

## CREATIONISM MORE CREDIBLE

### 51 GOOD REASONS TO BELIEVE

See <http://liberative.tripod.com>

Creationism is not opposed to legitimate scientific inquiry whatsoever; in fact, the Biblical mandate to “subdue” the earth (Genesis 1:28) requires us to understand the physical processes that are at work in the universe, which is the general purpose of science. Once we leave the realm of data, however, and enter into a discussion of interpretation, science ends and religion begins. Most branches of modern science were founded by believers in creationism, such as: Newton, Faraday, Maxwell, and Kelvin in physics; Boyle, Dalton, and Ramsay in chemistry; Ray, Linnaeus, Mendel, Pasteur, Virchow, and Agassiz in biology; Steno, Woodward, Brewster, Buckland, and Curvier in geology; Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Herschel, and Maunder in astronomy; and Pascal and Leibnitz in mathematics. Even today, many scientists reject the “particles-to-people” idea (that everything “made” itself); these include: Dr. Russell Humphreys, of the Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque; Dr. Edward Boudreaux of the University of New Orleans; Dr. Maciej Giertych, of the Institute of Dendrology – Polish Academy of Sciences; Dr. Aw Swee-Eng, Head of the Department of Nuclear Medicine and Director of Clinical Research at Singapore General Hospital. Thus, the often-repeated charge that no real scientist rejects evolution is fundamentally, well, without foundation.

Today’s science has advanced to the point that almost all secular scientists have utterly abandoned “Darwinian” evolution in favor of “rapid mutation”, “radial symmetry”, “punctuated equilibrium”, or variations of this far-out theory. It is the only explanation (in their minds) for the complete lack of fossil evidence (despite literally millions of discovered fossils) of any species changing into another. There simply is no such thing as macro-evolution. Micro-evolution, however, is very possible and is in fact explained in the Bible, speaking of creatures: “and all their kinds”. In other words, species adapt, sometimes quite quickly. However, a lizard is still a lizard and a monkey is still a monkey! Charles Darwin himself summed it up best in his book “The Origin of Species”, when he said, “Noting the abundance of fossils, numerous transitionals must be found to prove my theory.”

#### ADAPTATIONS V/S EVOLUTION

If we were to witness an increase in organic complexity over eons, such as reptiles mutating into birds, we would properly call this “macro-evolution.” To describe small changes that occur in a species over time, such as alterations in color or bone structure, the proper term is “micro-evolution”. “Micro-evolution” merely describes how some existing genetic traits are emphasized over others – “varieties” within

a “type”. However, “micro-evolution” is a misnomer, as it implies that “a little” evolution is taking place. In actuality, no evolution is occurring, because no increase in complexity (such as the development of a new organ) is being generated. Out of the millions of fossils in the world, not one transitional form has been found. When apparent examples of useful mutations are examined thoroughly, it becomes clear that all known species show up in the fossil record abruptly, without intermediate forms, thus contributing to the theory of special creation and the flood. Even evolutionists acknowledge that the fossil record is one of “fully-formed abrupt appearance” and “stasis” (i.e. no change over time). Usually, they brush this aside as a “research issue”.

#### ELEMENTAL ACCUMULATIONS

Scientists know fairly accurately how much of each element is being put into the oceans by rivers each year. They also know the current concentration of these elements in the oceans. By simple division, they can calculate the time it took to reach present levels, accounting for sedimentation and dissipation. None of these elements give an age of the earth coming even close to the billions of years in evolution. The oceans contain about 3.6% salt; even granting generous assumptions this means they are less than 62 million years old. Our atmosphere has less than 40,000 years worth of accumulated helium, based on the production of this gas from the decay of uranium and thorium (its only natural sources). Helium levels in the atmosphere are only 0.05% of what would be expected for a 4.57 billion year old earth. Because there is no known way for large amounts of helium to escape our atmosphere, the atmosphere must be young. All granite on earth contains mica, which is composed of 3 isotopes – polonium 210, 214, and 238, ranging in half-life (decay rate) from .00162 seconds to 3 minutes. Thus the mica was captured in during a time span of less than ½ second to 21 minutes at most, and did not take 300 million years to form as evolutionists want to believe.

#### THERMODYNAMICS

The First Law of Thermodynamics, also known as the Law of Conservation of Energy, states that there can be no creation or annihilation of matter or energy. Certainly, one form of energy can be converted into another, one state of matter can be converted into another, and matter/energy inter-conversions can occur. But the total amount of matter and energy combined always remains constant. Thus, the universe could not just spring into existence and its very existence suggests that there is a Creator God. The Second Law of Thermodynamics, also called the Law of Entropy, states that anything which is organized tends, with time, to become disorganized. Any physical system left to itself will decay; that is, it will become worn; it will lose energy and or-

ganization inside the system. Where work is done, energy is expelled, never to be used again. Instead of remaining highly organized, as earth’s systems do, everything tends to become less organized. For example, chemical processes will reach equilibrium and then become inert over time.

This Second Law of Thermodynamics can be expressed in different but equivalent ways. They include: A) Classical Thermodynamics: The energy available for useful work in a functioning system tends to decrease, though the total energy remains constant; B) Statistical Thermodynamics: The complexity or order of a structured system tends to become disorganized and random; and C) Informational Thermodynamics: The information that is conveyed by a communicating system tends to become distorted and incomplete over time. In other words, the increase of information required for a life form to evolve from amino acids up could never happen; this increase in information by itself alone violates the Second Law. More complex forms of life cannot be organized from simpler versions, and evolution requires a constant increase in order, strictly by chance, not a few rather millions of times. To say that the chaos of the Big Bang has randomly transformed itself into the human brain with its 120 trillion connections is a clear violation of the Second Law, which presents another insurmountable barrier to evolutionary idealism. Evolutionists commonly object that the Second Law applies to closed, or isolated systems, and that the Earth is certainly not a closed system. (It gets lots of raw energy from the Sun, for example.)

Dr. Duane Gish put forth 4 conditions that must be met for complexity to be generated in an environment: 1) The system must be an open system; 2) An adequate external energy force must be available; 3) The system must possess energy conversion mechanisms; and 4) A control mechanism must exist within the system for directing, maintaining and replicating these energy conversion mechanisms. However, all systems, whether open or closed, tend to deteriorate. For example, living organisms are open systems but they all decay and die. The equations of Thermodynamics clearly show that an influx of raw heat energy (as from the sun) into any “open” system (such as earth’s environment) will increase the entropy (decay) of that system more rapidly than if it were an isolated system.

Still, evolution is based on increasing complexity and the adding of enormous amounts of genetic information that would eventually turn a single-celled organism into pre-Cambrian and Cambrian trilobites which “evolved” into marine invertebrates to vertebrate fish to amphibians to reptiles to birds and mammals and eventually to man. It would take an astronomical number of beneficial mutations, and incredible amounts of DNA arising, to bring about this

“increased complexity” in order to “evolve” a single-celled organism up to a human being consisting of 50 trillion living cells. And although nothing like this has ever been observed (a mutation being responsible for one species turning into another) evolutionists are dogmatic that it happened.

The question isn't whether there is enough “raw energy” from the sun to drive a mythical evolutionary process; but how it could even be performed, because you don't see a pile of lumber, bricks, and nails spontaneously collaborating to form a house. There surely is enough “raw energy” from the sun to perform the process, but without some intelligent source to instigate it, the lumber, bricks, and nails will just sit there and collect dust. An embryo growing into an adult or a seed growing into a tree only happens when supported by an outside energy source and it is only manipulating pre-existing information in the DNA to drive the process (simply an outward manifestation of pre-encoded DNA). In addition, the theory of evolution relies on hundreds of millions of years of time and chance, but the longer the amount of time, the greater the entropy.

#### PROBABILITY V/S IMPROBABILITY

The science of probability has not been favorable to evolutionary theory, even with that theory's loose time restraints. Dr. James Coppedge, of the Center for Probability Research in Biology in California, made some amazing calculations. Dr. Coppedge applied all the laws of probability studies to the possibility of a single cell coming into existence by chance. He considered in the same way a single protein molecule, and even one single gene. His discoveries are revolutionary. He did his computations based on a theoretical a world in which the earth's entire surface – all the oceans, all the atoms, and the whole crust – would be available. He then had amino acids bind at a rate 1 ½ trillion times faster than they do in nature. In computing the possibilities, he found that to provide a single protein molecule by chance combination it would take 10, to the 262nd power, years. (That is, the number 1 followed by 262 zeroes.) To get a single cell – the single smallest living cell known to mankind – which is called the *Mycoplasma Hominis H39*, it would take 10, to the 119,841st power, years. That means that if you took thin pieces of paper and wrote 1 and then zeroes after (it), you would fill up the entire known universe with paper before you could ever even write this number. That is how many years it would take to make one living cell, smaller than any human cell! According to Emile Borel, a French scientist and an expert in the area of probability, an event on the cosmic level with a probability of less than 1 out of 10, to the 50th power, will not happen. Sir Fred Hoyle, the British mathematician and astronomer, was quoted in *Nature* magazine (November 12<sup>th</sup> 1981), as saying “The chance that higher life forms might have

emerged in this way (evolution) is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.”

#### SPONTANEOUS GENERATION OF LIFE

Evolutionists say billions of years after the Big Bang the planets coagulated from gas, vapor, and dust; cooled down; and it rained for millions of years, forming earth's oceans – a primordial soup rich with many complex chemicals. This is where the first “simple cell” (as Darwin called it) supposedly formed, defying the fact that proteins unbound in water more quickly than they bond. Meanwhile, biogenic law has two provable concepts to it: 1) Life can only come from life; and 2) Like kinds always give rise to like kinds. (Reptiles produce other reptiles, and do not arcanelly become birds.) More than a century after it was first proposed, scientists have never seen this law violated. Although Louis Pasteur (famous for “pasteurization”) disproved “spontaneous generation” over a century ago, some evolutionists will argue he only tested large, modern organisms and that it's still possible.

This is what evolutionists believe happened, even though no scientist (even with all our great technology) has ever been able to synthesize a living cell out of non-living chemicals or material. In fact, two scientists – Dr. Miller and Dr. Urey – tested the hypothesis that mankind could create life from scratch. In experiments, they created a few amino acids under tightly controlled circumstances that were supposed to mimic those conditions of a primordial earth. They assumed a (chemically) “reducing” atmosphere; however, this is pure speculation and contradicts the empirical evidence, because if it existed we should find methane stuck to ancient sedimentary clays but we do not; instead there are oxidized rocks as far down as geologists dig. Therefore, amino acids would really have been destroyed by oxidation, but without oxygen UV radiation would arrive unhindered, also meaning death. Using a spark to simulate lightning, trapping out the gases he wanted, and finally filtering the product, Dr. Miller produced a combination of 85% tar, 13% carboxylic acid, and 2% amino acids. Actually, this spark was better at tearing the amino acids apart than putting them together and evolutionary science should show how life arose without any outside intelligence to guide it. Also, the amino acids would have inevitably bonded with the tar and not survived, even if there had been the 20 different amino acids necessary for viable life. The amino acids Miller created were a long way from being alive, and the solution contained both left- and right-handed amino acids. In nature, only left-handed amino acids are used to make proteins. In fact, if even one right-handed amino acid occurs in the code of a protein, it renders the entire chain useless. Dr. Miller himself has stated that no useful conclusions

can be drawn from his experiments. Besides, it took intelligent design to construct the experiment in the first place! In review, Miller used the wrong starting conditions, interfered with the experiment, and got the wrong results. Other than that it went great.

Furthermore, the various nucleotides essential for building RNA and DNA molecules require radically different external conditions for their random assembly. Cytosine and uracil need near-boiling water temperatures, while adenine and guanine need freezing water temperatures. Thus, it seems most unlikely that under natural conditions all four building blocks would come together under adequate concentrations at the same place. Self-assembled life arising in a primordial soup or on a mineral substrate would be expected to leave behind some inorganic kerogen tars marked by a certain carbon-13 to carbon-12 ratio. No such kerogen is found in the geologic column. In addition, the simplest chemical step for the origin of life – the gathering of amino acids that are all left-handed and nucleotide sugars that are all right-handed – cannot be achieved under inorganic conditions.

#### COMPARATIVE ANATOMY / HOMOMOLOGY

Comparative anatomy is a theory stating that like features inside two different creatures means they are distant cousins on the evolutionary “tree”. The problem with this is that those features the scientists use to “prove” like ancestry usually come from different areas on the DNA strand. Like an architect, an Intelligent Designer could certainly make multiple uses out of codes for well-constructed organs or skeletons, but this does not imply biological relationships.

Darwin said that embryological evidence was “second to none in importance”. The idea of embryonic recapitulation, or the theory that higher life forms go through the previous evolutionary chain before birth, was popularized by Ernst Haeckel in 1866. It was later found that Haeckel forged the diagrams which he used as evidence for the theory. In the human embryo, the main arguments for embryonic recapitulation are the supposed “gill slits” (left over from fish), the “yolk sac” (left over from the reptile stage), and the “tail” (from the monkeys). The so-called gill slits are never really slits, nor do they ever function in respiration. They are actually four pairs of pharyngeal pouches: the first pair becomes germ-fighting organs; the second, the two middle-ear canals; the third and fourth pairs become the important parathyroid and thymus glands. The yolk sac does not store food because the mother's body provides all of the embryo's food. In fact, the “yolk sac” is not a yolk sac at all; its true function is to produce the first blood cells. The “tail” is just the tip of the spine extending beyond the muscles of the embryo. The end of this will eventually become the coccyx, which is instrumental in the ability to stand and sit as humans normally do. Also arguing against

recapitulation is the fact that different higher life forms experience different embryonic stages in different orders, and often contrary to the assumed evolutionary order.

Homology studies the similarity of structures between different types of organisms. People have argued that these similarities are evidence of one common ancestor. However, as Luther Sunderland points out, when the concentration of red blood cells is compared (according to the ideas of homology) humans are more closely related to frogs, fish, and birds than to sheep. With the development of molecular biology, we can now make a comparison of the same cells in different species, adding a whole new dimension to homology. Unfortunately for the evolutionists, molecular biology does as all other evidence, presenting a greater argument against evolution theory than for it.

Molecular biology can test proteins of the same type in different organisms to determine how much difference there is in amino acid makeup. The resulting figure is converted into a percentage. The lower it is, the less difference there is between the proteins. Dr. Michael Denton states, "There is not a trace at a molecular level of the traditional evolutionary series: fish to amphibian to reptile to mammal. Incredibly man is closer to lamprey than are fish."

Using the evolutionist reasoning of so-called "similarities" between animals, one could conclude that crocodiles and chickens are closely related, because the A-hemoglobin of crocodiles has more in common with that of chickens (17.5 %) than that of vipers (5.6 %), which are their fellow reptiles. Hemoglobin, the complex molecule that carries oxygen in blood, is found in vertebrates but it is also found in some earthworms, starfish, crustaceans, mollusks, and even in some bacteria. Maybe we "evolved" from chickens, because our lysozyme is closer to chicken lysozyme than that of any fellow mammal. Also, the antigen receptor protein in camels and sharks has the same unusual single chain structure, but this cannot be explained by envisioning a common ancestor of sharks and camels.

#### VESTIGIAL ORGANS

Vestigial organs are those in the body which are said to be useless, remnants left over from evolutionary development. It is said they were formerly important organs but are not needed any more. At one time, more than 180 organs of the human body were classified as such. In the last 100 years, all but four of these organs have been found to have important functions for the body. Some of these were the pituitary gland (which oversees skeletal growth), the thymus (an endocrine gland), the pineal gland (which in turn affects the development of sex glands), the tonsils and the appendix (both of which fight disease; the appendix also aids greatly in digestion).

It appears that every part of the human body has functionality, implying masterful

design, not chance evolutionary processes. The fact that an organ must sometimes be removed, or that one can live without it, does not make it vestigial. The bones of the "vestigial" pelvis in whales are, in fact, anchor points where muscles essential to their reproductive systems attach. (Male and female whales differ considerably.)

Evolution implies that if an organ has lost its value, over time it should vanish completely. Furthermore, if organs did become useless, this would serve to back up the Second Law of Thermodynamics and the degenerative process, rather than evolution, which requires adaptation of existing organs for new purposes and new organs forming for likewise useful purposes, rather than old ones dying out. Evolutionists have mostly given up the vestigial argument.

#### IRREDUCIBLE COMPLEXITY

Darwin wrote, "If it could be shown that any biological organ or system existed which could not possibly be made by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." A common example of irreducible complexity is the mousetrap, which must have all parts (the catch, the hammer, the holding bar, the platform, and the spring) in the right places in order for it to function. Molecular biologist Dr. Michael Behe observes in his book *Darwin's Black Box* that, "The cell is chock full of 'irreducibly complex' systems... literally molecular machines" which could not evolve step-by-step.

In his book *Evolution – A Theory in Crisis*, Dr. Michael Denton (a non-creationist) wrote, "To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand-million times until it is twenty kilometers in diameter and resembles a giant large airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like the port holes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings, we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity. Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality, the smallest element of which, a functional protein or gene, is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality which is exactly the opposite of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man? Alongside the level of ingenuity and complexity exhibited by the molecular machinery of life, even our most advanced artifacts appear clumsy.... It would be an illusion to think that what we are aware of at present is any more than a fraction of the full extent of biological design. In practically every field of fundamental biological research ever-increasing levels of design

and complexity are being revealed at an ever-accelerating rate." Even the simplest cell is incredibly and irreducibly complex; it won't work until fully assembled, lending credence to the idea of God as our Creator.

#### PEPPERED MOTHS

Peppered Moths are used widely in textbooks to describe evolution. This case study does describe a form of evolution; just not the way evolutionists would have you think. It describes micro-evolution – that is, change within a kind – but not a new kind of animal arising from another. In England, as the Industrial Revolution turned the trees darker, because of the air pollution more black moths survived, simply because they blended in better with the darker trees and passed their genetic traits along. Predators attacked the whiter moths, which contrasted with their background. Natural selection took place, but the moth species didn't evolve into any kind of new creature.

#### PEST CONTROL

Evolutionists also cite the fact that rats have become immune to the effects of the drug Warfarin, and they say the rats evolved to resist the drug. The simple fact is that the genetic information for resisting Warfarin was already there. Naturally, if one applies the drug to a group of 100 rats and ten possess the resistance to it, the ones without such code will be wiped out and the genetic information that they possess will also die with them. Only the ones with the resistance will survive and they will pass these genes along to their descendants. Eventually, the entire rat population will possess this same resistance, giving the illusion that they evolved. But natural selection simply eliminated the rats without that resistance. Anyway, you still have a rat; it hasn't changed into another species, which is what evolution is all about. Likewise, bacteria that seem to have evolved resistance actually come from the same species, in which the resistance was already present. No new genetic information arose; natural selection simply eliminated the weaker genes.

#### GECKO LIZARDS

The gecko lizard can run across ceilings and walls without falling off. Looking at the feet of the gecko under a regular microscope, tiny little hairs appear; but these could not hold the lizard to the ceiling. It took electron microscopes for scientists to find the tinier suction cups that are attached to these hairs – more than 500 million on each gecko, a puzzle for evolutionists.

#### SEA SLUGS

The sea slug too can be used to show evolution as false. Sea slugs feed on the sea anemone, an animal with poisoned harpoons that paralyze anything they contact. The sea slug, however, is able to put these little darts into a sack inside its stomach, storing them to use in its own defense. All these abilities needed to be present from the get-go or the

slug would have died when it first tried to eat the sea anemone. How did multiple survival mechanisms arise in the sea slug by chance? Why did the slug evolve the dart storage if the anemone wasn't edible? Natural selection wouldn't favor a slug with the dart-storage capacity, because no need for storage would exist until the slug could devour the anemone. Which came first? Or was everything designed simultaneously?

#### GARDENING ANTS

One of nature's most impressive symbiotic relationships exists between the gardening ant and the Bull's Horn acacia tree. The tree supplies the ants with food in pods especially accessible to them. The tree also provides shelter for the ants. The ants reciprocate by clipping all the growth that competes with the acacia tree. Consequently, the acacia tree never has any competition, and therefore gets plenty of sunlight in a dense rain forest. If the ants are removed from the tree, the acacia dies within 2 to 15 months. How would this partnership arise in a survival of the fittest competition between the plant and animal kingdoms?

#### MIMICRY

Mimicry is the ability of a creature to imitate another so that it is hard to tell the fake from the real. Most mimicry is found in the insect world. An example would be the praying mantis, which looks like a stick, or certain spiders, which pretend to be ants. How does a creature (like a chameleon) evolve the ability to change color to the point that it represents an advantage? Some insects even imitate things that are normally lethal. This mimicry seems to warrant that the creatures were created fully formed and did not evolve. To attract other fish (luring and catching its meals), the Hawaiian angler fish uses a dorsal fin, which has a set of fake eyes and mouth. The angler just shakes his "lure", acting like a little fish in trouble, and waits for the predator to move in. At times, this lure is bitten off, but built into the fish's DNA is the ability to grow a new one.

#### FLIGHT

Insects are the only invertebrates that can fly. In contrast to other winged creatures, insects fly by moving their wings in a sculling motion (similar to rowing a boat); all other flyers use straight flapping (with the exception of the hummingbird). Also, there are four different flyers in the fossil record, each with unique characteristics. They are: reptiles (represented by the pterodactyls), modern birds (which could not emerge from a reptilian ancestor), mammals (represented by the bat), and flying insects. There are too many different characteristics for these to have a common ancestor, yet the odds against four parallel evolutionary tracks for flight are staggering. So that birds can fly, the ratio of weight to bone strength must be exactly right; else the bird will be grounded. While hollow bones

are good enough for most birds, the bone structure of hawks and a few other birds are much more advanced in their design. This is necessary because a hollow bone design does not allow for high gravity turns. Added to the hawk's bones is a design that includes diagonal struts, providing the very best strength-to-weight ratio. This structure, known as the Warren Truss, is technologically advanced, having been discovered by flight engineers only in the last 50 years.

#### ECHOLOCATION

Dolphins have a sonar system so precise that it is the envy of the U.S. Navy. Cetaceans that use echolocation (to form mental images via ultrasonic echoes) can detect a fish the size of a golf ball 230 feet away. One of the amazing features of many dolphins and whales is the "melon" – a fatty protrusion on the forehead which focuses the emitted sound waves into a beam that the creatures can direct wherever they choose. This works because different lipids (fatty compounds) bend the ultrasonic sound waves (faster vibrations than human hearing can detect), as they travel through them, in different ways. The different lipids have to be arranged in the right shape and sequence in order to focus the returning sound waves. Each separate lipid is unique, and different from normal blubber-type lipids, having been made by complicated chemical processes that require several distinct enzymes. For such an organ to have evolved, not only must random mutations have formed the correct enzymes to make the right lipids, but other mutations must have caused the lipids to be deposited in the right places, in exactly the right shapes. A gradual step-by-step process isn't feasible because until the lipids were fully formed, in their exact shape and almost in their exact places, echolocation would have been non-functional and useless. Yet evolution dictates that the cetaceans decided to use echolocation in light of such an accidental formation.

#### EYES

Charles Darwin himself was troubled by the design shown in the human eye: how was evolution to explain this? In Darwin's times, almost nothing was known about the complexity and sophistication of this organ. In fact, scientists still do not fully understand how it works. When confronted with darkness, the human eye increases its ability to see 100,000 times. No camera can come close to that. If you were told that the most sophisticated camera made by Minolta came about by natural processes, you would laugh; yet, evolutionists believe the human eye, which is thousands upon thousands of times more sophisticated, came about "by chance". Evolutionists even say the human eye is a "poor design"; but if so, try building a more sophisticated camera with all our abundant technology. It's impossible!

The human eye normally performs 100,000 separate functions each day; then,

while you sleep, it does its own maintenance work. Considering the number of complex structures in the eye, as well as its highly-integrated synchronization, it is baffling to imagine how the evolutionist can believe that the eye developed from a random natural process of trial and error. No evolutionist can create (from fossil evidence or otherwise) a functional human eye without any item among: the rods, cones, optical nerve, retina, cornea, pupil, lens, and so forth. Indeed, the eye is known to be useless unless it is fully developed. It either functions as an integrated whole or not at all, and evolutionists say it would take thousands of years to develop eyes. They will tell you that where there is a want nature will provide, so supposedly nature decided that man needed an eye, although nothing had ever been seen or needed to be seen.

The human eye is (in a sense) "inferior" to an eagle's eye, or a lobster's or a squid's, but to say that it is a "poor design" disregards the fact that whatever (or Whoever) created the human eye really thought it over well, even boring a hole in a bone of the nose to discharge the special fluid which moistens the eye. Moreover, human eyes are placed under a bony brow to protect them and they are given shutters to keep foreign material out. With a pair of eyes on a horizontal plane, we not only can sense in a broader spectrum but we also have a range finder that determines distances.

The human visual system cannot register motion as accurately and sensitively as that of a fly, but if it did, we would see all fluorescent lighting and television flickering continually. We cannot see at night as well as a cat, but we surpass that in some other areas. For example, cats have no color vision. The human eye represents an excellent balance between versatility and performance, a combination enabling astonishing technological achievements through the ages. In recent times, our capacity to construct devices for seeing the very distant, the microscopic, and in the darkest night, has augmented the practical scope of our vision exceeding that of any other creature.

Some evolutionists claim that the verted retinae of cephalopods (e.g. squids and octopi), are more efficient than the inverted retinae found in vertebrates. But this presupposes that the inverted retina is inefficient in the first place. Also, they have never shown that cephalopods actually see better. On the contrary, their eyes merely approach some of the lower vertebrate eyes in efficiency and they are probably color-blind. We don't need an eye like a squid because we don't live in their type of environment. Moreover, the cephalopod retinae, besides being "verted", are actually much simpler than the "inverted" retinae of vertebrates. In their natural environment, cephalopods are exposed to much lower light intensities than are most vertebrates, and they generally live for only two or three

years. Nothing is known about the lifespan of the giant squid; in any case, it is believed to frequent great depths at which there is very little light. Thus, for cephalopods there is less of a need for protection against damage from too much light (as humans have). The main reason that our retinas are wired “backwards” is to protect against the toxic and heating effects of light. It is obvious that God designed the human eye; any other conclusion is irrational and unscientific.

Yet the eye did not develop only once; rather, there are five different types of eyes known to us today – human, squid, vertebrate, arthropod, and trilobite. Thus, evolution means that chance mutations created not one, but five separate viewing systems. Furthermore, evolutionist Richard Dawkins says, “Unlike human designers, natural selection can’t go downhill not even if there is a tempting higher hill on the other side of the valley.” So, if the human eye evolved, why is it inferior to the eye of a squid or lobster? Natural selection would preserve the complexity and usefulness of the squid eye, not evolve to an “inferior” eye like a human’s. According to Dawkins, this leap doesn’t happen; yet we see this in the human eye, so Dawkins contradicts himself.

Trilobites are thought to be extinct. Because they lived at the ocean’s bottom, great numbers were preserved. Some trilobites eyes had eye lenses made out of calcite. (Thousands found.) Because they are made out of “rock” and therefore don’t decay, paleontologists have been able to study them and have found several interesting things. Unlike human eyes, which are composed of a single lens, the trilobite eye is composed of a double lens with up to 15,000 separate lens surfaces in each eye. This allows the trilobite to see under water perfectly without distortion. Several laws of optics, including Abbe’s Sine Law and Fermat’s Principle, are inherent in the design of these lenses, whether made by God or by mere nature. Given billions of years for evolution, how did the trilobite grow a second lens, and how did the eye function before the second lens was present?

#### METEORITIC DUST

Meteoritic dust falls on the earth continuously, adding up to many thousands (if not millions) of tons per year. Realizing this, and theorizing that the moon also had meteoritic dust piling up on it for millions of years, NASA scientists were worried, thinking the first lunar ship landing would sink into the many feet of moon dust which should have accumulated. However, only about 1/8 inch of dust was found, indicating a young moon. Also, meteoritic material contributes nickel to the oceans. Based on the amount of nickel in the oceans and the supply from meteoritic dust, the earth figures to be just several thousands of years old, not the millions (or billions) evolutionists opine it is. This, and the lack of meteor-

itic dust piles on the earth, lend to the creationist belief in a young earth.

#### THE SOLAR SYSTEM

Evolutionary astronomers calculate the universe as 10 to 12 billion years old. They postulate that the solar system appeared after enough particles gravitated together. However, given this hypothesis, the sun (99% of the mass) should have 700 times more angular momentum (spinning inertia) than all the planets combined. Instead, the planets have 50 times more angular momentum than the sun. Some evolutionists state that, “The sun transferred most of its momentum to the planets via a process known as ‘magnetic braking’: in the early stages of the solar system, the sun’s magnetic field dragged ionized atoms outside of it (in the solar nebula), transferring energy that accelerated the atoms but slowed the sun’s rotation.” But there is no evidence of this phenomenon occurring today. Why ask why?

According to the Law of Conservation of Angular Momentum, when a spinning object breaks apart in a frictionless environment, all the fragments will spin in the same direction. However, Venus and Uranus spin backwards from all the other planets, and Uranus actually spins on its side, like a wheel. Again, if we are to believe the naturalists, the orbit of each of the solar systems 63 (largest) moons should lie in the equatorial plane of the planet that it orbits, but many, including the earth’s moon, are in highly inclined orbits. Six of the moons rotate backwards. Jupiter, Saturn, and Neptune all have moons orbiting in both directions. Evolutionists are prone to say planets and moons were created by objects colliding, but these numerous collisions would be largely self-canceling, producing planets for the most part without any spin at all.

The intense wind of the young sun (far more intense than the solar wind at present) would have driven excess gas and dust out of the still-forming solar system, including what gas the evolutionists claim pulled together into the large gas planets (Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Neptune) during the “T-Tauri Phase”. Furthermore, the sun, acting like a giant vacuum cleaner, sweeps up close to 100,000 tons of inflow per day. The sun’s radiation pressure also serves to push small, interplanetary dust particles outward into space – a phenomenon known as the Poynting-Robertson Effect. If the solar system is truly billions of years old, and if naturalism is true, then the solar system should have been swept clean by now, but tons of space dust remains.

The sun’s diameter is shrinking at the rate of five feet per hour. At this rate, life could not have existed on the earth 100,000 years ago; 4.57 billion years ago, the sun would have vaporized the earth. Even if the sun was enlarging once (as some evolutionists postulate), 3 billion years ago it would have been too small to heat earth at all and life could not have accidentally arisen. In

addition, the earth’s spin rate is slowing a fraction of a second every year, which means that, if the earth were billions of years old, the centrifugal force would have deformed earth’s contour very noticeably.

Over the past 150 years, careful measurements by scientists have shown that the earth’s magnetic field decreases by half every 1,400 years. At this rate, 10,000 to 12,000 years ago the earth’s magnetism would have equaled that of a magnetic star, totally incapable of supporting any life on it, even the simplest. Also, if electric currents in the earth’s core are responsible for the earth’s magnetism, the heat generated by these currents some 20,000 years ago would have dissolved our planet.

#### THE MOON

How life on earth could have survived without the moon and how the moon could have arrived just the right distance away is another problem. Darwin’s son George proposed that the earth spun so fast a chunk broke off (Fission Theory); but the earth could never have spun fast enough to throw a moon into orbit and the escaping moon would have been shattered while within the Roche limit (11,500 miles). In the Capture Theory, the moon happened to be attracted to the earth perfectly while it was wandering through the solar system, but passing that close is unlikely; the moon would have more likely been slingshotted like artificial satellites than captured; even a successful capture would have resulted in an elongated, comet-like orbit. The Condensation Theory says the moon grew out of a dust cloud within earth’s gravity field, but no such cloud could have been dense enough and besides moon rocks don’t contain enough iron for that to be true. Therefore, the currently fashionable idea is the Impact Theory – that the moon is material blasted off earth by another object impacting – but the other object would have had to have been twice as massive as Mars and there would have been an excess of angular momentum left over. Oddly, earth’s moon is almost exactly the same size as the sun in earth’s sky and it rotates at right angles with the earth so the same side is always facing us. Yet evolutionists claim it arrived in orbit by accident.

#### THE BIG BANG

The Big Bang, as taught by evolutionists, was supposed to have happened 16 to 20 billion years ago. All the matter and energy in the universe was drawn into a ball the size of a proton, energy spinning rapidly – violating the conservation of matter and energy. Eventually this exploded, hurling out particles that would obey the laws of gravity, centrifugal force, inertia, and so forth. Evolutionists sometimes say, “The universe breaks down at a singularity”, but where did this original mass come from? It violates the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics, and physics does not confer the title “Law” unless an inviolable

concept is at stake. It is absurd for scientists to twist these laws, thereby rejecting the existence of our Creator. Only by adding energy and information to an existing early universe could one expect nature to initiate an evolving universe. The evidence just does not exist to support this ludicrous idea. The universe is known to be “running down”, yet evolutionary theory postulates that it is “building up”. Experience teaches us that things left untouched become less orderly over time and more chaotic.

## STARS & GALAXIES

According to the “nebular hypothesis”, stars condensed from vast clouds of gas, but these clouds would need a push-start, such as (in particular) the shockwave from another star exploding – a chicken-and-egg problem – furthermore, the heavier elements necessary require pre-existing stars. A star cluster contains hundreds or thousands of stars moving, as one author put it, “like a swarm of bees.” These heavenly bodies are held together by gravity. But in some clusters, the stars are moving so fast that they could not have held together for millions or billions of years, but rather thousands only.

The rotation of spiral galaxies, over the course of billions of years, would erase their spiral shape. Since they obviously retain this shape, they must only be thousands of years old. Dr. James Trefil, professor of physics at Mason University in Virginia accepts the “Big Bang” model, but admits, “There shouldn’t be galaxies out there at all and even if there are galaxies they shouldn’t be lumped together the way they are.... one of the thorniest [problems] in cosmology.”

When big stars run out of gas, they explode in supernovas, so bright that they briefly outshine most of the galaxy, and the remnants keep expanding for hundreds of thousands of years (according to physics equations). A certain number of these “supernova remnants” are visible from earth. According to the evolutionist model, for galaxies our size there should be approximately 7,250 supernova remnants visible. Using the creationist age of the galaxy, one would expect 125 to 200 of such remnants. The actual number of super nova remnants visible from earth is 205, not thousands. In addition, there aren’t any Stage-3 SNR’s, indicating that the galaxies have not been around long enough for wider expansion.

Astronomers James Gunn and Allen Sandage made separate but almost identical discoveries: the light from distant galaxies has shifted toward the red end of the spectrum, meaning that they are not slowing down but accelerating; and so, the universe, it appears, will not collapse on itself again (as in a vacuum) repeating the process throughout eternity. James Gunn said, “This expansion is such a strange conclusion, that one’s first assumption is that it cannot really be true, and yet, it is the premier fact.” While evolutionists state that it takes at least 100,000 years for a star to

“evolve” from a red giant to a white dwarf, Egyptian hieroglyphs (circa 2,000 B.C.) describe Sirius as red; so did Cicero (in 50 B.C.), Seneca (in the First Century), and Ptolemy (in 150 A.D.); today, Sirius has become a white dwarf.

## FOSSILS

Charles Darwin stated in his book “Origin of Species” that “The geological record is extremely imperfect and this fact will to a large extent explain why we do not find intermediate varieties, connecting together all the extinct and existing forms of life by the finest graduated steps. He who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record, will rightly reject my whole theory.” Now, 130 years and billions of fossils later, we can rightly reject the view of an incomplete fossil record or of one “connecting together all... forms of life by the finest graduated steps.” It’s false.

A pair of cowboy boots was recently found in Texas, with the bones inside completely fossilized. Yet the leather was hardly decomposed and the stitching is even visible. These boots seem about 150 years old, indicating that things can fossilize quickly. Also, Ken Ham of Australia also has in his overlay presentation a photograph of a fossilized miner’s hat, about 50 years old, found in New Zealand. Other examples include a petrified waterwheel, chopped wood in Arizona’s Petrified Forest, and upside-down trees going through several soil layers, including coal. Glen French has many petrified logs cut in the 1930’s near his home, with chainsaw marks visible on the ends. The sole of a shoe was found in a lump of coal in Nevada, allegedly 213 to 248 million years old. All that is necessary for fossilization is quick burial and the right conditions, not thousands of years.

Seeing the problem of gradual evolution in contrast to the fossil record and the obvious abrupt appearances of species, Dr. Stephen Jay Gould and Dr. Niles Eldredge formed the theory of punctuated equilibria. Punctuated equilibria is, by example, a bird giving birth to a mammal, thus leaving no transitional fossils within the geological record. Many top evolutionists disagree with this strange theory. And punctuated equilibria has its problems, too. For instance, in the above case (of a bird bearing a mammal), another mammal of the same kind but of the opposite sex must be born at the same approximate time in the same area in order for the new species to continue. The odds of just one organism appearing this way, let alone two fulfilling the circumstances required, are beyond astronomical.

Careful observation reveals that most animals have remained practically the same, despite millions of years of time for them to evolve. Many fossils from older rocks, when compared to their modern counterparts, are identical in form. Not even one change of a species into another has ever

been recorded, yet evolution is upheld in most intellectual circles as fact.

## TOO MANY FOSSILS

The fact that there are so many fossils is another problem for evolutionists, who repeat that all these things happened over millions of years. We don’t see this happening today. Millions of bison were killed in North America in the last century but very few are fossilized. Meanwhile, great dinosaur beds have been excavated in New Mexico, Alberta, Tanzania, and Belgium. There are great hippopotamus beds in Sicily, amphibian beds in Texas, and mastodon fossils in Florida. This is more evidence for a world-wide flood in which billions of animals were killed by rushing water and buried by a tidal wave of sediment. In fact, for an animal to be fossilized, it has to be buried quickly (usually alive) to prevent scavengers and bacteria from destroying the carcass. The vast fossil graveyards throughout the world are evidence of one great catastrophe, rather than a scattering of local catastrophes. Beds have been found containing marine fossils by the thousands to billions, extending for miles in places such as Scotland, New York, California, Mount Ararat in Turkey, and other places. Ken Carpenter of the Denver Natural History Museum argues that some fish don’t float when they die (to rot or be eaten by scavengers); that scales and fins and such can be preserved for long periods of time. If, for example, a dead fish floats to the bottom of a basin, which would have very low oxygen levels, decay would be almost non-existent. Then the fish would be slowly buried by clay and other particles that fell to the bottom. But there are Ichthyosaurs fossilized in the process of giving birth, fossilized jellyfish, fish several feet long fossilized as if snapped frozen all at once, and numerous fish almost perfectly preserved.

It is remarkably suspicious that NASA scientists state they believe “catastrophic floods” formed many of the geological features on Mars, a planet without a drop of water on it; meanwhile, they reject the idea of a global flood on earth, which is abundant with water that covers 70% of the planet’s surface. What this reveals is an anti-God bias amongst evolutionists. If the Bible didn’t speak of a global flood then they might have no problem with it. In fact, the earth has so much water on it that, if the entire surface was leveled out to a common elevation, the water would cover the whole surface to a depth of 1 ½ miles.

Fossils found in diverse places pose a great problem for evolutionists. According to the Bible, the climate of earth used to be the same all over (vegetation “was upon the face of all the earth” – Genesis 1:29). However, this is not true today and presents an interesting dilemma for evolutionists. There are thousands of fossils of camels, horses, and rhinos found in permafrost regions, such as Siberia and Alaska. There are also

the great elephant ("mammoth") beds located in these areas. Some of those mammoths have been excavated with flesh and stomach contents still intact. Lush and verdant valleys would have been required to provide the 400 pounds of food for a mammoth to eat each day. This gives more evidence that the earth (at one time) was subject to a uniform climate (the same everywhere) and, if the earth climate really was uniform, this sheds more light on a possible "catastrophic event" that triggered dramatic changes in the climate all over the globe.

#### DATING METHODS

The main radiometric dating methods used for determining the age of fossils – potassium-argon ("K-Ar") and carbon-14 – are notoriously unreliable. Carbon-14 dating is usually sound within a few hundred years span of time. But there are exceptions to this. For example, a living mollusk was dated using the carbon-14 method; readings said it had been dead for 3,000 years. Lava rocks from a volcano in Hawaii which erupted in 1801 were tested, using the potassium-argon method. Those readings showed the lava to be nearly 3 billion years old. Moon rocks were tested by various radiometric methods, yielding dates ranging from 700 million to 28 billion years.

Radiometric dating methods such as potassium-argon, uranium-lead, and rubidium-strontium, are also based on assumptions. These methods depend upon chemical change (uranium to lead, etc.) where the parent material (i.e. uranium) is converted to the daughter material (i.e. lead) at a known rate, called a "half-life". They cannot be trusted, on the basis that too little is known. In order to come up with a correct date, you must know: 1) How much of the parent material was in it at the start; 2) How much of the daughter material was in it at the start; and 3) If there has been some type of contamination since. In obtaining dates now, scientists assume the answers to these questions or ignore them all together. The fact is that we cannot know how old a specimen is unless we were there when it was formed. Furthermore, the production rate of carbon-14 in the atmosphere exceeds the decay rate by about 30%. If the atmosphere really were old, by now, these two rates would be in equilibrium. Thus, the disparity in the two rates confirms a young atmosphere. When non-equilibrium datum is used instead of the unwarranted evolutionary assumption – equilibrium – computed dates of all the organic materials fall within 10,000 years, like the Bible says.

The two methods (carbon-14 and potassium-argon) also contradict each other. Andrew Snelling in Australia performed both the carbon-14 and the K-Ar dating methods on some wood buried by a basalt lava flow. According to the carbon-14 test, the wood was 45,000 years old; according to K-Ar, it was 45 million years old! If these methods were truly reliable, they

would be somewhere near each other whenever both are applied to the same item.

Numerous examples show that carbon dating even of itself is inconsistent: 1) part of a Vollosovitch mammoth carbon-dated at 29,500 years old with another part dated at 44,000 years; 2) part of frozen baby Dima mammoth dated at 40,000 years old with another part dated at 26,000 years, the wood immediately dated around the carcass at 9-10,000 years; 3) the lower leg of the Fairbanks Creek Mammoth dated at 15,380 years with its skin and flesh at dated 21,300.

There was the K-Ar test on a dacite lava dome at Mount Saint Helens, known to have formed in 1986. However, the dating method instead gave an age of 300,000 to 400,000 years old. Also emblematic is the dating of andesite lava flows in New Zealand from Mount Ngauruhoe. There were five lava flows: one occurred in 1975, one in 1949, and three in 1954. The dates given from the K-Ar method ranged from less than 0.27 to 3.5 million years. If the potassium-argon method is so far off when evaluating rocks of known ages, how can we trust it to date items of unknown ages?

#### PARACONFORMITY / GEOLOGIC TABLE

Naturalist geologists believe the earth's rocks were laid down in a uniform manner over billions of years. The geologic table is supposed to show that rocks are in a sequential layer from pre-Cambrian upward to the earth's crust. However, no place on earth has this sequential pattern from "oldest" to "youngest". Still, evolutionary geologists contend that rocks were laid down in a uniform, predictable manner over billions of years. These scientists label and date these rock layers with familiar names such as Jurassic and pre-Cambrian. The term "paraconformity" describes those rock formations that are missing certain layers which "science" predicted but are missing.

Lots of "gaps" appear in the geologic table – one layer of rock on top of another with space missing in between (sometimes 100's of millions of years). Typically, there is no visible gullying or weathering in these examples, unlike what we see when the ground has really been exposed for long periods. At several places in the Baltic region, clays of the so-called Pleistocene age rest directly on clays that contain Cambrian age fossils, creating an evolutionary gap of 400 million years. Yet, in the same region, the difference between layers can hardly be located, so similar the two clays.

The lack of extensive soil layers in the fossil record is a huge concern for evolutionists. With layers of earth exposed for millions of years, one should expect to find numerous soil layers. Even in extreme desert environments, these should build up after eons of time. Yet the fossil record holds very little evidence of any build-up. Creationism predicts that only certain selected areas on earth would present soil layers; that's because it's what one would

expect after a worldwide flood; it's also exactly what studying the earth reveals.

Around the world, there are rock layers out of the sequence that evolution expects. In Glacier National Park, for example, a block of pre-Cambrian rock sits on top of Cretaceous-period "newer" rock – 1 billion year-old rock supposedly on top of 100 million year old rock! Geologists looking for signs of movement such as scrape marks or tallis piles find none. Additionally, the tensile strength of the rock makes it highly unlikely that the older block of rock moved across the newer without shattering to dust. Also, in Alberta there is a piece of pre-Cambrian rock 350 miles long by 15 miles wide by 7 miles deep. How did it get to the top if it's one of the oldest? Any scientist will tell you it's impossible to move something of this mass through the earth. Also, there are no upward thrust marks on this rock. In conclusion, there is no geologic table – just a tool for "duping" innocents.

#### PETRIFIED PLANTS

Petrified logs represent something of an enigma for evolutionists. These logs point to a rapid, catastrophic event, such as a massive worldwide flood, rather than a slow burial. These trees all have their branches stripped off; yet their bark is intact. This would indicate a very different method for deposition than we currently find in forests; and it speaks to an event of enormous power. Polystratic trees are fossil trees that extend through several layers ("many strata") of rock, often penetrating 20 feet deep. According to evolutionists, a 20-foot deposit of rock would take place slowly and uniformly, over a great many years – maybe 40 million. Trees petrified most likely would not be buried almost perfectly straight up and down. However, these trees were buried rapidly, from top to bottom. Otherwise, the top of the trunks would have decayed well before new rock layers had a chance to surround them. One example of polystratic trees can be seen at Spirit Lake in Washington State. In 1980, the observable (and recorded) catastrophic events at Mount Saint Helens buried thousands of trees rapidly in mudslides; many upright.

Sometimes evolutionists try to explain polystratic evidence as a reburial event, but this can hardly be the case when the rock layers are situated directly against the trunk of the tree. Polystratic plants (in general) are fossilized plants extending through several layers of rock representing many, many years of deposition – according to evolutionists – and a plethora of examples has been found. An amazing specimen found in Texas is a club moss extending 120 feet through several different rock layers, representing 300 to 400 million years in the evolutionary model. Evolutionists have often passed this off as another reburial event, but such can hardly be the case because the rock layers come right up against the trunk of the tree. While evolutionists may point to the

coal and peat deposits in Nova Scotia, these examples are no more than 5 feet tall and in a moderately young layer of rock. Creationists point to petrified, polystratic plants as evidence for a worldwide flood.

## OIL & COAL

One of the biggest enigmas for evolutionists is that there are massive coal beds in Antarctica, being the remains of fossilized plants matter which had accumulated into the spongy layers of peat. When peat is heated to 150° Celsius and a moderate amount of pressure is added, coal is formed. Today, Antarctica's climate doesn't support any plant life whatsoever; this further proves that there was a massive climactic change at some time in earth's history.

While evolutionists believe coal was formed over millions of years, as plant matter accumulated in vast "coal swamps"; the Mount Saint Helens eruption created spongy layers of peat in Spirit Lake over the course of only a few months. Floating logs rubbed together, stripping off the bark and leaves which then fell to the lake floor; and this should only take moderate pressure and heat to form coal, just as probably happened in Antarctica not all that long ago. In fact, current oil fields are under too much pressure for them to be very old, because our best science estimates the longest time a rock layer could keep oil under pressure is 100,000 years (not millions). By this time table, our oil is only 10,000 years old at most; not millions as evolutionists claim.

Furthermore, when the carbon-14 test was first created, scientists used it to date all sorts of things. Tests of fossil fuels revealed they were just several thousand years old, instead of millions as predicted by evolution. After such early dates were found, scientists stopped using the carbon-14 method to date oil and coal, because it threw their worldview a whack. Today, oil can be made in a few minutes in a lab and black coal can also be formed at an astonishing rate. Isn't it intellectually unsound for scientists to reject a process that fails to yield the results their spirituality demands?

## PERMANENCE OF KINDS

If life has always been in a continual stream of transmutation from one species to another, as evolutionists insist, then we would expect to find many intermediate fossils for each advancement from one species to the next. Yet we do not find any transitional species at all. Instead of finding fish growing limbs and reptiles sprouting wings in the fossil record, what we actually see are gaping holes. Creationists continually ask evolutionists to explain the following gaps; non-living matter to protozoan, protozoan to metazoans, metazoans to invertebrates, invertebrates to fish, fish to amphibians, amphibians to reptiles, reptiles to birds, reptiles to fur-bearing quadrupeds, quadrupeds to apes, and apes to man. Transitional fossils simply don't exist.

Furthermore, "permanence of kinds" or "stasis" is a field of observation which has determined most animals have remained relatively unchanged throughout the fossil record. Despite supposedly millions of years and billions of chances to evolve into higher life forms, many fossils from "older" rocks, when compared to their modern counterparts, are identical in form. Worms still look like worms, not some hybrid creatures. Not one change of one life form into another has ever been recorded, yet evolution is somehow still regarded as fact.

Evolutionism relies heavily on mutations during cell reproduction; supposedly gamma rays caused the cells to make trillions of mistakes and eventually we arrived, simply as the product. While mutations are an undisputed fact, they only bring about small changes. Most mutations are harmful; they are neutral at best; and they are just a scrambling of information that pre-existed, not new genetic information developing (which is what evolutionists need). A five-legged cow or a two-headed turtle might be born, but this is simply from genetic information having been put in the wrong place.

Texas A&M microbiologist Dr Barton has recently shown there are structures within the DNA code itself which protect against copying errors, meaning that the system of each life-form was fully functional at the beginning. In a letter to Luther Sunderland, Dr. Colin Patterson, of the British Museum of Natural History, wrote: "I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them. You suggest that an artist should be used to visualize such transformations, but where would he get the information from? I could not, honestly, provide it, and if I were to leave it to artistic license, would that not mislead the reader?" Here is a man sitting amidst one of the greatest fossil collections ever and he knows of absolutely zero transitional fossils. This quote summarizes discussions about fossil evidence in our day.

## FOSSIL HORSES

However, the fossil horse series is still taught to schoolchildren as proof of evolution. There are at least four problems with this series: 1) A complete series of these horses in the correct order has never been found in any rock anywhere in the world; 2) The sequence of small toes to big-toed horses does not exist in the fossil record; 3) All of the "fossil horse" teeth found have been either of the grazing type or of the browsing type; there are no transitional types of teeth; and 4) Two modern horses have been found in the fossil record at the same level as the earliest types. Horse evolution is now a debunked theory.

## THE ARCHAEOPTERYX

Evolutionists have tried to build up Caudipteryx Zouii, and Protarchaeopteryx

Robusta as reptile-to-bird transitional species. Another famous one was Sinosauropteryx Prima, which they believed was a feathered dinosaur firmly on its way to becoming a bird; but a Yale paleontologist discovered its "feathers" were really nothing more than a parallel array of fibers, probably collagen. Archaeopteryx, too, was originally thought of as a transitional fossil between the reptiles and birds. It is now considered by most evolutionists to be a true bird. Furthermore, true birds have definitely been found lower in the fossil record, seemingly older than Archaeopteryx. Evolutionists have stated that Archaeopteryx had scales, but this is a complete falsehood, because all Archaeopteryx fossils have evidenced that it had feathers and not scales. The only time evolutionists have really seen scales on a birdlike reptile is in artists' renditions, which have been used in this way since the first false "transitional".

Francis Hitching, an evolutionist, has made some key statements attempting to show that Archaeopteryx is a transitional life-form; all of these are demonstrably hollow. Hitching says Archaeopteryx had a long bony tail, like a reptile's. However, in the embryonic stage, some living birds have more tail vertebrae than Archaeopteryx did. They later fuse to become an upstanding bone called the pygostyle. The tail bone and feather arrangement on swans are very similar to those of Archaeopteryx. Hitching says Archaeopteryx had claws on its feet and on its feathered forelimbs. However, many living birds such as the hoatzin in South America, the touraco in Africa, and the ostrich also have claws; in all, nine families of birds have claws on the wings. Hitching says Archaeopteryx had teeth. However, while modern birds do not have teeth, many ancient (Mesozoic) birds did. The teeth do not show the connection of Archaeopteryx with any other animal, because every subclass of vertebrates has some with teeth and some without. Hitching says Archaeopteryx had a shallow breastbone. However, various modern flying birds such as the hoatzin have similarly shallow breastbones, and this does not disqualify them from being classified as birds. And there are, of course, many species of non-flying birds, both living and extinct.

Recent examination of Archaeopteryx feathers has shown they are the same as the feathers of modern birds that are excellent fliers. Even evolutionist Dr. John Ostrom says that there is no question they are the same as modern birds' feathers. They are asymmetrical, with a center shaft and parallel barbs like those of today's flying birds. Hitching says that the bones of Archaeopteryx were solid, not hollow like a bird. However, the long bones of Archaeopteryx are now known to have been hollow. Hitching says that Archaeopteryx predates the general arrival of birds by millions of years. However, recent paleontological discoveries

disprove this. In 1977, a geologist from Brigham Young University, James Jensen, discovered in the Dry Mesa quarry of the Morrison formation in western Colorado a fossil in Lower Jurassic rock; it was unquestionably that of a bird. This particular deposit is dated as 60 million years older than the Upper Jurassic rock in which Archaeopteryx had been found. Jensen first found the rear-leg femur and, later, the remainder of the skeleton. When this was reported, Professor Ostrom commented, "It is obvious we must now look for the ancestors of flying birds in a period of time much older than that in which Archaeopteryx lived."

And so it goes with the fossil that many textbooks set forth as the best example of a transitional form. What the evolutionists don't tell you about Archaeopteryx is that it had fully-formed flying feathers, the classical elliptical wings of modern woodland birds; its brain was that of a flying bird with a large cerebellum and visual cortex; both its maxilla (upper jaw) and mandible (lower jaw) moved. In most vertebrates, including reptiles, only the mandible moves. There are also stark differences between reptile and bird lungs. The reptilian lung brings air into tiny air sacs called alveoli where blood extracts the oxygen and releases carbon dioxide out the same way it entered. Birds have a complicated system of air sacs even involving hollow bones. This system keeps air flowing in one direction through tubes in the lung (called "parabronchi") and blood moves through the lung's blood vessels in the opposite direction for efficient oxygen uptake. The avian (birds') lung is super-efficient and only advantageous at high altitudes. A reptilian lung could not "evolve" into a bird lung step-by-step through a "functional intermediate", because such a thing (if it did exist) would be unable to breathe at all.

Furthermore, it would be illogical for the short forelimbs on a dinosaur to have graduated into wings. In proportion to dinosaurs, forelimbs are a very small percentage of body mass; but in proportion to a bird, wings are a very large portion. Thus, the hypothetical animal would have had lousy forelimbs before it had good wings and probably couldn't have flown or caught anything to eat, not to mention being unable to defend itself from predators. In his book *Climbing Mt. Improbable*, renowned atheist Richard Dawkins wrote that, "Feathers are modified reptilian scales"; however, a scale is just a fold in the skin while a feather originates from follicles inside the skin, just like hair would. It would take a mountain of genetic information for evolution to convert a scale into a feather. Still, evolutionists believe that dinosaurs attained feathers for insulation and later "adapted" them for flight. But natural selection would not be likely to drive such a change away from such great heat insulators. The feathers of flying birds have numerous, tiny hooklets

and grooves; however, birds that don't fly (such as ostriches) have feathers without the aerodynamic shape of hooklets and grooves; they are more like insulators. Again, there's no logic to the idea dinosaurs would attain feathers for insulation, adapt them for flight, and re-adapt them back to being insulators. Rather, natural selection would preserve the insulating capacity of feathers and most likely not evolve aerodynamic ones. Furthermore, new research shows that birds lack the embryonic thumb which dinosaurs had, suggesting that it is almost impossible for the species to be closely related.

#### REPTILES TO MAMMALS?

Many reptiles somewhat resembling mammals are supposedly transitional; but this would mean drastic changes, because reptiles are cold-blooded while mammals are warm-blooded, with a constant body temperature regulated by a complex control system. Mammals also have two extra layers of skin, hair, and sweat glands – all of which reptiles lack. The reptilian heart has three chambers and two aortas, which somehow evolutionists believe evolved into four chambers and one aorta. A staggering difference in bodily chemistry also separates mammals from reptiles, because mammalian kidneys excrete urea while reptilian kidneys excrete uric acid. A complex endocrine system is required so that mammalian kidneys can regulate constant levels of certain substances in their blood. Finally, mammals produce milk to nurse their young while reptiles don't. Creationists explain simply that God designed these systems.

#### AMPHIBIANS TO REPTILES?

Evolutionists also claim that amphibians evolved into reptiles. Seymouria is commonly touted as an "intermediate" species between the two kinds of animals and is supposedly around 280 million years old – which is actually 30 million years younger than the earliest bona-fide reptiles – Hylonomus and Paleothyris. Still, how could the transformation from amphibian eggs to reptilian eggs occur? In amphibians, urea is excreted; in reptiles, it's water-insoluble uric acid. Between the two kinds of animals, urea would have poisoned all embryos. A step further, as reptiles evolved on to mammals, the urea would have had to have changed back to uric acid. Certain creationists will tell you any "god" who would cause such chemical changes of urea to uric acid and back again to urea is either an idiot or a monster; God did not use the evolutionary process to create life on earth.

#### MAMMALS TO WHALES?

Evolutionists who say land mammals evolved into whales (via Basilosaurus) don't mention the vast quantity of genetic information that theoretically would be required. They also fail to mention that Ambulocetus was 10 times smaller than Basilosaurus, but these species are drawn the same size. In

fact, Basilosaurus was fully aquatic and not transitional whatsoever. The jump from a land-dweller to this, without any intermediate stages, is irrational. Since they have no intermediate fossils, evolutionists rely on renditions of imaginative artistry and the best fossil evidence they can produce for the transition is usually skull fragments and teeth (but not leg bones). The November 1980 issue of "Science Digest" depicts a whale with legs coming out of the sea. Pakicetus is also, supposedly, a transitional species between mammals and whales, but the book *Teaching About Evolution* doesn't mention this animal, meaning the authors must not consider it good evidence.

#### APES TO HUMANS?

The biggest myth in evolution is certainly the transition from apes to humans, a myth based on similarities which actually reveal nothing other than a common designer. Some contend that apes and humans both have two arms and two legs, but apes have four legs and walk on their knuckles. Others point to the fact that there is a 98.4% similarity in genetic makeup. It should also be noted that chimpanzees have 48 chromosomes; humans have only 46; and the DNA molecules of a chromosome are some of the most complex things in the entire universe. Yet evolution is supposed to be about increasing complexity, so a chimp should be inferior in such ways to a human if we evolved from them. Dr. Barney Maddox discovered that the 1.6% difference between the genomes of a chimp and a human consist of 48 million nucleotides. Moreover, Dr. Maddox discovered that combining any 3 of the 48 million in succession proves lethal to the host organism, making it biophysically impossible for an ape to graduate into being human. (Actually it's completely against both our genetic coding and theirs.)

#### PREHISTORIC FORGERIES

When Neanderthal Man (a prehistoric human) was first discovered, only part of an arm was recovered. Yet, the scientific community fabricated an entire ancient society around this bone. Scientists have since found the remains of quite a few Neanderthals and after careful study have concluded that these ancestors were regular humans with bone disease, probably rickets or some other form of Vitamin D deficiency such as arthritis. Neanderthal Man also had a brain case more than 13% larger than modern humans' – the opposite of evolution. Unfortunately, this rush to judgment is a consistent and disingenuous theme of the evolutionary (pseudo)science community.

For 50 years, Piltdown Man was thought to be an ancestor, but it turns out to actually be a composite – the jawbone of an orangutan (teeth filed down) and the skull of a small child, stained by the "discoverers" to gain recognition and promote evolution. Nebraska Man, one more fabrication, represented a whole society and lifestyle devel-

oped by evolutionists around the discovery of a single tooth, which proved to be that of an extinct pig. Java Man (from the island of Java) was found to actually be an orangutan; human skulls have recently been discovered in the same layer of rock. Peking Man came from a site in China, dubiously unobserved for over 50 years; all examples were reported to have the back of their skulls smashed in, as is done when people of that region hunt monkey brains. Modern human remains were found at the same site.

Homo Erectus was a forgery concocted by Eugene Dubois, who combined a skull fragment from a gibbon ape with a human leg bone that he found 50 feet away, via part of a human skull that he also found at the site. "Lucy" is yet another forgery – Australopithecus – with bones assembled from different locations – bones shown by spectrograph to match chimpanzees rather than humans. The Laetoli Footprints were found in the same strata as the Lucy bones; while they were made by animals like Lucy, supposedly; a podiatrist concluded the footprints were of regular humans, contemporaneous to Lucy. Furthermore, the fossilized remains of humans have been found lower in the geological table than dinosaurs, not just once but at least 28 times thus far.

#### POPULATION SEQUENCING

The population of humans on earth now grows at about 2% per year. Wars, disease, famines, and such have wiped out approximately 1/3 of the population every 82 years. Thus, the practicable application of growth rate throughout human history would be about half that number, and one can extrapolate backwards to see how long it would take to reach present-day numbers. But even using the conservative growth figure of 0.5% per year, earth's population would have been 8 people about 5,000 years ago. That squares nicely with the number of people the Bible says were on Noah's Ark (8, according to Genesis 6:18). However, applying the same small growth rate on the time scale of evolutionists runs into major difficulties. Starting with one "couple" just 41,000 years ago would give us a current population of "2" with 89 zeroes after it.

Furthermore, naturalists would have us believe that humans developed in a sequential order: Stone Age, Copper Age, Brass Age, Bronze, Iron, etc. But a quick look at the history of the Middle East and archaeology will show that the Israelites possessed iron when their neighbors had only developed to the point of brass. Furthermore, African natives in the 1950's and 1960's were still using tools of wood and stone (as were Native Americans in the 1800's). Today, there are still tribes in South America that use only wood and stone tools. Apart from technology, these are regular humans, not the "missing link" as thought by those evolutionists who decapitated Aborigines in Australia to display "Stone Age" technology users in American museums.

No verifiable record of human civilization is more than 5,000 years old, nor goes back more than 6,000 years. Civilization, like everything else, appears suddenly in the historical record. Robert Young's concordance (22<sup>nd</sup> edition) lists 37 ancient written accounts which all place the date for creation at no earlier than 7,000 B.C.

Mitochondrial DNA is passed only through the motherly lineage, and similarities of mitochondrial DNA indicate that all people are descended from a single human female, whom scientists have dubbed "Mitochondrial Eve". Current evidence about the mutation rate in mitochondrial DNA, if applied to Eve, indicates that she lived 6,000 to 6,500 years ago, which is consistent with the Biblical creation account.

#### LIVING FOSSILS

Leading evolutionist Dr. Ernst Mayr stated in a debate with creationist Dr. Duane Gish that if it could be proven humans and dinosaurs lived contemporaneously then the "theory" of evolution would have absolutely no basis in science. But in 1997 over 200 pounds of frozen, unfossilized dinosaur bones were found in Alaska, containing red blood cells, hemoglobin, and DNA. Research indicates these cells couldn't last more than 5,000 to 6,000 years even under the most ideal conditions.

Furthermore, evolutionists insist that dinosaurs died out millions of years before man appeared; but there are many reasons to not believe this. The Bible describes several dinosaurs in such detail that there can be no doubt they were around in antediluvian times and for a short time afterwards. If dinosaurs co-existed with man, then evolution is dead in the water. There are also the stories of animals much like dinosaurs in the legends of many lands (called "dragons"). Many times in the past several decades, explorers have recorded sightings of flying reptiles much like the pterodactyl.

Human footprints were found along with those of a dinosaur in limestone near the Paluxy River in Texas. As a matter of fact, there have been many excavations of man-made tools in rock layers supposedly over 100 million years old. In June of 1936, a man-made hammer was found in Cretaceous rock ("dated" 144 million years ago) near Enchanted Rock State Park, Texas; yet evolutionists claim humans only evolved 3 million years ago, and Cretaceous rock is where dinosaur remains are prevalently found. Later, in June of 1968, William Meister and his wife were hunting for trilobite fossils near Antelope Springs, Utah. Meister broke open a piece of shale only to find a human sandal print almost perfectly preserved; compressed in the heel of that human print was a type of trilobite, which shows the entire "evolutionary" (and geological) time frame neatly enclosed.

Also not to be tossed aside is the possibility of dinosaurs living today – perhaps not many, and perhaps not very large ones,

but alive nonetheless. Consider stories such as those of the Loch Ness monster (of which many convincing photographs have been taken). People have also claimed to see dinosaur-like creatures in isolated areas of the world. Recently, a Japanese fishing boat pulled up a carcass of a huge animal that intensely resembled a dinosaur. A group of scientists on an expedition into a jungle looking for dinosaur evidence claims that they witnessed one, but their camera was damaged. However, they tape-recorded the roar of the beast and this recording was checked. The voice patterns on it did not resemble those of any other known roaring.

At any rate, the evidence for man and dinosaur having lived together at one time poses another problem for the evolutionists. They say, "If the dinosaurs lived at the same time as man, they would have had to have been on the Ark, and that's impossible!" Not true. The ark was about 1 1/2 football fields long, 75 feet wide, and 45 feet tall – a volume of 1,518,750 cubic feet! Therefore, there would have been plenty of room on the Ark for the dinosaurs (especially considering that only a few were of enormous size such as the Tyrannosaurus and Brontosaurus). Also, the Bible states that Noah was to take two of every kind onto the Ark. Many dinosaurs and reptiles were of the same kind, but much smaller. Dinosaurs pose no problem for creation science.

Darwin realized that "living fossils", so ancient and unchanged, are not what evolutionists expect to find in nature. For example, the coelacanth fish was believed to be extinct until being rediscovered in 1938. As Niles Eldredge remarked, "In the context of Darwin's own founding conceptions, and certainly from the perspective of the modern synthesis, living fossils are something of an enigma, if not an embarrassment." Peter Ward terms living fossils "evolutionary curiosities, more embarrassments to the theory of evolution than anything else."

#### DNA EVIDENCE

Evolution is finished with the advance of DNA technology. Creationists argue that information is always made by some intelligent personal being. First, the person must originate the concept of the final product, the goal, or the outcome. Then, the person must, by reason, determine the materials, tools, and specific sequence of steps needed to achieve the goal. So information always comes from an intelligent process occurring within someone's mind. In the case of the genetic information system, it is very clear that this must be a mind of supreme intelligence and a person of awesome power.

Only 3% of human DNA appears to be code for how to build eyes, skin, hands, arms, legs, the heart, the liver, and so forth. Meanwhile, molecular biologists at Harvard Medical School and physicists at Boston University have done research indicating that so-called "junk" DNA is not junk at all. Their study of 37 DNA sequences contain-

ing 50,000 base pairs from a variety of organisms, showed that the “junk” DNA, amounting to 97% of the human genome, is actually written in a special language. Their tests revealed “language like properties” in the “junk” DNA, indicating it to be distinctly different from the “code” of the genes. It has been wondered just where in the genome are the instructions that tell the genes when to “express” and when not to – so you get fingernails on your fingers and not on your eyeballs, for example. It seems the “junk” DNA, now known to have its own programmed language, will turn out the place. Furthermore, the “junk” DNA seems to determine environmental factors, such as whether a colt will grow a slightly longer coat in the wintertime. This development re-envisioned the “junk”, which evolutionists have purported to be left over from eons of evolutionary trial and error, enormously strengthening the argument that God simply made the genetic code to begin with.

In addition, the “simple cell” of Darwin turns out to not really be so simple; rather, Eugene Koonin and others approximate that the minimum requirement for a living cell would be 256 genes. Such an organism could barely repair DNA damage, it could not fine-tune the performance of its remaining genes, and it would lack the ability to digest complex compounds, therefore needing a comprehensive supply of organic nutrients from its environment. The smallest known genome of all free-living organisms is that of the *Mycoplasma Genitalium*, which has 482 genes and 580 thousand base pairs. These genes are only functional in the presence of pre-existing transitioning and replicating machinery, such as a cell membrane; the species can only survive by parasitism; it is unable to manufacture its nutrients for itself. Even if *Mycoplasma Genitalium* could arise out of non-living matter, it would not survive, so evolutionist theory needs a more complex organism with even more genes and base pairs of information. Most living cells that (hypothetically) might come out of non-living material could not survive for very long.

#### THE ANTHROPIC PRINCIPLE

Researchers for the first time are measuring the far reaches of the cosmos, developing a list of indicators for whether a star system would support life. They have found that many physical characteristics must fit within very narrow ranges for any possibility of life to exist. These discoveries spawned the “Anthropic Principle” – the observation that all physical features of the universe (especially our solar system) are nearly perfect to suit the needs of life, particularly those of humanoids. In 1961, noted American physicist Robert Dicke noticed that life in the universe is possible only because of the special relationships existing among certain cosmological parameters (relationships researched by British physicist Paul Dirac 24 years earlier).

Stars of the right type for sustaining life supportable planets only can occur during a narrow range of ages for the universe, and limited values for the gravitational constant.

If the proton were more stable, there would be insufficient matter for life to be possible, deriving from the first split second of the universe existing; less, and protons decaying would deliver lethal doses of radiation to all large animals, even before they could “evolve”. The velocity of light can be expressed in a variety of ways as a function of any one of the fundamental forces of physics or as a function of one of the fine structure constants. Hence, in the case of this constant, too, the slightest change, up or down, would negate any possibility for life in the universe. Furthermore, our universe has a high degree of uniformity. Such uniformity is considered to have arisen from a brief period of inflationary pressure expansion near the time of universe’s origin. If some mechanism had not smoothed the universe to the degree we see, the universe would have developed into a lot bunch of black holes separated by virtually empty space. On the other hand, if the universe were smoothed beyond this degree then stars, star clusters, and galaxies might never have formed at all. Either way, the universe would be incapable of supporting life.

The billions of stars and the universe circulating in intricate precision through our sky indicate we were “designed” by God. This universe is infinitely complex. Earth, if it were much closer to the sun, would fry; much farther and it would freeze. The earth is the only planet in our solar system with a 23.5° tilt on its axis. If the tilt were greater, the middle regions would fry and the poles would accumulate huge masses of ice.

The earth is also the only planet with an abundance of water, the only element besides bismuth that is heavier at 4° Celsius than at freezing (0° Celsius). Otherwise, all the lakes, rivers, and such would freeze from the bottom up, killing all the fish. The moon is necessary too. The tides that the moon produces aerate the oceans, keep it clean, and supply oxygen for the plankton which is the foundation of that food chain.

No other atmosphere is like earth’s: 81% nitrogen, 18% oxygen, and 1% a dozen trace elements. No other atmosphere is even close to this, and the elements are not mixed chemically but rather are mechanically intermingled by the moon’s tidal effect upon the atmosphere. Humankind dumps an enormous amount of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere and it is absorbed into the ocean. If this were not so, the human race would cease to exist. At any given time, the earth’s surface is 50% covered by clouds, letting just the right amount of sunshine in. If earth had cloud cover several miles thick, like Venus’s, life would cease to exist here.

Nitrogen is amazing too. It is extremely inert; else we would all be poisoned by it. Because of its inertness, it is difficult

to get it to combine naturally with other things. But plants need it in the ground for their survival. How does God provide nitrogen for the plants? He does it through lightning. 100,000 lightning bolts strike earth daily, creating 100 million tons of useable nitrogen plant food in the soil each year.

In conclusion, it would appear that evolutionists have thrown all scientific caution to the wind. With today’s scientific advantages and advances we will see evolution falling farther by the wayside scientifically yet advanced as fact, philosophically, to our children. There is more than ample evidence for man’s sudden and abrupt appearance – Creation, if you will – and absolutely none for a long gradient process or evolution. One is easily established while the other is essentially sleight; thus, evolution is much more a “religious belief” than a scientific fact. It takes more faith to believe in evolution than it does creation.

Just consider these points and many others and you will see how, as Psalms 19:1 says, “The heavens are telling the glory of God; the firmament proclaims His handiwork.” Indeed, God has provided many amazing things that should let us know for a fact that He designed the universe. Just consider how complex and amazing this world of ours is. It is not the product of evolution or any other “chance” happenstance. You and everything else around you are precious, designed by God Almighty. †

---

#### THE PRAYER OF SAINT FRANCIS

Lord, make me into  
 A channel of Thy peace –  
 That, where there is hatred,  
 I may bring love;  
 That, where there is wrong,  
 I may bring the spirit of forgiveness;  
 That, where there is discord,  
 I may bring harmony;  
 That, where there is error,  
 I may bring truth;  
 That, where there is doubt,  
 I may bring faith;  
 That, where there is despair,  
 I may bring hope;  
 That, where there are shadows,  
 I may bring light;  
 That, where there is sadness,  
 I may bring joy.

Lord, grant that I may seek rather  
 To comfort than to be comforted,  
 To understand than to be understood,  
 And to love than to be loved.

For it is by self-forgetting  
 That one finds.  
 It is by forgiving  
 That one is forgiven.  
 And it is by dying  
 That one awakens  
 To Eternal Life.

AMEN.