other types of *Australopithecus*, but others have reached the same conclusion for *Australopithecus afarensis*. Further, not everyone believes the Lucy group or the so-called *afarensis* even represents a different category of *Australopithecus*.

In 1982, Bill Jungers at the Stony Brook Institute in New York “argued that **Lucy’s legs were too short, in relation to her arms, for her species to have achieved a fully modern adaptation to bipedalism**” (*Lucy’s Child*, p. 194).

In 1983, Randy Susman and Jack Stern, also of Stony Brook, concluded that Lucy and her kin spent most of their time climbing trees. They “detailed more than two dozen separate anatomical traits suggesting that the species was a less efficient biped than modern humans” (*Lucy’s Child*, p. 194). **They described Lucy’s hands and feet as being long and curved, typical of a tree-dwelling ape, even more highly curved than a chimpanzee** (Milton, *Shattering the Myths*, p. 207).

That year Susman and Stern reported in the *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*: “The fact that the anterior portion of the iliac blade faces laterally in humans but not in chimpanzees is obvious. The marked resemblance of AL 288-1 [Lucy] to the chimpanzee is equally obvious” (J. T. Stern and R.L. Susman, *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 80:279, 1983).

Russell Tuttle of the University of Chicago reached the same conclusion as Jungers, Susman, and Stern. He pointed to the “**curved fingers and toes**” as an “apelike adaptation for grasping tree branches.”

In 1983, a conference was held at the Institute of Human Origins at Berkeley in California to discuss the issue of Lucy’s bipedalism. Russell Tuttle argued that the Laetoli footprints could not have been made by a Lucy-type creature because **its long, curved toes and other features would have left a different sort of print** (*Lucy’s Child*, p. 196). Randy Susman emphasized that the creature’s “**strong, curved, apelike finger bones,**” and its “**long arms relative to its legs**” speak of tree living. Jack Stern used features of the hip, knee, ankle, and pelvis as evidence for his view that the creature did not walk in a human fashion.

In 1984, Charles Oxnard, professor of Anatomy and Biological Sciences at the University of Southern California, concluded that australopithecine is “**IRREVOCABLY REMOVED FROM A PLACE IN THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN BIPEDALISM. ... All this should make us wonder about the unusual presentation of human evolution in introductory textbooks, in**

**encyclopedias and in popular publications”** (*The Order of Man: A Biomathematical Anatomy of the Primates*, p. 332).

In 1993, Christine Tardieu, an anthropologist in Paris, reported that **Lucy’s “locking mechanism was not developed.”** Humans have a locking mechanism in the knees that allow us to stand upright comfortably for long periods of time. Lucy didn’t have that, so she certainly didn’t stand around nonchalantly like she is depicted in the museums.

In 1994, Dr. Fred Spoor and his colleagues at University College, London, using CT scans of australopithecine inner ear canals, demonstrated that **they did not walk habitually upright** (“New Evidence: Lucy Was a Knuckle-walker,” Creation Ministries International, May 5, 2000, citing F. Spoor, B. Wood and F. Zonneveld, “Implications of early hominid morphology for evolution of human bipedal locomotion,” *Nature* 369(6482):645–648, 1994).

In 1994, Jack T. Stern, Jr., told the 63rd Annual Meeting of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists that he believes that *A. afarensis* **“walked funny, not like humans”** (Gish, p. 257).

In 2000, *Science* magazine reported that Lucy **“has the morphology that was classic for knuckle walkers”** (Erik Stokstad, “Hominid Ancestors May Have Knuckle Walked,” *Science*, March 24, 2000, Vol. 287, no. 5461, pp. 2131-2132).

In 2009, after anthropologists gathered at the Institute of Human Origins in New York to discuss Lucy, a report in the *New York Times* made the following interesting summary:

“The debate over whether the primate Lucy actually stood up on two feet three million years ago and walked-- thus becoming one of mankind’s most important ancestors--has evolved into two interpretive viewpoints, three family trees, spats over four scientific techniques and too many personality clashes to count. ... The long and short of it is, according to a participant, that **bipedality lies in the eye of the beholder**” (“Did Lucy Actually Stand on Her Own Two Feet?” (*New York Times*, Aug. 29, 2009).

In 2012, researchers who had spent 11 years studying the shoulder blades of an *Australopithecus afarensis* skeleton reported that Lucy definitely lived in trees, at least for much of the time. They found that Lucy’s shoulder sockets face upward like “modern apes” rather than outward as with humans (“Early Human ‘Lucy’ Swing from the Trees,” Fox News, Oct. 26, 2012). Researcher David Green said, “These remarkable fossils provide strong evidence that these individuals were **still climbing [trees]** at this stage in human evolution.”

Artistic reconstructions typically depict Lucy with *human hands, walking uprightly* in a purely human manner on *human feet*, and typically *with human-proportioned arms and legs*. This is true for the models and drawings that I have seen personally at the Museum of Natural History in New York City, the American Museum of Natural Sciences in Washington D.C., the British Museum of Natural History, the Field Museum in Chicago, Yale University’s Peabody Museum, the Museum of Man in San Diego, and the natural history museum at Michigan State University Ann Arbor.

These reconstructions are not scientific; they are brainwashing tools.

All of the evolutionary stories about ape-men are fairy tales. They have never explained how an ape could make the GIANT leap to become a man.

For an ape to evolve into a man would require changes that would be miraculous.

***The ape would have to evolve human posture.***

There are many major structural features that allow man to walk upright:

- fine balance
- a flat face to look ahead
- upright skull
- S-shaped curved spine so head and trunk are balanced over center of gravity
- extendable hips
- large, forward-facing knee joint, aligned under the hip joint with its mechanical axis behind the line of gravity.
- wide curved pelvis
- angled femur bones
- fully extendable knee joints that lock in upright position
- long legs
- arched feet
- strong big toes tightly bound to and aligned with the other toes, as opposed to the big toe of apes which is like a flexible thumb

***The ape would have to evolve the amazing human hand.***

The ape's hand has been called "the foot hand," because it is designed for walking as well as grasping.

Unlike the ape hand, the human hand is capable of precise grip and manipulation of objects. It is capable of playing the piano and performing brain surgery.

The human thumb is so superior to the ape's thumb that it has been called "the 24 caret thumb" by researchers

Sir Isaac Newton said, "In the absence of any other proof, the thumb alone would convince me of God's existence."

***The ape would have to evolve huge new resources in the brain to control the human hand.***

"The human primary motor cortex in the brain is four times larger than a chimpanzee's" (Craig Beidler, "Proof of God in the Palm of Your Hand").

The ape would have to evolve the amazing human nervous system that is necessary to control his hands and legs in a human fashion so his arms and hands can perform feats that an ape cannot perform.

Recently scientists have discovered that the tendons in the hand themselves are intelligent and actually perform mathematical computations to assist the hand in performing the brain's commands (Neuromuscular Biomechanics Laboratory at Cornell University, "The tendon network of the fingers performs anatomical computation," *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, June 2007).

A skilled typist visually processes up to eight keys in advance and the tendons and muscles begin performing the key strokes about three characters in advance of striking the keys (Dr. Randy Guliuzza, ICR, "Proof of God in the Palm of Your Hand").

***The ape would have to evolve human intelligence.***

And none of this explains where man's thoughts originate in the first place. The brain is a biological machine. It does not explain man's thoughts. Only a God-given spirit can explain that.

***The ape would have to evolve human speech.***

In the 1970s, a chimpanzee named Nim Chimpsky was raised as a human and taught sign language. He could not understand anything more than simple commands. The longest string of signed words Nim ever signed was "give orange me give eat orange me eat orange give me eat orange give me you."

All of these "miraculous" changes would have to occur at the genetic level by "blind" mutations.

No one has ever demonstrated that this happened or even that it is scientifically possible.

Even speaking from an evolutionary standpoint, we must ask why Lucy would "evolve" upright walking and why "natural selection" would allow her to survive?

Michael Pitman, who taught biology at Cambridge, said, "If a group of them decided to swing down from the trees and become *Homo erectus* on the plain, upright gait would be the last thing they would want" (*Adam and Evolution*).

If an ape gradually evolved human walking, it would start with some kind of clumsy part-ape, part-human walk. It would be a crippled ape, and like a four-winged fruit fly, it would not survive.

## **SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE AGAINST THE APE MEN**

The history of "ape men" is filled with lies and myths.

Examples are Haeckel's Ape Men, Java Man, Piltdown Man, Nebraska Man, Neanderthal, and Lucy.

The models of “ape men” are not based on scientific evidence. They are imaginary.

Multitudes of people have believed that evolution is true because of these drawings and models, but they were not scientific facts.

### REVIEW QUESTIONS ON APE MEN

1. Who was the father of ape-man research?
2. Who discovered “Java Man”?
- 3 Where was the discovery made?
4. This man found an ape skull and a human thighbone how far apart?
5. What evidence was there that the skull and thighbone were from the same individual?
6. How long was Piltdown Man used as evidence for evolution?
7. When was it discovered?
8. Nebraska Man was invented on the basis of what evidence?
9. What was the famous trial where this evidence was used?
10. Nebraska Man turned out to be what?
11. In what year were the first bones of Neanderthal Man found?
12. Why was it called Neanderthal?
13. Who was the first man to proclaim that Neanderthal was an ape-man?
14. When did evolutionists start re-examining Neanderthal?
15. He was reclassified as what?
16. Who discovered the bones of the fossil called “Lucy”?
17. In what year were the bones found?
18. About how tall was Lucy?
19. What is the evolutionary name for Lucy?
20. Is there a consensus of opinion that Lucy walked upright like a man?
21. What are two ways that the models of Lucy are false?
22. The ape’s hand has been called what?

### THE FOSSIL RECORD

➤ A PowerPoint presentation of this study on the fossil record is included in the *Unshakeable Faith* apologetics course package. It is basically a graphical edition of this text, and the student and teacher are strongly advised to go through the PowerPoints, as the graphics are an important part of the instruction.

Museums, textbooks, and documentaries use the fossil record as a major icon of evolution, but the fact is that if you remove the evolutionary presumptions, the evidence refutes evolution and supports creationism.

By way of introduction, we observe that the fossil record is vast.

Charles Darwin knew that the fossil record did not provide evidence for his doctrine, because it did not provide evidence for a vast number of “missing links,” but he believed this “problem” could be explained by the incompleteness of the record and the rudimentary state of paleontology in his day.

This can no longer be used as an excuse. Today there are an estimated 200 million fossils in museums worldwide, including 100 million invertebrates (Carl Werner, *Evolution: The Grand Experiment*, Vol. 1, p. 77).

We will consider the following points:

1. The fossil record’s geological column has major problems.
2. The fossil record does not contain countless transitional creatures.
3. The fossil record show creatures appearing suddenly, fully formed.
4. The fossil record shows complexity from its “earliest layers.”
5. The fossil record exhibits stability.
6. The uniformitarian view is now rejected even by evolutionists.
7. The uniformitarian view was disproven by Mt. Saint Helens.
8. The fossil record shows evidence for the global flood.

### **1. The fossil record’s “geological column” has major problems.**

The “column” supposedly consists of the **Paleozoic**, the supposed age of multi-celled organisms, fish, and amphibians, the **Mesozoic**, the age of reptiles and dinosaurs, and the **Cenozoic**, the age of mammals and birds. These three major time periods are further divided into 12 divisions: The Paleozoic consists of Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, Devonian, Mississippian, Pennsylvanian, Permian. The Mesozoic consists of Triassic, Jurassic, and Cretaceous. The Cenozoic consists of Tertiary and Quaternary.

*A major problem with this is the missing strata.*

“Potentially more important to geological thinking are those unconformities that signal large chunks of geological history are missing, even though the strata on either side of the unconformity are perfectly parallel and show no evidence of erosion. Did millions of years fly by with no discernible effect? A possible though controversial inference is that our geological clocks and stratigraphic concepts need working on” (*Unknown Earth*, 1980, p. 219).

*Another problem is that the “geological column” is often jumbled together.*

“Since 1840 there have been many rock formations discovered with fossils completely out of order according to the geologic column--like Precambrian sitting on dinosaur-age Cretaceous--but these have been either explained away or simply ignored” (Luther Sunderland, *Darwin’s Enigma*, p. 51).

*Another problem is the fossilized trees that pierce geological layers.*

This contradicts the idea that the strata were laid down gradually over millions of years. The trees would have rotted away had this been the case. These have been found in Alaska, Alabama,

Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Montana, Ohio, Tennessee, West Virginia, Washington state, England, Germany, France, Nova Scotia, and elsewhere.

*Another problem is the out-of-place fossils.*

Many out-of-place fossils have been found that disprove the evolutionary fossil column, but they are usually ignored.

Walt Brown provides many examples of out-of-place fossils in his book *In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood*.

At Uzbekistan, hoof prints of horses were found in rocks dating to the dinosaurs, which is supposed to be millions of years before the horse evolved

Petrified trees in Arizona's Petrified Forest contain fossilized nests of bees and cocoons of wasps, but insects supposedly didn't evolve until 100 million years later.

A bird that has been named Confuciusornis predates the supposed feathered dinosaurs from which it allegedly evolved.

A list of nearly 200 wrong-order formations in the U.S. alone can be found in an eight-part series by Walter Lammerts ("Recorded Instances of Wrong-Order Formations," *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, September 1984, December 1984, March 1985, December 1985, March 1986, June 1986, December 1986, June 1987).

## **2. The fossil record does not contain the countless transitional creatures that Darwinian evolution requires.**

In *On the Origin of Species* Darwin acknowledged that his proposition requires *ENORMOUS* numbers of intermediate links. His answer to the issue of the missing links was that the fossil record was too incomplete in his day. But subsequent research into the fossil record.

But instead of countless numbers of transitional limbs and creatures, evolutionists can only point to a few highly questionable ones.

This has been admitted by some evolutionists, though they have hesitated to say it too loudly.

In 1981, Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe, highly respected physicists, wrote:

"... either there were no transitions or the transitions were so rapid as to be analogous to quantum jumps. ... WHEREVER ONE WOULD LIKE EVIDENCE OF MAJOR CHANGES AND LINKAGES ... THE EVIDENCE IS CONSPICUOUSLY MISSING FROM THE FOSSIL RECORD. ... These conclusions dispose of Darwinism" (*Evolution from Space*, pp. 82, 86, 89, 94).

Hoyle was not a creationist; neither is Wickramasinghe.

Evolutionists claim to have found missing links, but when they are examined, it is evident that they are not the kind of evidence that would stand up in court. Even the evolutionists cannot agree about them.

Francis Hitching, who is an evolutionist, says:

“[The intermediates] are simply **speculative candidates** in the evolutionary ladder--**disconnected links in a hypothetical chain**” (*The Neck of the Giraffe*, p. 19).

In *Evolution: The Grand Experiment* (volume 1), Dr. Carl Werner examines the fossil record for evidence of the evolution of invertebrates, fish, bats, pinnipeds, flying reptiles, dinosaurs, whales, birds, and flowering plants. He traveled to major natural history museums and interviewed the experts. The book provides evidence that all of the “links” are still missing. Consider the following examples of quotes from scientists:

*Evidence for the evolution of Invertebrates:*

“Despite 30 years of research on Ediacaran fossils, there are very few, if any, unambiguous ancestors of things that appear in the Cambrian” (Dr. Andrew Knoll, Paleontologist and Professor of Biology, Harvard University).

*Evidence for the evolution of fish:*

“... the transition from spineless invertebrates to the first backboned fishes is still shrouded in mystery, and many theories abound as to how the changes took place” (Dr. John Long, an evolutionist and the author of *The Rise of Fishes*).

*Evidence for the evolution of bats:*

“There’s a ten-million-year period of early mammal evolution where you would guess that there’d be some sort of bat precursor, but once again, nothing” (Dr. Gary Morgan, Assistant Curator of Paleontology, New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science and a specialist in bat evolution).

*Evidence for the evolution of pterosaurs:*

“The ancestors are not known” (Dr. Gunter Viohl, Curator of the Jura Museum, Eichstatt, Germany).

We see, therefore, that the fossil record disproves evolution in that it does not contain the countless transitional creatures that Darwinian evolution requires.

### **3. The fossil record shows creatures appearing suddenly, fully formed, with no evolutionary history.**

Jeffrey Schwartz says the major animal groups “appear in the fossil record as Athena did from the head of Zeus--full blown and raring to go” (Wells, *Icons of Evolution*, p. 41).

Stephen Gould (d. 2002), one of the most influential evolutionists of the 20th century: “In any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; **it**

**appears all at once and ‘fully formed’**” (Gould, *Wonderful Life*, cited from Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 50).

D. M. Raup and S. M. Stanley: “Unfortunately, the origins of most higher categories are shrouded in mystery: commonly new higher categories **appear abruptly** in the fossil record without evidence of transitional forms” (Raup and Stanley, *Principles of Paleontology*, 1971, p. 306).

The suddenness of the appearance of creatures has even been given the name “**Cambrian explosion**” or “**biology’s big bang**.” The Cambrian layer is named after rocks in Cambria, Wales. This “layer” is supposed to be 500 to 600 million years old and to represent the beginning of life on earth.

Jonathan Wells, Ph.D. in cell biology from the University of California, Berkeley, states:

“Although the abrupt appearance of animal fossils in the Cambrian was known to Darwin, the full extent of the phenomenon wasn’t appreciated until the 1980s, when fossils from the previously-discovered Burgess Shale in Canada were re-analyzed by paleontologists Harry Whittington, Derek Briggs, and Simon Conway Morris. The 1980s also marked the discovery of two other fossil locations similar to the Burgess Shale: the Sirius Passet in northern Greenland, and the Chengjiang in southern China. All of these locations document the bewildering variety of animals that appeared in the Cambrian” (*Icons of Evolution*, pp. 38, 39).

Darwinism predicts that the fossil record will show that creatures gradually evolve, but in fact it shows creatures appearing fully formed.

#### **4. The fossil record demonstrates complexity from its earliest layers.**

According to the Darwinian doctrine of evolution, life arose from a “simple” creature such as a bacterium to higher and higher life forms.

The fossil record disproves this, even if you allow for evolutionary dating schemes. Creatures appear not only fully developed but with incredibly complex features such as the bat’s echolocation equipment.

“The oldest bat fossils, belonging to an extinct lineage, were unearthed from rocks about 54 million years old, but the creatures that they represent aren’t dramatically different from living bats, says Mark S. Springer, an evolutionary biologist at the University of California, Riverside. Hallmark features of these creatures include the elongated fingers that support the wing membranes and the extensive coiling of bony structures in the inner ears, a sign that they were capable of detecting the high-frequency chirps used in echolocation” (J. Bergman, “Evidence for the Evolution of Bats,” *Origins*, Feb. 2008, cited from Jonathan Sarfati, *By Design*, p. 49).

Consider **the trilobite**, which is found at the earliest stages of life by evolutionary thinking. It is an amazingly complex creature. It had a compound eye with as many as 15,000 lenses *per eye*, all of which worked together in perfect harmony to provide exceptional vision for this “simple” creature. Dr. Andrew Snelling calls it “the most sophisticated optical system ever utilized by any organism” (cited from *In Six Days*, edited by John Ashton, p. 295).

In fact, there is no such thing as “simple life.” Even plant life is extremely complex.

*Consider Plant Math.*

The plant is constantly monitoring the light and performing complex calculations in order to ration its store of starch until the sun reappears.

“If the starch store is used too fast, plants will starve and stop growing during the night. If the store is used too slowly, some of it will be wasted” (Dr. Alison Smith, metabolic biologist, “These Plants Do Math,” *Business Insider*, June 24, 2013).

At the John Innes Center in Norwich, researchers studied the *Arbidopsis*, a small flowering plants of the mustard family. They attempted to trick the plants by changing light conditions, introducing windows of sunlight during the night, etc., but the plants adapted in every situation. It is obvious that the starch balance and light conditions are being monitored continually and recomputed according to the condition.

*Consider Plant Communication*

Plants can detect sounds of insects eating them. They make poison to kill insects. They call insects to eat caterpillars. The wild tobacco plant recognizes different insects by their chemicals.

Plants make deadly “lollipops” which when eaten by caterpillars create a smell that attracts birds that eat the caterpillars.

The complexity of creatures at every level of the fossil record disproves evolution.

**5. The fossil record exhibits stasis or stability of species rather than change.**

Creatures not only appear in the fossil record fully formed but also retain the same form and habits throughout their existence, even over supposed “millions of years.”

Paleontologists call this observable phenomenon “stasis.”

Steven Stanley, a professor at Johns Hopkins University, pulled no punches in his admission that the fossil record shows stasis rather than gradualism:

“Having carefully scrutinized data from the fossil record during the past decade, however, I have demonstrated **a biological stability for species of animals and plants that I think would have shocked Darwin.** Certainly it has jolted many modern evolutionists. ... **Once established, an average species of animal or plant will not change enough to be regarded as a new species, even after surviving for something like a hundred thousand, or a million, or even ten million generations. ... Something tends to prevent the wholesale restructuring of species,** once it has become well established on earth” (“The New Evolution,” *Johns Hopkins Magazine*, June 1982, cited from Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma*, pp. 117, 118).

Prominent evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould was equally candid:

**“Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth.** They appear in the fossil record looking pretty much the same as when they disappear; morphological change is usually limited and directionless” (Gould, *Wonderful Life*, cited from Phillip Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, p. 50)

Consider plants. At the Burke Museum of Natural History in Seattle there is a display of supposed 50 million year old fossilized leaves of cedar, pine, ginkgo, birch, and dawn redwood, and they look exactly like the “modern” varieties.

Darwinism predicts that the fossil record will demonstrate constant change and non-stability of species, but in fact it shows sudden appearance followed by amazing stability.

#### **6. The uniformitarian view is now rejected even by evolutionists.**

Charles Lyell said the geological layers were laid down over millions of years of gradual buildup. He said “the past is the key to the present,” meaning that conditions have remained the same over millions of years of time. This is called “uniformitarianism.”

Today this theory is being rejected by the evidence that things formerly thought to have required millions of years can actually occur quickly.

Some geologists are calling themselves “neo-catastrophists.” They believe that many of the fossil rocks were laid down by massive local floods.

In fact, the current evolutionary theory is that the earth has witnessed a series of global catastrophes. The Chicago Field Museum describes six “mass extinctions” that were supposedly caused by shifting continents, volcanic activity, meteors, etc.

But they won’t admit that there was a *global* flood, because they don’t want to believe the Bible.

#### **7. The uniformitarian view was disproven by Mt. Saint Helens.**

The Mt. Saint Helens volcano explosion has proven that geological layers can be formed in hours and days. Mt. Saint Helens is located in Washington State in the northwest part of the United States.

On May 18, 1980, the mountain exploded, and the entire northern face was blasted away. Canyons up to 140 feet deep and several miles long were carved into solid bedrock in places. This was caused by fast flowing water and mud. Thick rock layers were formed in a short time

This proves that layers of sediment can be laid down quickly and that great canyons such as the Grand Canyon can form quickly.

#### **8. The fossil record contains evidence of the global flood described in the Bible.**

*The global flood explains the layers of sedimentary rock throughout the world.*

“Sedimentary” rock is laid down by moving water. The rock layers throughout the world are hundreds of feet deep and miles long.

Ordovician Soom Shale in South Africa is 30 feet thick and stretches hundreds of miles.

The Devonian Thunder Bay formation in Michigan is 12 feet thick and stretches for hundreds of miles.

The Siwalki Hills in India is 2,000 to 3,000 feet high and several hundred miles long.

The Morrison Formation covers an area of about a million square miles in 13 states in America and three Canadian provinces--from Manitoba to Arizona, from Alberta to Texas.

The Green River Formation covers a large territory in Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado.

There is a thick layer of water-laid white chalky rock that runs from America to eastern Europe and the Middle East. The “white cliffs of Dover” are a part of this rock layer that covers two continents.

*The global flood explains the massive fossil beds.*

The fossil beds are vast graveyards of dead animals that were quickly buried and fossilized.

The fossilization that we see in the great fossil beds throughout the earth could not possibly be explained in evolutionary terms. Fossil beds do not occur under normal conditions. Dead animals are quickly consumed by animals, insects, worms, and bacteria, and are destroyed by the action of the environment (sun, rain, wind, moving water, etc.).

The vast herds of millions of bison that were killed in the late 19th century on the western plains of America left no fossil evidence.

The lions that infested Israel for centuries and that are mentioned 141 times in the Old Testament have left no fossilized remains (2 Ki. 17:25).

This exposes another myth in the natural history museums.

The Chicago Field Museum says fossilization occurs naturally when dead creatures “soak in ground water for a long, long time.”

The British Museum of Natural History has a display labeled “Fishy death.” It says, “The fossils in this slab belong to a school of fish that died in the same place at the same time. Their lake dried out during a hot spell leaving the trapped fish to die. When the fish dies, it falls to the sea floor and becomes buried in sediments. The soft body parts rot away leaving the hard bones. Sediment layers accumulate and become compacted over time, forming a rock mould around the skeleton. The skeleton is gradually replaced by other minerals.”

These are unscientific statements. Fossilization does not naturally occur in this manner.

When a fish dies, it is quickly devoured by animals and eaten by germs. When a clam dies, it opens up. but fossil graveyards contain millions of clams that are closed,

This means that they were fossilized rapidly.

Coal deposits contain the fossils of perfectly preserved skeletons of large dinosaurs which would have had to have been covered almost instantly. Otherwise the bones would have disappeared.

Fossil graveyards contain millions of “soft-bodied” organisms, including bacteria, embryos, leaves, flowers, worms, jellyfish, fish eggs, and fragile insects including butterflies.

This is impossible under normal circumstances. Such things don't fossilize. They disappear quickly after death.

Food can be seen in the guts of fossilized fish. There are fossilized scorpions with their stings preserved. There are fish with embryos inside their abdomens.

In fossils in the Triassic Cow Brand Formation in Virginia microscopic details are preserved at a resolution of approximately 1 micron. This is 25 times smaller than we can see with our eyes.

In fossils in the Cretaceous Santana Formation in Brazil skin, scales, muscle fiber, and gills with arteries and veins are visible. In one female specimen the ovaries are preserved with developing eggs inside (Snelling).

In fossils in the lignite beds of Geiseltal in Germany leaves have been so well preserved that alpha and beta types of chlorophyll can be recognized. The color has even been preserved.

The trilobite's compound eye has been fossilized in such detail that scientists have been able to study it microscopically.

The fossils that are found all over the earth are evidence of a global flood that covered creatures quickly and preserved them.

*The global flood explains the sorting.*

The global flood explains why bottom-dwelling sea creatures that lived near the shore are often found at the lower levels of the fossil strata, as these would usually have been buried first.

The flood waters did not reach maximum height for 150 days. Land animals and birds would have been killed after the sea creatures that lived in the shallow areas near land.

*The global flood explains the mixing.*

The global flood explains why land animals and sea animals are oftentimes jumbled together in the fossil beds.

*The global flood explains sea creatures on mountains.*

In Peru and other places, whale fossils have been found high in mountains far from the ocean. I own a beautiful trilobite fossil from the atlas mountains of morocco. The trilobite was a sea creature. The fossils of the ammonite, another sea creature, are found in the high himalayas. The Ammonite was a sea creature of the order of squid.

Evolutionists say that the land was lifted up over a long period of time to form the mountains with the sea fossils on them. But this is not possible. If the creatures had died in a sea before the land lifted up, they would not have fossilized. Such fossilization doesn't happen over a long period of time.

Evolutionists also theorize that the fossils were made by layers of volcanic ash, but volcanic ash doesn't make fossils.

We have a living laboratory in Mt. Saint Helens, one of the most powerful volcanic eruptions of recent times. In 1980, it poured out countless tons of ash. The ash plum was 15 miles (25 km) high. The ash covered a large part of the western United States. It killed some people and many animals, but it didn't produce fossils.

Further, the rock layers in which fossils are found are sedimentary rather than igneous, which refers to rock made by volcanic lava. This means the rock was laid down by water.

The best explanation for the sedimentary rock layers and the massive fossil beds is the global flood described in the Bible.

Recent books by men with Ph.D.s in geology and engineering show evidence for the creationist view of the fossil record.

*Earth's Catastrophic Past* by Andrew Snelling

*The Geology Book* by John D. Morris

*In the Beginning* by Walt Brown

Summary of the fossil record's witness against evolution:

Far from providing evidence for the evolution of life, the fossil record disproves evolution.

The fossil record does not contain the countless transitional creatures that evolution requires.

The fossil record shows creatures appearing suddenly, fully formed.

The fossil record demonstrates complexity from its earliest layers.

The fossil record exhibits stability of species rather than change.

## REVIEW QUESTIONS ON THE FOSSIL RECORD

1. Why did Darwin know that the fossil record did not provide evidence for his “theory”?
2. How did he answer this problem?
3. Why can this no longer be used as an excuse?
4. What is the evolutionary geological column?
5. What are the three major eras of the geological time scale and what are the evolutionary dates given for these eras?
6. What are four problems with the geological column?
7. What is an unconformity?
8. What is an example of an unconformity in the Grand Canyon and how much evolutionary time is missing there?
9. What is an “out of order” fossil?
10. What is an example of an out-of-order fossil?
11. What Ph.D. traveled to major museums in search of “missing links”?
12. According to evolutionist Jay Gould, animals appear in the fossil record \_\_\_\_\_.
13. What is the Cambrian Explosion?
14. When did this happen, according to evolutionists?
15. How does the Cambrian Explosion disprove evolution?
16. How does the trilobite’s eye refute evolution?
17. The fact that creatures appear in the fossil record and do not change is called what?
18. How is this evidence against evolution?
19. What volcano has provided a laboratory to test evolutionary theories of geology?
20. Where is this volcano located?
21. When did this volcano erupt?
22. How did this volcano explosion disprove the evolutionary theory that rock layers and canyons are formed over millions of years?
23. What is sedimentary rock?
24. How much of the earth is covered with sedimentary rock?
25. The Chicago Field Museum says that fossilization occurs when dead creatures “soak in ground water for a long time.” Why is this not true?
26. If a lake dries up, why do the fish not become fossilized?
27. The fact that there are millions of closed clams in fossil beds proves what?
28. How does the global flood explain the way that creatures are usually sorted in geological layers?
29. What do evolutionists say about sea creature fossils that are found on mountains?
30. Why is this theory not possible?