

## **SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

**"The evolutionary establishment fears creation science because evolution itself crumbles when challenged by evidence. In the 1970s and 1980s, hundreds of public debates were arranged between evolutionary scientists and creation scientists. The latter scored resounding victories, with the result that, today, few evolutionists will debate. Isaac Asimov, Stephen Jay Gould, and the late Carl Sagan, while highly critical of creationism, all declined to debate."—James Perloff, *Tornado in a Junkyard* (1999), p. 241.**

**"It was because Darwinian theory broke man's link with God and set him adrift in a cosmos without purpose or end that its impact was so fundamental. No other intellectual revolution in modern times . . . so profoundly affected the way men viewed themselves and their place in the universe."—\*Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 67 [Australian molecular biologist].**

**"Unfortunately, in the field of evolution most explanations are not good. As a matter of fact, they hardly qualify as explanations at all; they are suggestions, hunches, pipe dreams, hardly worthy of being called hypotheses."—\*Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried* (1971), p. 147.**

**"No one has ever found an organism that is known not to have parents, or a parent. This is the strongest evidence on behalf of evolution."—\*Tom Bethell, "Agnostic Evolutionists," *Harper's*, February 1985, p. 61.**

**"As by this theory, innumerable transitional forms must have existed. Why do we not find them embedded in the crust of the earth? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of being, as we see them, well-defined species?"—\*Charles Darwin (1866), quoted in *H. Enoch, Evolution or Creation*, p. 139.**

**"Scientists have no proof that life was not the result of an act of creation."—\*Robert Jastrow, *The Enchanted Loom: Mind in the Universe* (1981), p. 19 [a leading astronomer].**

**"Evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to bend their observations to fit in with it."—\*H. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin* 31 (1980), p. 138.**

## ***Scientists Speak about Evolution***

***Top-flight scientists have something to tell you about evolution. Such statements will never be found in the popular magazines, alongside gorgeous paintings of ape-man and Big Bangs and solemn pronouncements about millions of years for this rock and that fish. Instead they are generally reserved only for professional books and journals.***

***Most scientists are working in very narrow fields; they do not see the overall picture, and assume, even though their field does not prove***

**evolution, that perhaps other areas of science probably vindicate it. They are well-meaning men. The biologists and geneticists know their facts, and research does not prove evolution, but assume that geology does. The geologists know their field does not prove evolution, but hope that the biologists and geneticists have proven it. Those who do know the facts, fear to disclose them to the general public, lest they be fired. But they do write articles in their own professional journals and books, condemning evolutionary theory.**

**Included below are a number of admissions by leading evolutionists of earlier decades, such as \*Charles Darwin, \*Austin Clark, or \*Fred Hoyle. The truth is that evolutionists cannot make scientific facts fit the theory.**

**An asterisk ( \* ) by a name indicates that person is NOT known to be a creationist. Of over 4,000 quotations in the set of books this site is based on, only 164 statements are by creationists.**

**"The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination."—\*Dr. Fleischman [Erlangen zoologist].**

**"It is almost invariably assumed that animals with bodies composed of a single cell represent the primitive animals from which all others derived. They are commonly supposed to have preceded all other animal types in their appearance. There is not the slightest basis for this assumption."—\*Austin Clark, *The New Evolution* (1930), pp. 235-236.**

**"The hypothesis that life has developed from inorganic matter is, at present, still an article of faith."—\*J.W.N. Sullivan, *The Limitations of Science* (1933), p. 95.**

**"Where are we when presented with the mystery of life? We find ourselves facing a granite wall which we have not even chipped . . . We know virtually nothing of growth, nothing of life."—\*W. Kaempffert, "The Greatest Mystery of All: The Secret of Life," *New York Times*.**

**"The theory of evolution is totally inadequate to explain the origin and manifestation of the inorganic world.' "—Sir John Ambrose Fleming, F.R.S., quoted in H. Enoch, *Evolution or Creation* (1966), p. 91 [discoverer of the thermionic valve].**

**"I think, however, that we must go further than this and admit that the only acceptable explanation is creation. I know that this is anathema to physicists, as indeed it is to me, but we must not reject a theory that we do not like if the experimental evidence supports it."—\*H. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin*, 31 (1980), p. 138.**

**"I am not satisfied that Darwin proved his point or that his influence in scientific and public thinking has been beneficial . . . the success of Darwinism was accomplished by a decline in scientific integrity."—\*W.R.**

**Thompson, Introduction to \*Charles Darwin's, Origin of the Species [Canadian scientist].**

**"One of the determining forces of scientism was a fantastic accidental imagination which could explain every irregularity in the solar system without explanation, leap the gaps in the atomic series without evidence [a gap required by the Big Bang theory], postulate the discovery of fossils which have never been discovered, and prophesy the success of breeding experiments which have never succeeded. Of this kind of science it might truly be said that it was `knowledge falsely so called.'"  
"—\*David C.C. Watson, *The Great Brain Robbery* (1976).**

**"The hold of the evolutionary paradigm [theoretical system] is so powerful that an idea which is more like a principle of medieval astrology than a serious twentieth century scientific theory has become a reality for evolutionary biologists."—\*Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 306 [Australian molecular biologist].**

**"The particular truth is simply that we have no reliable evidence as to the evolutionary sequence . . . One can find qualified professional arguments for any group being the descendant of almost any other."—J. Bonner, "Book Review," *American Scientist*, 49:1961, p. 240.**

**"It was because Darwinian theory broke man's link with God and set him adrift in a cosmos without purpose or end that its impact was so fundamental. No other intellectual revolution in modern times . . . so profoundly affected the way men viewed themselves and their place in the universe."—\*Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 67 [Australian molecular biologist].**

**"I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning, consequently assumed it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption . . . The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics; he is also concerned to prove there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do . . . For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom."—\*Aldous Huxley, "Confessions of a Professed Atheist," *Report: Perspective on the News*, Vol. 3, June 1966, p. 19 [grandson of evolutionist Thomas Huxley, Darwin's closest friend and promoter, and brother of evolutionist Julian Huxley. Aldous Huxley was one of the most influential liberal writers of the 20th century].**

**"Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless."—\*Bounoure, *Le***

**Monde Et La Vie (October 1963) [Director of Research at the National center of Scientific Research in France].**

**"As by this theory, innumerable transitional forms must have existed. Why do we not find them embedded in the crust of the earth? Why is not all nature in confusion [of halfway species] instead of being, as we see them, well-defined species?"—\*Charles Darwin, quoted in H. Enoch, *Evolution or Creation* (1966), p. 139.**

**"`Creation,' in the ordinary sense of the word, is perfectly conceivable. I find no difficulty in conceiving that, at some former period, this universe was not in existence; and that it made its appearance in six days . . . in consequence of the volition of some pre-existing Being."—\*Thomas Huxley, quoted in \*Leonard Huxley, *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley, Vol. II* (1903), p. 429.**

**"The theory of evolution suffers from grave defects, which are more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge."—\*Albert Fleishmann, *Zoologist*.**

**"I argue that the `theory of evolution' does not take predictions, so far as ecology is concerned, but is instead a logical formula which can be used only to classify empiricisms [theories] and to show the relationships which such a classification implies . . . these theories are actually tautologies and, as such, cannot make empirically testable predictions. They are not scientific theories at all."—\*R.H. Peters, "Tautology in Evolution and Ecology," *American Naturalist* (1976), Vol. 110, No. 1, p. 1 [emphasis his].**

**"Scientists have no proof that life was not the result of an act of creation."—\*Robert Jastrow, *The Enchanted Loom: Mind in the Universe* (1981), p. 19.**

**"In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to `bend' their observations to fit in with it."—\*H. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin*, 31 (1980), p. 138.**

**"When Darwin presented a paper [with Alfred Wallace] to the Linnean Society in 1858, a Professor Haugton of Dublin remarked, `All that was new was false, and what was true was old.' This, we think, will be the final verdict on the matter, the epitaph on Darwinism."—\*Fred Hoyle and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space* (1981), p. 159.**

**"Creation and evolution, between them, exhaust the possible explanations for the origin of living things. Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must**

*have been created by some omnipotent intelligence.*"—\*D.J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial* (1983), p. 197.

*"With the failure of these many efforts, science was left in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to postulate theories of living origins which it could not demonstrate. After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort, could not be proved to take place today had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past."*—\*Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, (1957), p. 199.

*"The over-riding supremacy of the myth has created a widespread illusion that the theory of evolution was all but proved one hundred years ago and that all subsequent biological research—paleontological, zoological, and in the newer branches of genetics and molecular biology—has provided ever-increasing evidence for Darwinian ideas."*—\*Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 327.

*"The irony is devastating. The main purpose of Darwinism was to drive every last trace of an incredible God from biology. But the theory replaces God with an even more incredible deity—omnipotent chance."*—\*T. Roszak, *Unfinished Animal* (1975), pp. 101-102.

*"Today our duty is to destroy the myth of evolution, considered as a simple, understood and explained phenomenon which keeps rapidly unfolding before us. Biologists must be encouraged to think about the weaknesses and extrapolations that the theoreticians put forward or lay down as established truths. The deceit is sometimes unconscious, but not always, since some people, owing to their sectarianism, purposely overlook reality and refuse to acknowledge the inadequacies and falsity of their beliefs."*—\*Pierre-Paul de Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms* (1977), p. 8.

*"The evolution theory can by no means be regarded as an innocuous natural philosophy, but that it is a serious obstruction to biological research. It obstructs—as has been repeatedly shown—the attainment of consistent results, even from uniform experimental material. For everything must ultimately be forced to fit this theory. An exact biology cannot, therefore, be built up."*—\*H. Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbuilding*, 1954, p. 11.

*"It is therefore of immediate concern to both biologists and layman that Darwinism is under attack. The theory of life that undermined nineteenth-century religion has virtually become a religion itself and, in its turn, is being threatened by fresh ideas. The attacks are certainly not limited to those of the creationists and religious fundamentalists who deny Darwinism for political and moral reason. The main thrust of the criticism comes from within science itself. The doubts about Darwinism represent a political revolt from within rather than a siege from*

**without."—\*B. Leith, *The Descent of Darwin: A Handbook of Doubts about Darwinism* (1982), p. 11.**

**"My attempts to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for more than 40 years have completely failed. At least I should hardly be accused of having started from any preconceived anti-evolutionary standpoint."—\*H. Nilsson, *Synthetic Speciation* (1953), p. 31.**

**"Just as pre-Darwinian biology was carried out by people whose faith was in the Creator and His plan, post-Darwinian biology is being carried out by people whose faith is in, almost, the deity of Darwin. They've seen their task as to elaborate his theory and to fill the gaps in it, to fill the trunk and twigs of the tree. But it seems to me that the theoretical framework has very little impact on the actual progress of the work in biological research. In a way some aspects of Darwinism and of neo-Darwinism seem to me to have held back the progress of science."—Colin Patterson, *The Listener* [senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, London].**

**"Throughout the past century there has always existed a significant minority of first-rate biologists who have never been able to bring themselves to accept the validity of Darwinian claims. In fact, the number of biologists who have expressed some degree of disillusionment is practically endless."—\*Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1986), p. 327.**

**"I personally hold the evolutionary position, but yet lament the fact that the majority of our Ph.D. graduates are frightfully ignorant of many of the serious problems of the evolution theory. These problems will not be solved unless we bring them to the attention of students. Most students assume evolution is proved, the missing link is found, and all we have left is a few rough edges to smooth out. Actually, quite the contrary is true; and many recent discoveries . . . have forced us to re-evaluate our basic assumptions."—\*Director of a large graduate program in biology, quoted in *Creation: The Cutting Edge* (1982), p. 26.**

**"The creation account in Genesis and the theory of evolution could not be reconciled. One must be right and the other wrong. The story of the fossils agreed with the account of Genesis. In the oldest rocks we did not find a series of fossils covering the gradual changes from the most primitive creatures to developed forms, but rather in the oldest rocks developed species suddenly appeared. Between every species there was a complete absence of intermediate fossils."—\*D.B. Gower, "Scientist Rejects Evolution," *Kentish Times*, England, December 11, 1975, p. 4 [biochemist].**

**"From the almost total absence of fossil evidence relative to the origin of the phyla, it follows that any explanation of the mechanism in the creative evolution of the fundamental structural plans is heavily burdened with hypothesis. This should appear as an epigraph to every**

**book on evolution. The lack of direct evidence leads to the formulation of pure conjecture as to the genesis of the phyla; we do not even have a basis to determine the extent to which these opinions are correct."**—**\*Pierre-Paul de Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms* (1977), p. 31.**

**"We still do not know the mechanics of evolution in spite of the over-confident claims in some quarters, nor are we likely to make further progress in this by the classical methods of paleontology or biology; and we shall certainly not advance matters by jumping up and down shrilling, `Darwin is god and I, So-and-so, am his prophet.'" —\*Errol White, *Proceedings of the Linnean Society, London*, 177:8 (1966).**

**"I feel that the effect of hypotheses of common ancestry in systematics has not been merely boring, not just a lack of knowledge; I think it has been positively anti-knowledge . . . Well, what about evolution? It certainly has the function of knowledge, but does it convey any? Well, we are back to the question I have been putting to people, `Is there one thing you can tell me about?' The absence of answers seems to suggest that it is true, evolution does not convey any knowledge."—\*Colin Patterson, *Director AMNH, Address at the American Museum of Natural History* (November 5, 1981).**

**"What is it [evolution] based upon? Upon nothing whatever but faith, upon belief in the reality of the unseen—belief in the fossils that cannot be produced, belief in the embryological experiments that refuse to come off. It is faith unjustified by works."—\*Arthur N. Field.**

There are scientists all over the world who know that evolutionary theory is bankrupt. Such men as \*Charles Darwin, \*Thomas and \*Julian Huxley, and \*Steven Jay Gould have admitted it. But you will not find these statements in the popular press. Such admissions are only made to fellow professionals.

An asterisk ( \* ) by a name indicates that person is not known to be a creationist.

**"Paleontologists [fossil experts] have paid an exorbitant price for Darwin's argument. We fancy ourselves as the only true students of life's history, yet to preserve our favored account of evolution by natural selection we view our data as so bad that we almost never see the very process we profess to study."—\*Steven Jay Gould, *The Panda's Thumb* (1982), pp. 181-182 [*Harvard professor and the leading evolutionary spokesman of the latter half of the twentieth century*].**

**"The problem of the origin of species has not advanced in the last 150 years. One hundred and fifty years have already passed during which it has been said that the evolution of the species is a fact but, without giving real proofs of it and without even a principle of explaining it. During the last one hundred and fifty years of research that has been carried out along this line [in order to prove the theory], there has been**

no discovery of anything. It is simply a repetition in different ways of what Darwin said in 1859. This lack of results is unforgivable in a day when molecular biology has really opened the veil covering the mystery of reproduction and heredity . .

"Finally, there is only one attitude which is possible as I have just shown: It consists in affirming that intelligence comes before life. Many people will say this is not science, it is philosophy. The only thing I am interested in is fact, and this conclusion comes out of an analysis and observation of the facts."—\*G. Salet, *Hasard et Certitude: Le Transformisme devant la Biologie Actuelle* (1973), p. 331.

"The theories of evolution, with which our studious youth have been deceived, constitute actually a dogma that all the world continues to teach; but each, in his specialty, the zoologist or the botanist, ascertains that none of the explanations furnished is adequate . . It results from this summary, that the theory of evolution is impossible."—\*P. Lemoine, "Introduction: De L' Evolution?" *Encyclopedie Francaise*, Vol. 5 (1937), p. 6.

"Darwinism is a creed not only with scientists committed to document the all-purpose role of natural selection. It is a creed with masses of people who have at best a vague notion of the mechanism of evolution as proposed by Darwin, let alone as further complicated by his successors. Clearly, the appeal cannot be that of a scientific truth but of a philosophical belief which is not difficult to identify. Darwinism is a belief in the meaninglessness of existence."—\*R. Kirk, "The Rediscovery of Creation," in *National Review*, (May 27, 1983), p. 641.

"I have always been slightly suspicious of the theory of evolution because of its ability to account for any property of living beings (the long neck of the giraffe, for example). I have therefore tried to see whether biological discoveries over the last thirty years or so fit in with Darwin's theory. I do not think that they do. To my mind, the theory does not stand up at all."—\*H. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physic Bulletin*, 31 (1980), p. 138.

"Evolution is baseless and quite incredible."—\*John Ambrose Fleming, President, *British Association for Advancement of Science*, in "The Unleashing of Evolutionary Thought."

"Unfortunately, in the field of evolution most explanations are not good. As a matter of fact, they hardly qualify as explanations at all; they are suggestions, hunches, pipe dreams, hardly worthy of being called hypotheses."—\*Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried* (1971), p. 147.

"It is not the duty of science to defend the theory of evolution, and stick by it to the bitter end—no matter which illogical and unsupported conclusions it offers. On the contrary, it is expected that scientists recognize the patently obvious impossibility of Darwin's



pronouncements and predictions . . . Let's cut the umbilical cord that tied us down to Darwin for such a long time. It is choking us and holding us back."—*I.L. Cohen, Darwin Was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities (1985).*

"This general tendency to eliminate, by means of unverifiable speculations, the limits of the categories Nature presents to us, is the inheritance of biology from *The Origin of Species*. To establish the continuity required by theory, historical arguments are invoked, even though historical evidence is lacking. Thus are engendered those fragile towers of hypothesis based on hypothesis, where fact and fiction intermingle in an inextricable confusion."—*W.R. Thompson, "Introduction," to Everyman's Library issue of Charles Darwin's, Origin of Species (1956 edition).*

"`Scientists who go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great con men, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution we do not have one iota of fact.' A tangled mishmash of guessing games and figure juggling [Tahmisian called it]."—*The Fresno Bee, August 20, 1959, p. 1-B [quoting T.N. Tahmisian, physiologist for the Atomic Energy Commission].*

"`The theory [of evolution] is a scientific mistake.' "—*Louis Agassiz, quoted in H. Enoch, Evolution or Creation, (1966), p. 139. [Agassiz was a Harvard University professor and the pioneer in glaciation.]*

"[In Darwin's writings] possibilities were assumed to add up to probability, and probabilities then were promoted to certitudes."—*Agassiz, op. cit., p. 335.*

"The origin of all diversity among living beings remains a mystery as totally unexplained as if the book of Mr. Darwin had never been written, for no theory unsupported by fact, however plausible it may appear, can be admitted in science."—*L. Agassiz on the Origin of Species, American Journal of Science, 30 (1860), p. 154. [Darwin's book was published in 1859.]*

"[Darwin could] summon up enough general, vague and conjectural reasons to account for this fact, and if these were not taken seriously, he could come up with a different, but equally general, vague and conjectural set of reasons."—*Gertrude Himmelfarb, Darwin and Darwinian Revolution (1968), p. 319.*

"Ultimately the Darwinian theory of evolution is no more nor less than the great cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century . . . the origin of life and of new beings on earth is still largely as enigmatic as when Darwin set sail on the [ship] *Beagle*."—*Michael Denton, Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (1986), p. 358.*

"It has been estimated that no fewer than 800 phrases in the subjunctive mood (such as `Let us assume,' or `We may well suppose,' etc.) are to

be found between the covers of Darwin's *Origin of Species* alone."—L. Merson Davies [*British scientist*], *Modern Science* (1953), p. 7.

"I can envision observations and experiments that would disprove any evolutionary theory I know."—\*Stephen Jay Gould, "Evolution as Fact and Theory," *Discover* 2(5):34-37 (1981).

"Unfortunately for Darwin's future reputation, his life was spent on the problem of evolution which is deductive by nature . . . It is absurd to expect that many facts will not always be irreconcilable with any theory of evolution and, today, every one of his theories is contradicted by facts."—\*P.T. Mora, *The Dogma of Evolution*, p. 194.

"Darwinism is a creed not only with scientists committed to document the all-purpose role of natural selection. It is a creed with masses of people who have, at best, a vague notion of the mechanism of evolution as proposed by Darwin, let alone as further complicated by his successors."—\*S. Jaki, *Cosmos and Creator* (1982).

"In essence, we contend that neo-Darwinism is a theory of differential survival and not one of origin . . .

"We are certainly not arguing here that differential survival of whole organisms does not occur. This must inevitably happen [i.e. some species become extinct]. The question that we must ask is, does this represent the controlling dynamic of organic evolution? Cannot a similar argument be equally well-constructed to 'explain' any frequency distribution? For example, consider rocks which vary in hardness and also persist through time. Clearly the harder rocks are better 'adapted' to survive harsh climatic conditions. As Lewontin points out, a similar story can be told about political parties, rumors, jokes, stars, and discarded soft drink containers."—\*A.J. Hughes and \*D. Lambert, "Functionalism, Structuralism, 'Ways of Seeing,'" *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 787 (1984), pp. 796-797.

"Biologists have indeed built their advances in evolutionary theory on the Darwinian foundation, not realizing that the foundation is about to topple because of Darwin's three mistakes.

"George Bernard Shaw wisecracked once that Darwin had the luck to please everybody who had an axe to grind. Well, I also have an axe to grind, but I am not pleased. We have suffered through two world wars and are threatened by an Armageddon. We have had enough of the Darwinian fallacy."—\*Kenneth Hsu, "Reply," *Geology*, 15 (1987), p. 177.

"Therefore, a grotesque account of a period some thousands of years ago is taken seriously though it be built by piling special assumptions on special assumptions, *ad hoc* hypothesis [invented for a purpose] on *ad hoc* hypothesis, and tearing apart the fabric of science whenever it appears convenient. The result is a fantasia which is neither history nor

science."—\*James Conant [chemist and former president, Harvard University], quoted in *Origins Research*, Vol. 5, No. 2, 1982, p. 2.

"It is inherent in any definition of science that statements that cannot be checked by observation are not really saying anything—or at least they are not science." —\*George G. Simpson, "The Nonprevalence of Humanoids," in *Science*, 143 (1964) p. 770.

"In accepting evolution as fact, how many biologists pause to reflect that science is built upon theories that have been proved by experiment to be correct or remember that the theory of animal evolution has never been thus approved."—\*L.H. Matthews, "Introduction," *Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin (1971 edition).

"Present-day ultra-Darwinism, which is so sure of itself, impresses incompletely informed biologists, misleads them, and inspires fallacious interpretations . .

"Through use and abuse of hidden postulates, of bold, often ill-founded extrapolations, a pseudoscience has been created. It is taking root in the very heart of biology and is leading astray many biochemists and biologists, who sincerely believe that the accuracy of fundamental concepts has been demonstrated, which is not the case."—\*Pierre P. de Grasse, *The Evolution of Living Organisms* (1977), p. 202.

"The over-riding supremacy of the myth [of evolution] has created a widespread illusion that the theory of evolution was all but proved one hundred years ago and that all subsequent biological research—paleontological, zoological and in the newer branches of genetics and molecular biology—has provided ever-increasing evidence for Darwinian ideas. Nothing could be further from the truth.

[In a letter to Asa Gray, a Harvard professor of biology, Darwin wrote:] "I am quite conscious that my speculations run quite beyond the bounds of true science."—\*Charles Darwin, quoted in \*N.C. Gillespie, *Charles Darwin and the Problem of Creation* (1979), p. 2 [University of Chicago book].

"The fact is that the evidence was so patchy one hundred years ago that even Darwin himself had increasing doubts as to the validity of his views, and the only aspect of his theory which has received any support over the past century is where it applies to microevolutionary phenomena. His general theory, that all life on earth had originated and evolved by a gradual successive accumulation of fortuitous mutations, is still, as it was in Darwin's time, a highly speculative hypothesis entirely without direct factual support and very far from that self-evident axiom some of its more aggressive advocates would have us believe."—\*Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1986), p. 77.

Scientific facts

which annihilate evolutionary theory

## BRIEF HISTORY OF EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

### INTRODUCTION

*Introduction:* Stellar evolution is based on the concept that nothing can explode and produce all the stars and worlds. Life evolution is founded on the twin theories of *spontaneous generation* and *Lamarckism* (the inheritance of acquired characteristics);—yet, although they remain the basis of biological evolution, both were debunked by scientists over a century ago.

Science is the study of the natural world. We are thankful for the many dedicated scientists who are hard at work, improving life for us. But we will learn, in this book, that their discoveries have provided no worthwhile evidence supporting evolutionary theory.

*Premises* are important. These are the concepts by which scientific facts are interpreted. For over a century, efforts have been made to explain scientific discoveries by a mid-19th century theory, known as "evolution." It has formed the foundation for many other theories, which also are not founded on scientific facts!

Restating them again, *here are the two premises on which the various theories of evolution are based:*

1 - This is the evolutionary formula for making a universe:

Nothing + nothing = two elements + time = 92 natural elements + time = all physical laws and a completely structured universe of galaxies, systems, stars, planets, and moons orbiting in perfect balance and order.

2 - This is the evolutionary formula for making life:

Dirt + water + time = living creatures.

Evolutionists theorize that the above two formulas can enable everything about us to make itself—with the exception of man-made things, such as automobiles or buildings. Complicated things, such as wooden boxes with nails in them, require thought, intelligence, and careful workmanship. But everything else about us in nature (such as hummingbirds and the human eye) is declared to be the result of accidental mishaps, random confusion, and time. You will not even need raw materials to begin with. They make themselves too.

*How did all this nonsense get started? We will begin this site with a brief overview of the modern history of evolutionary theory.*

But let us not forget that, though it may be nonsensical, evolutionary theory has greatly affected—and damaged—mankind in the 20th century. Will we continue to let this happen, now that we are in the 21st century? The social and moral

impact that evolutionary concepts have had on the modern world has been terrific.

Morality and ethical standards have been greatly reduced. Children and youth are taught in school that they are an advanced level of animals; there are no moral principles. Since they are just animals, they should do whatever they want. Personal survival and success will come only by rivalry, strife, and stepping on others.

Here is a brief overview of some of the people and events in the history of modern evolutionary theory. But it is only a glimpse. Much more will be found as you read farther in this site. *And it is all fascinating reading!*

#### 1- 18th AND 19th CENTURY SCIENTISTS

Prior to the middle of the 1800s, scientists were researchers who firmly believed that all nature was made by a Master Designer. Those pioneers who laid the foundations of modern science were creationists. They were men of giant intellect who struggled against great odds in carrying on their work. They were hard-working researchers.

In contrast, the philosophers sat around, hardly stirring from their armchairs and theorized about everything while the scientists, ignoring them, kept at their work.

But a change came about in the 19th century, when the philosophers tried to gain control of scientific endeavor and suppress research and findings that would be unfavorable to their theories. Today's evolutionists vigorously defend the unscientific theories they thought up over a century ago.

*William Paley* (1743-1805), in his 1802 classic, *Natural Theology*, summarized the viewpoint of the scientists.

He argued that the kind of carefully designed structures we see in the living world point clearly to a Designer. If we see a watch, we know that it had a designer and maker; it would be foolish to imagine that it made itself. *This is the "argument by design."* All about us is the world of nature, and over our heads at night is a universe of stars. We can ignore or ridicule what is there or say it all made itself, but our scoffing does not change the reality of the situation. A leading atheistic scientist of our time, \*Fred Hoyle, wrote that, although it was not difficult to disprove Darwinism, what Paley had to say appeared likely to be unanswerable (\*Fred Hoyle and \*Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space*, 1981, p. 96).

*It is a remarkable fact that the basis of evolutionary theory was destroyed by seven scientific research findings,—before \*Charles Darwin first published the theory.*

*Carl Linn* (*Carolus Linnaeus*, 1707-1778) was a scientist who classified immense numbers of living organisms. An earnest creationist, he clearly saw that there were no halfway species. All plant and animal species were definite categories,

separate from one another. Variation was possible within a species, and there were many sub-species. But there were no cross-overs from one species to another (\*R. Milner, *Encyclopedia of Evolution*, 1990, p. 276).

*First Law of Thermodynamics* (1847). Heinrich von Helmholtz stated the *law of conservation of energy*: The sum total of all matter will always remain the same. This law refutes several aspects of evolutionary theory. \*Isaac Asimov calls it "the most fundamental generalization about the universe that scientists have ever been able to make" (\*Isaac Asimov, "In the Game of Energy and Thermodynamics You Can't Even Break Even," *Journal of Smithsonian Institute*, June 1970, p. 6).

*Second Law of Thermodynamics* (1850). R.J.E. Clausius stated the *law of entropy*: All systems will tend toward the most mathematically probable state, and eventually become totally random and disorganized (\*Harold Blum, *Time's Arrow and Evolution*, 1968, p. 201). In other words, everything runs down, wears out, and goes to pieces (\*R.R. Kinsay, "Physics: to What Extent is it Deterministic," *American Scientist* 56, 1968, p. 100). This law totally eliminates the basic evolutionary theory that simple evolves into complex. \*Einstein said the two laws were the most enduring laws he knew of (\*Jeremy Rifkin, *Entropy: A New World View*, 1980, p. 6).

*Guadeloupe Woman Found* (1812). This is a well-authenticated discovery which has been in the British Museum for over a century. A fully modern human skeleton was found in the French Caribbean island of Guadeloupe inside an immense slab of limestone, dated by modern geologists at 28 million years old. (More examples could be cited.) Human beings, just like those living today (but sometimes larger), have been found in very deep levels of strata.

*Gregor Mendel* (1822-1884) was a creationist who lived and worked near Brunn (now Brno), Czechoslovakia. He was a science and math teacher. Unlike the theorists, Mendel was a true scientist. He bred garden peas and studied the results of crossing various varieties. Beginning his work in 1856, he concluded it within eight years. In 1865, he reported his research in the *Journal of the Brunn Society for the Study of Natural Science*. The journal was distributed to 120 libraries in Europe, England, and America. Yet his research was totally ignored by the scientific community until it was rediscovered in 1900 (\*R.A. Fisher, "Has Mendel's Work Been Rediscovered?" *Annals of Science*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1936). His experiments clearly showed that one species could not transmute into another one. A genetic barrier existed that could not be bridged. Mendel's work laid the basis for modern genetics, and his discoveries effectively destroyed the basis for species evolution (\*Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, 1984, pp. 63-64).

*Louis Pasteur* (1822-1895) was another genuine scientist. In the process of studying fermentation, he performed his famous 1861 experiment, in which he disproved the theory of spontaneous generation. Life cannot arise from non-living materials. This experiment was very important; for, up to that time, a majority of scientists believed in spontaneous generation. (They thought that if a pile of old clothes were left in a corner, it would breed mice! The proof was that, upon later returning to the clothes, mice would frequently be found there.)

Pasteur concluded from his experiment that only God could create living creatures. But modern evolutionary theory continues to be based on that outdated theory disproved by Pasteur: spontaneous generation (life arises from non-life). Why? Because it is the only basis on which evolution could occur. As \*Adams notes, "With spontaneous generation discredited [by Pasteur], biologists were left with no theory of the origin of life at all" (\**J. Edison Adams, Plants: An Introduction to Modern Biology, 1967, p. 585*).

*August Friedrich Leopold Weismann* (1834-1914) was a German biologist who disproved \*Lamarck's notion of "the inheritance of acquired characteristics." He is primarily remembered as the scientist who cut off the tails of 901 young white mice in 19 successive generations, yet each new generation was born with a full-length tail. The final generation, he reported, had tails as long as those originally measured on the first. Weismann also carried out other experiments that buttressed his refutation of Lamarckism. His discoveries, along with the fact that circumcision of Jewish males for 4,000 years had not affected the foreskin, doomed the theory (\**Jean Rostand, Orion Book of Evolution, 1960, p. 64*). Yet Lamarckism continues today as the disguised basis of evolutionary biology. For example, evolutionists still teach that giraffes kept

stretching their necks to reach higher branches, so their necks became longer! In a later book, \*Darwin abandoned natural selection as unworkable, and returned to Lamarckism as the cause of the never-observed change from one species to another (\**Randall Hedtke, The Secret of the Sixth Edition, 1984*).

*Here is a brief, partial overview of what true scientists were accomplishing in the 18th and 19th centuries. All of them were Creationists:*

*Louis Agassiz* (1807-1873): glacial geology, ichthyology.

*Charles Babbage* (1792-1871): actuarial tables, calculating machine, foundations of computer science.

*Francis Bacon* (1561-1626): scientific method of research.

*Robert Boyle* (1627-1691): chemistry, gas dynamics.

*Sir David Brewster* (1781-1868): optical mineralogy, kaleidoscope.

*Georges Cuvier* (1769-1832): comparative anatomy, vertebrate paleontology.

*Sir Humphry Davy* (1778-1829): thermokinetics.

*Jean Henri Fabre* (1823-1915): entomology of living insects.

*Michael Faraday* (1791-1867): electric generator, electro-magnetics, field theory.

*Sir John A. Fleming* (1849-1945): electronics, thermic valve.

*Joseph Henry* (1797-1878): electric motor, galvanometer.

*Sir William Herschel* (1738-1822): galactic astronomy, double stars.

*James Joule* (1818-1889): reversible thermodynamics.

*Lord William Kelvin* (1824-1907): absolute temperature scale, energetics, thermodynamics, transatlantic cable.

*Johannes Kepler* (1571-1630): celestial mechanics, ephemeris tables, physical astronomy.

*Carolus Linnaeus* (1707-1778): classification system, systematic biology.

*Joseph Lister* (1827-1912): antiseptic surgery.

*Matthew Maury* (1806-1873): hydrography, oceanography.

*James C. Maxwell* (1831-1879): electrical dynamics, statistical thermodynamics.

*Gregor Mendel* (1822-1884): genetics.

*Samuel F.B. Morse* (1791-1872): telegraph.

*Isaac Newton* (1642-1727): calculus, dynamics, law of gravity, reflecting telescopes.

*Blaise Pascal* (1623-1662): hydrostatics, barometer.

*Louise Pasteur* (1822-1895): bacteriology, biogenesis law, pasteurization, vaccination, and immunization.

*Sir William Ramsey* (1852-1916): inert gases, isotropic chemistry.

*John Ray* (1827-1705): natural history, classification of plants and animals.

*John Rayleigh* (1842-1919): dimensional analysis, model analysis.

*Bernhard Riemann* (1826-1866): non-Euclidean geometry.

*Sir James Simpson* (1811-1870): chloroform, gynecology.

*Sir George Stokes* (1819-1903): fluid mechanics.

*Rudolph Virchow* (1821-1902): pathology.

## 2 - 18th AND 19th CENTURY EVOLUTIONISTS

*And now we will view the armchair philosophers. Hardly one of them ever set foot in field research or entered the door of a science laboratory, yet they founded the modern theory of evolution:*

*\*Emmanuel Swedenborg* (1688-1772) was a do-nothing expert. In his 1734 book, *Principia*, he theorized that a rapidly rotating nebula formed itself into our solar system of sun and planets. He claimed that he obtained the idea from spirits during a séance. It is significant that the nebular hypothesis theory originated from such a source.

*\*Comte de Buffon* (1707-1788) was a dissolute philosopher who, unable to improve on the work of Linnaeus, spent his time criticizing him. He theorized



that species originated from one another and that a chunk was torn out of the sun, which became our planet. As with the other philosophers, he presented no evidence in support of his theories.

**\*Jean-Baptist Lamarck (1744-1829)** made a name for himself by theorizing. He accomplished little else of significance. He laid the foundation of modern evolutionary theory, with his concept of "inheritance of acquired characteristics," which was later given the name *Lamarckism*. In 1809, he published a book, *Philosophie zoologique*, in which he declared that the giraffe got its long neck by stretching it up to reach the higher branches, and birds that lived in water grew webbed feet. According to that, if you pull hard on your feet, you will gradually increase their length; and, if you decide in your mind to do so, you can grow hair on your bald head, and your offspring will never be bald. This is science?

**\*Lamarck's other erroneous contribution to evolution was the theory of uniformitarianism.** This is the conjecture that all earlier ages on earth were exactly as they are today, calm and peaceful with no worldwide Flood or other great catastrophes.

**\*Robert Chambers (1802-1883)** was a spiritualist who regularly communicated with spirits. As a result of his contacts, he wrote the first popular evolution book in all of Britain. Called *Vestiges of Creation* (1844), it was printed 15 years before **\*Charles Darwin's book, *Origin of the Species*.**

**\*Charles Lyell (1797-1875).** Like **\*Charles Darwin**, Lyell inherited great wealth and was able to spend his time theorizing. Lyell published his *Principles of Geology* in 1830-1833, and it became the basis for the modern theory of sedimentary strata,—even though 20th-century discoveries in radiodating, radiocarbon dating, missing strata, and overthrusts (older strata on top of more recent strata) have nullified the theory.

In order to prove his theory, Lyell was quite willing to misstate the facts. He learned that Niagara Falls had eroded a seven-mile [11 km] channel from Queenston, Ontario, and that it was eroding at about 3 feet [1 m] a year. So Lyell conveniently changed that to one foot [.3 m] a year, which meant that the falls had been flowing for 35,000 years! But Lyell had not told the truth. Three-foot erosion a year, at its present rate of flow, would only take us back 7000 to 9000 years,—and it would be expected that, just after the Flood, the flow would, for a time, have greatly increased the erosion rate. Lyell was a close friend of Darwin, and urged him to write his book, *Origin of the Species*.

**\*Alfred Russell Wallace (1823-1913)** is considered to be the man who developed the theory which **\*Darwin** published. **\*Wallace** was deeply involved in spiritism at the time he formulated the theory in his *Ternate Paper*, which **\*Darwin**, with the help of two friends (**\*Charles Lyell** and **\*Joseph Hooker**), pirated and published under his own name. **\*Darwin**, a wealthy man, thus obtained the royalties which belonged to Wallace, a poverty-ridden theorist. In 1980, **\*Arnold C. Brackman**, in his book, *A Delicate Arrangement*, established that Darwin plagiarized Wallace's material. It was arranged that a paper by Darwin would

be read to the Royal Society, in London, while Wallace's was held back until later. Priorities for the ideas thus having been taken care of, Darwin set to work to prepare his book.

In 1875, Wallace came out openly for spiritism and Marxism, another stepchild of Darwinism. This was Wallace's theory: Species have changed in the past, by which one species descended from another in a manner that we cannot prove today. That is exactly what modern evolution teaches. Yet it has no more evidence supporting the theory than Wallace had in 1858 when he devised the theory while in a fever.

In February 1858, while in a delirious fever on the island of Ternate in the Moluccas, Wallace conceived the idea, "*survival of the fittest*," as being the method by which species change. But the concept proves nothing. *The fittest; which one is that? It is the one that survived longest. Which one survives longest? The fittest.* This is reasoning in a circle. The phrase says nothing about the evolutionary process, much less proving it.

In the first edition of his book, Darwin regarded "natural selection" and "survival of the fittest" as different concepts. By the sixth edition of his *Origin of the Species*, he thought they meant the same thing, but that "survival of the fittest" was the more accurate. In a still later book (*Descent of Man, 1871*), Darwin ultimately abandoned "natural selection" as a hopeless mechanism and returned to Lamarckism. Even Darwin recognized the theory was falling to pieces. The supporting evidence just was not there.

\**Charles Darwin* (1809-1882) was born into wealth and able to have a life of ease. He took two years of medical school at Edinburgh University, and then dropped out. It was the only scientific training he ever received. Because he spent the time in bars with his friends, he barely passed his courses. Darwin had no particular purpose in life, and his father planned to get him into a nicely paid job as an Anglican minister. Darwin did not object.

But an influential relative got him a position as the unpaid "naturalist" on a ship planning to sail around the world, the *Beagle*. The voyage lasted from December 1831 to October 1836.

It is of interest that, after engaging in spiritism, certain men in history have been seized with a deep hatred of God and have then been guided to devise evil teachings, that have destroyed large numbers of people, while others have engaged in warfare which have annihilated millions. In connection with this, we think of such known spiritists as \*Sigmund Freud and \*Adolf Hitler. It is not commonly known that \*Charles Darwin, while a naturalist aboard the *Beagle*, was initiated into witchcraft in South America by nationals. During horseback travels into the interior, he took part in their ceremonies and, as a result, *something happened to him*. Upon his return to England, although his health was strangely weakened, he spent the rest of his life working on theories to destroy faith in the Creator.

After leaving South America, Darwin was on the Galapagos Islands for a few days. While there, he saw some finches which had blown in from South America and adapted to their environment, producing several sub-species. He was certain that this showed cross-species evolution (change into new species). But they were still finches. This theory about the finches was the primary evidence of evolution he brought back with him to England.

Darwin, *never a scientist* and knowing nothing about the practicalities of genetics, then married his first cousin, which resulted in all seven of his children having physical or mental disorders. (One girl died after birth, another at 10. His oldest daughter had a prolonged breakdown at 15. Three of his children became semi-invalids, and his last son was born mentally retarded and died 19 months after birth.)

His book, *Origin of the Species*, was first published in November 1859. The full title, *On the Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, reveals the viciousness of the underlying concept; this concept led directly to two of the worst wars in the history of mankind.

In his book, Darwin reasoned from theory to facts, and provided little evidence for what he had to say. Modern evolutionists are ashamed of the book, with its ridiculous arguments.

Darwin's book had what some men wanted: a clear out-in-the-open, current statement in favor of species change. So, in spite of its laughable imperfections, they capitalized on it. Here is what you will find in his book:

- Darwin would cite authorities that he did not mention. He repeatedly said it was "only an abstract," and "a fuller edition" would come out later. But, although he wrote other books, try as he may he never could find the proof for his theories. No one since has found it either.
- When he did name an authority, it was just an opinion from a letter. Phrases indicating the hypothetical nature of his ideas were frequent: "It might have been," "Maybe," "probably," "it is conceivable that." A favorite of his was: "Let us take an imaginary example."
- Darwin would suggest a possibility, and later refer back to it as a fact: "As we have already demonstrated previously." Elsewhere he would suggest a possible series of events and then conclude by assuming that proved the point.
- He relied heavily on stories instead of facts. Confusing examples would be given. He would use specious and devious arguments, and spent much time suggesting possible explanations why the facts he needed were not available.

Here is an example of his reasoning: To explain the fossil trans-species gaps, Darwin suggested that *species must have been changing quickly in other parts of the world where men had not yet examined the strata. Later these changed species traveled over to the Western World, to be found in strata there as new species. So*

*species were changing on the other side of the world, and that was why species in the process of change were not found on our side!*

With thinking like this, who needs science? But remember that Charles Darwin never had a day of schooling in the sciences.

Here is Darwin's explanation of how one species changes into another: It is a variation of \*Lamarck's theory of inheritance of acquired characteristics (\*Nicholas Hutton III, *Evidence of Evolution*, 1962, p. 138). Calling it *pangenesis*, Darwin said that an organ affected by the environment would respond by giving off particles that he called *gemmules*. These particles supposedly helped determine hereditary characteristics. The environment would affect an organ; gemmules would drop out of the organ; and the gemmules would travel to the reproductive organs, where they would affect the cells (\*W. Stansfield, *Science of Evolution*, 1977, p. 38). As mentioned earlier, scientists today are ashamed of Darwin's ideas.

In his book, Darwin taught that man came from an ape, and that the stronger races would, within a century or two, destroy the weaker ones. (Modern evolutionists claim that man and ape descended from a common ancestor.)

After taking part in the witchcraft ceremonies, not only was his mind affected but his body also. He developed a chronic and incapacitating illness, and went to his death under a depression he could not shake (*Random House Encyclopedia*, 1977, p. 768).

He frequently commented in private letters that he recognized that there was no evidence for his theory, and that it could destroy the morality of the human race. "Long before the reader has arrived at this part of my work, a crowd of difficulties will have occurred to him. Some of them are so serious that to this day I can hardly reflect on them without in some degree becoming staggered" (\*Charles Darwin, *Origin of the Species*, 1860, p. 178; quoted from *Harvard Classics*, 1909 ed., Vol. 11). "Often a cold shudder has run through me, and I have asked myself whether I may have not devoted myself to a phantasy" (\*Charles Darwin, *Life and Letters*, 1887, Vol. 2, p. 229).

\*Thomas Huxley (1825-1895) was the man \*Darwin called "my bulldog." \*Darwin was so frail in health that he did not make public appearances, but remained secluded in the mansion he inherited. After being personally converted by Darwin (on a visit to Darwin's home), Huxley championed the evolutionary cause with everything he had. In the latter part of the 19th century, while \*Haeckel labored earnestly on the European continent, Huxley was Darwin's primary advocate in England.

*The \*X Club* was a secret society in London which worked to further evolutionary thought and suppress scientific opposition to it. It was powerful, for all scientific papers considered by the Royal Society had to be first approved by this small group of nine members. Chaired by \*Huxley, its members made contacts and powerfully affected British scientific associations (\*Michael Pitman, *Adam and Evolution*, 1984, p. 64). " 'But what do they do?' asked a curious

journalist. 'They run British science,' a professor replied, 'and on the whole, they don't do it badly' " (\*R. Milner, *Encyclopedia of Evolution*, 1990, p. 467). In the 20th century, U.S. government agencies, working closely with the \*National Science Federation and kindred organizations, have channeled funds for research to universities willing to try to find evidence for evolution. Down to the present day, the theorists are still trying to control the scientists.

*The Oxford Debate* was held in June 1860 at Oxford University, only seven months after the publication of \*Darwin's *Origin of the Species*. A special meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, it marked a major turning point in England,—just as the 1925 Scopes Trial would be the turning point in North America. Scientific facts had little to do with either event; both were just battles between personalities. In both instances, evolutionists won through ridicule. They dared not rely on scientific facts to support their case, because they had none.

Samuel Wilberforce, Anglican bishop of Oxford University, was scheduled to speak that evening in defense of creationism. \*Huxley had lectured on behalf of evolution in many English cities and was not planning to attend that night. But \*Chambers, a spiritualist adviser to Huxley, was impressed to find and tell him he must attend.

Wilberforce delivered a vigorous attack on evolution for half an hour before a packed audience of 700 people. His presentation was outstanding, and the audience was apparently with him. But then Wilberforce turned and rhetorically asked Huxley a humorous question, whether it was through his grandfather or his grandmother that Huxley claimed descent from an ape.

Huxley was extremely sharp-witted and, at the bishop's question, he clasped the knee of the person sitting next to him, and said, "He is delivered into my hands!"

Huxley arose and worked the audience up to a climax, and then declared that he would feel no shame in having an ape as an ancestor, but would be ashamed of a brilliant man who plunged into scientific questions of which he knew nothing (*John W. Klotz, "Science and Religion," in Studies in Creation, 1985, pp. 45-46*).

At this, the entire room went wild, some yelling one thing and others another. On a pretext so thin, the evolutionists in England became a power which scientists feared to oppose. We will learn that ridicule heaped on ridicule, through the public press, accomplished the same results for American evolutionists in Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925.

*The Orgueil Meteorite* (1861) was one of many hoaxes perpetrated, to further the cause of evolution. Someone inserted various dead microbes, and then covered it over with a surface appearing like the meteorite. The objective was to show that life came from outer space. But the hoax was later discovered (\**Scientific American, January 1965, p. 52*). A remarkable number of hoaxes have occurred since then. Men, working desperately, have tried to provide scientific evidence that does not exist. In the mid-1990s, a meteorite "from Mars" with "dead

organisms" on it was trumpeted in the press. But ignored were the conclusions of competent scientists, that the "discovery" was highly speculative.

*\*Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911).* Galton was *\*Charles Darwin's* cousin who amplified on one of the theory's logical conclusions. He declared that the "science" of "eugenics" was the key to humanity's problems: Put the weak, infirm, and aged to sleep. *\*Adolf Hitler*, an ardent evolutionist, used it successfully in World War II (*\*Otto Scott, "Playing God," in Chalcedon Report, No. 247, February 1986, p. 1).*

*\*Wallace's Break with \*Darwin.* Darwin's close friend, Russell Wallace, eventually separated from Darwin's position—a position he had given Darwin—when Wallace realized that the human brain was far too advanced for evolutionary processes to have produced it (*Loren C. Eiseley, "Was Darwin Wrong about the Human Brain?" Harpers Magazine, 211:66-70, 1955).*

*\*Herbert Spencer (1820-1903),* along with certain other men (*\*Friedrich Nietzsche, \*Karl Marx, \*Sigmund Freud, \*John Dewey, etc.*), introduced evolutionary modes and morality into social fields (sociology, psychology, education, warfare, economics, etc.) with devastating effects on the 20th century. Spencer, also a spiritist, was the one who initially invented the term, "evolution" (*\*R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 159; cf. 424).* Spencer introduced sociology into Europe, clothing it in evolutionary terms. From there it traveled to America. He urged that the unfit be eliminated, so society could properly evolve (*\*Harry E. Barnes, Historical Sociology, 1948, p. 13).* In later years, even the leading evolutionists of the time, such as Huxley and Darwin, became tired of the fact that Spencer could do nothing but theorize and knew so little of real-life facts.

*Archaeopteryx (1861, 1877).* These consisted of several fossils from a single limestone quarry in Germany, each of which the quarry owner sold at a high price. One appeared to possibly be a small dinosaur skeleton, complete with wings and feathers. European museums paid high prices for them. (As we will learn below, in 1985 Archaeopteryx was shown to be a fake.)

*\*Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919),* a teacher at the University of Jena in Germany, was the most zealous advocate of Darwinism on the continent in the 19th century. He drew a number of fraudulent charts (first published in

1868) which purported to show that human embryos were almost identical to those of other animals. Reputable scientists repudiated them within a few years, for embryologists recognized the deceit. (See chapter 16, *Vestiges and Recapitulation* on our website for the charts.) *\*Darwin* and *\*Haeckel* had a strong influence on the rise of world communism (*\*Daniel Gasman, Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League, 1971, p. xvi).*

*\*Marsh's Horse Series (1870s).* *\*Othniel C. Marsh* claimed to have found 30 different kinds of horse fossils in Wyoming and Nebraska. He reconstructed and arranged them in a small-to-large evolutionary series, which was never in a

straight line (*\*Encyclopedia Britannica, 1976 ed., Vol. 7, p. 13*). Although displayed in museums for a time, the great majority of scientists later repudiated this "horse series" (*\*Charles Deperet, Transformations of the Animal World, p. 105*; *\*G.A. Kerkut, Implications of Evolution, 1960, p. 149*).

*\*Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900)*. *\*Nietzsche* was a remarkable example of a man who *fully adopted* Darwinist principles. He wrote books declaring that the way to evolve was to have wars and kill the weaker races, in order to produce a "*super race*" (*\*T. Walter Wallbank and \*Alastair M. Taylor, Civilization Past and Present, Vol. 2, 1949 ed., p. 274*). *\*Darwin*, in *Origin of the Species*, also said that this needed to happen. The writings of both men were read by German militarists and led to World War I. *\*Hitler* valued both Darwin's and Nietzsche's books. When Hitler killed 6 million Jews, he was only doing what Darwin taught.

It is of interest, that a year before he defended *\*John Scopes'* right to teach Darwinism at the Dayton "Monkey Trial," *\*Clarence Darrow* declared in court that the murderous thinking of two young men was caused by their having learned *\*Nietzsche's* vicious Darwinism in the public schools (*\*W. Brigan, ed., Classified Speeches*).

*\*Asa Gray* was the first leading theistic evolutionary advocate in America, at the time when Darwin was writing his books. Gray, a Presbyterian, worked closely with *\*Charles W. Eliot*, president of Harvard, in promoting evolution as a "Christian teaching," yet teaching long ages and the book of Genesis as a fable.

*The Challenger* was a British ship dispatched to find evidence, on the ocean bottom, of evolutionary change. During its 1872-1876 voyage, it carried on seafloor dredging, but found no fossils developing on the bottom of the ocean. By this time, it was obvious to evolutionists that no fossils were developing on either land or sea, yet they kept quiet about the matter. Over the years, theories, hoaxes, false claims, and ridicule favoring evolution were spread abroad; but facts refuting it, when found, were kept hidden.

*\*Karl Marx (1818-1883)* is closely linked with Darwinism. That which *\*Darwin* did to biology, Marx with the help of others did to society. All the worst political philosophies of the 20th century emerged from the dark cave of Darwinism. Marx was thrilled when he read *Origin of the Species* and he immediately wrote Darwin and asked to dedicate his own major work, *Das Kapital*, to him. Darwin, in his reply, thanked him but said it would be best not to do so.

In 1866, Marx wrote to *\*Frederick Engels*, that *Origin of the Species* contained the basis in natural history for their political and economic system for an atheist world. Engels, the co-founder of world communism with Marx and *\*Lenin*, wrote to Karl Marx in 1859: "Darwin, whom I am just now reading, is splendid" (*\*C. Zirkle, Evolution, Marxian Biology, and the Social Scene, 1959, p. 85*). In 1861, Marx wrote to Engels: "Darwin's book is very important and serves me as a basis in natural selection for the class struggle in history" (*\*op. cit., p. 86*). At

Marx's funeral, Engels said that, as Darwin had discovered the law of organic evolution in natural history, so Marx had discovered the law of evolution in human history (*\*Otto Ruhle, Karl Marx, 1948, p. 366*).

As Darwin emphasized competitive survival as the key to advancement, so communism focused on the value of labor *rather than the laborer*. Like Darwin, Marx thought he had discovered the law of development. He saw history in stages, as the Darwinists saw geological strata and successive forms of life.

*\*William Grant Sumner (1840-1910)* applied evolutionary principles to political economics at Yale University. He taught many of America's future business and industrial leaders that strong business should succeed and the weak perish, and that to help the unfit was to injure the fit and accomplish nothing for society (*\*R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, pp. 59, 446, 72*). Millionaires were, in his thinking, the "fittest." Modern *laissez-faire* capitalism was the result (*\*Gilman M. Ostrander, The Evolutionary Outlook: 1875-1900, 1971, p. 5*).

*\*William James (1842-1910)* was another evolutionist who influenced American thinking. His view of psychology placed the study of human behavior on an animalistic evolutionary basis.

*Tidal Hypothesis Theory (1890)*. *\*George Darwin*, son of *\*Charles Darwin*, wanted to come up with something original, so he invented the theory that four million years ago the moon was pressed nearly against the earth, which revolved every five hours.—*Then one day, a heavy tide occurred in the oceans, which lifted it out to its present location!* Later proponents of George's theory decided that the Pacific Basin is the hole the moon left behind, when those large ocean waves pushed it out into space.

3 - 1898 TO 1949

*Bumpus' Sparrows (1898)*. Herman Bumpus was a zoologist at Brown University. During the winter of 1898, by accident he carried out one of the only field experiments in natural selection. One cold morning, finding 136 stunned house sparrows on the ground, he tried to nurse them back to health. Of the total, 72 revived and 64 died. He weighed and carefully measured all of them, and found that those closest to the average survived best. This frequently quoted research study is another evidence that the animal or plant closest to the original species is the most hardy. Sub-species variations will not be as hardy, and evolution entirely across species (if the DNA code would permit it) would therefore be too weakened to survive (*\*R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 61*).

*\*Hugo deVries (1848-1935)* was a Dutch botanist and one of the three men who, in 1900, rediscovered Mendel's paper on the law of heredity.

One day while working with primroses, deVries thought he had discovered a new species. This made headlines. He actually had found a new variety (sub-species) of the primrose, but deVries conjectured that perhaps his "new species" had suddenly sprung into existence as a "*mutation*." He theorized that new species



*"saltated"* (leaped), that is, continually spring into existence. His idea is called the *saltation theory*.

This was a new idea; and, during the first half of the 20th century, many evolutionary biologists, finding absolutely no evidence supporting "natural selection," switched from natural selection ("*Darwinism*") to mutations ("*neo-Darwinism*") as the mechanism by which the theorized cross-species changes occurred.

Later in this book, we will discover that mutations cannot produce evolution either, for they are always harmful. In addition, decades of experimentation have revealed they never produce new species.

In order to prove the mutation theory, deVries and other researchers immediately began experimentation on fruit flies; and it has continued ever since—but totally without success in producing new species.

Ironically, deVries' saltation theory was based on an observational error. In 1914 \*Edward Jeffries discovered that deVries' primrose was just a new variety, not a new species.

Decades later, it was discovered that most plant varieties are produced by variations in gene factors, rarely by mutations. Those caused by gene variations may be strong (although not as strong as the average original), but those varieties produced by mutations are always weak and have a poor survival rate. See chapter 10, *Mutations*, for much, much more on the mutation problem.

\**Walter S. Sutton* and \**T. Boveri* (1902) independently discovered chromosomes and the linkage of genetic characters. This was only two years after Mendel's research was rediscovered. Scientists were continually learning new facts about the fixity of the species.

\**Thomas Hunt Morgan* (1886-1945) was an American biologist who developed the theory of the gene. He found that the genetic determinants were present in a definite linear order in the chromosomes and could be somewhat "mapped." He was the first to work intensively with the fruit fly, *Drosophila* (\**Michael Pitman, Adam and Evolution, 1984, p. 70*). But research with fruit flies, and other creatures, has proved a total failure in showing mutations to be a mechanism for cross-species change (\**Richard B. Goldschmidt, "Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist," American Scientist, January 1952, p. 94*).

\**H.J. Muller* (1890-1967). Upon learning of the 1927 discovery that X-rays, gamma rays, and various chemicals could induce an extremely rapid increase of mutations in the chromosomes of test animals and plants, Muller pioneered in using X-rays to greatly increase the mutation rate in fruit flies. But all he and the other researchers found was that mutations were always harmful (\**H.J. Muller, Time, November 11, 1946, p. 38*; \**E.J. Gardner, Principles of Genetics, 1964, p. 192*; \**Theodosius Dobzhansky, Genetics and the Origin of the Species, 1951, p. 73*).

*\*Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) was deeply indebted to the evolutionary training he received in Germany as a young man. He fully accepted it, as well as \*Haeckel's recapitulation theory. Freud began his Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis (1916) with Haeckel's premise: "Each individual somehow recapitulates in an abbreviated form the entire development of the human race" (\*R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 177).*

Freud's "Oedipus complex" was based on a theory of "primal horde" he developed about a "mental complex" that caveman families had long ago. His theories of anxiety complexes, and "oral" and "anal" stages, etc., were based on his belief that our ancestors were savage.

*\*H.G. Wells (1866-1946), the science fiction pioneer based his imaginative writings on evolutionary teachings. He had received a science training under Professor \*Thomas H. Huxley, \*Darwin's chief defender.*

*\*Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (1859-1930), like a variety of other evolutionist leaders before and after, was an avid spiritist. Many of his mystery stories were based on evolutionary themes.*

*\*George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950) was so deeply involved in evolutionary theory, that he openly declared that he wrote his plays to teach various aspects of the theory (\*R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 461).*

*Pitldown Man (1912). In 1912, parts of a jaw and skull were found in England and dubbed "Pitldown Man." News of it created a sensation. The report of a dentist, in 1916, who said someone had filed down the teeth was ignored. As we will learn below, in 1953 the fact that it was a total hoax was uncovered. This, like all the later evidences that our ancestors were part ape, has been questioned or repudiated by reputable scientists.*

*World War I (1917-1918). Darwinism basically taught that there is no moral code, our ancestors were savage, and civilization only progressed by violence against others. It therefore led to extreme nationalism, racism, and warfare through Nazism and Fascism. Evolution was declared to involve "natural selection"; and, in the struggle to survive, the fittest will win out at the expense of their rivals. \*Frederich von Bernhard, a German military officer, wrote a book in 1909 extolling evolution and appealing to Germany to start another war. \*Heinrich von Treitsche, a Prussian militarist, loudly called for war by Germany in order to fulfill its "evolutionary destiny" (\*Heinrich G. von Treitsche, Politics, Vol. 1, pp. 66-67). Their teachings were fully adopted by the German government, and it only waited for a pretext to start the war (\*R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 59).*

*Communist Darwinism. \*Marx and \*Engels' acceptance of evolutionary theory made \*Darwin's theory the "scientific" basis of all later communist ideologies (\*Robert M. Young, "The Darwin Debate," in Marxism Today, Vol. 26, April 1982, p. 21). Communist teaching declared that evolutionary change, which taught class struggle, came by revolution and violent uprisings. Communist dogma declares that Lamarckism (inheritance of acquired characteristics) is the mechanism by which this is done. Mendelian genetics was officially outlawed in*

Russia in 1948, since it was recognized as disproving evolution. Communist theorists also settled on "synthetic speciation" instead of natural selection or mutations as the mechanism for species change (*\*L.B. Halstead, "Museum of Errors," in Nature, November 20, 1980, p. 208*). This concept is identical to the sudden change theory of *\*Goldschmidt and \*Gould, which we will mention later.*

*\*John Dewey (1859-1952)* was another influential thought leader. A vigorous Darwinist, Dewey founded and led out in the "progressive education movement" which so greatly affected U.S. educational history. But it was nothing more than careful animal training (*\*Samuel L. Blumenfeld, NEA: Trojan Horse in American Education, 1984, p. 43*). The purpose was to indoctrinate the youth into evolution, humanism, and collectivism. In 1933, Dewey became a charter member of the American Humanist Association and its first president. Its basic statement of beliefs, published that year as the Humanist Manifesto, became the unofficial framework of teaching in most school textbooks. The evolutionists recognized that they must gain control of all public education (*\*Sir Julian Huxley, quoted in \*Sol Tax and \*Charles Callender, eds., Evolution after Darwin, 3 vols., 1960*). Historically, American education was based on morals and standards; but Dewey declared that, in order to be "progressive," education must leave "the past" and "evolve upward" to new, modern concepts.

*The Scopes Trial (July 10 to July 21, 1925)* was a powerful aid to the cause of evolution, yet scientific discoveries were not involved. That was fortunate, since, except for a single tooth (later disproved), and a few other frauds, the evolutionists had nothing worthwhile to present (*\*The World's Most Famous Court Trial: A Complete Stenographic Report, 1925*).

*The ACLU (\*American Civil Liberties Union)* had been searching for someone they could use to test the Butler Act, which forbade the teaching of evolution in the public schools in Tennessee. *\*John Scopes (24 at the time)* volunteered for the job. He later privately admitted that he had never actually taught evolution in class, so the case was based on a fraud; he spent the time teaching them football maneuvers (*\*John Scopes, Center of the Storm, 1967, p. 60*). But no matter, the ACLU wanted to so humiliate the State of Tennessee, that no other state would ever dare oppose the evolutionists. The entire trial, widely reported as the "Tennessee Monkey Trial," was presented to the public as something of a comic opera. (A trained ape was even sent in, to walk around on a chain in the streets of Dayton.) But the objective was deadly serious, and they succeeded very well. Although the verdict was against Scopes, America's politicians learned the lesson: Do not oppose the evolutionists.

*The Scopes trial, the first event nationally broadcast over the radio, was a major victory for evolutionists throughout the world. Ridicule, side issues, misinformation, and false statements were used to win the battle.*

**SCOPES TRIAL—Evolutionists turned the Dayton trial into ridiculous circus in order to frighten later State governments into banning creationism from their school curricula.**

## **Part B**

### **BRIEF HISTORY OF EVOLUTIONARY THEORY**

**Nebraska Man Debunked (1928).** In 1922 a single molar tooth was found and named *Hesperopithecus*, or "Nebraska Man." An artist was told to make an "apeman" picture based on the tooth, which went around the world. Nebraska Man was a key evidence at the Scopes trial in July 1925 (The evolutionists had little else to offer!). \*Grafton Smith, one of those involved in publicizing Nebraska Man was knighted for his efforts in making known this fabulous find. When paleontologists returned to the site in 1928, they found the rest of the skeleton,—and discovered the tooth belonged to "an extinct pig"! (\**R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 322*). In 1972, living specimens of the same pig were found in Paraguay.

**George McCready Price (1870-1963)** had a master's level degree, but not in science. Yet he was the staunchest opponent of evolution in the first half of the 20th century. He produced 38 books and numerous articles to various journals. Price was the first person to carefully research into the accumulated findings of geologists, and he discovered that they had no evidence supporting their claims about strata and fossils. Since his time, the situation has not changed (\**R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 194*).

Along with mutations, the study of fossils and strata ranks as the leading potential evidences supporting evolutionary claims. But no transitional species have been found. Ancient species (aside from the extinct ones) were like those today, except larger, and strata are generally missing and at times switched—with "younger" strata below "older." Because there is no fossil/strata evidence supporting evolution, the museums display dinosaurs and other extinct animals as proof that evolution has occurred. But extinction is not an evidence of evolution. Much more on this in chapter 12, *Fossils and Strata*.

\**Oliver Wendel Holmes, Jr. (1841-1935)*, powerfully affected the U.S. Supreme Court in both viewpoint and legal precedents. He was forceful in his positions and a leading justice for 30 years. The prevalent view since his time is that law is a product of evolution and should continually evolve in accord with social policy. But this, of course, keeps taking America further and further from the U.S. Constitution.\**Vladimir (Nikolai) Lenin (1870-1924)* and \**Josef Stalin (1879-1953)*. Lenin was an ardent evolutionist who, in 1918, violently overthrew the Russian government and founded the Soviet Union.

According to \**Yaroslavsky*, a close friend of his, at an early age, while attending a Christian Orthodox school, Stalin began to read \**Darwin* and became an atheist (\**E. Yaroslavsky, Landmarks in the Life of Stalin, 1940, pp. 8-9*). Stalin was head of the Soviet Union from 1924 to 1953.

During those years, he was responsible for the death of millions of Russians who refused to yield to his slave-state tactics. The Soviet Union under Stalin was an outstanding example of Darwinist principles extended to an entire nation.

**\*Austin H. Clark (1880-1954)**, an ardent evolutionist, was on the staff of the Smithsonian Institute from 1908 to 1950 and a member of several important scientific organizations. A prominent scientist, he authored several books and about 600 scientific articles. But, after years of honestly trying to deal with the fact that there is no evidence of cross-species change, in 1930 he wrote an astounding book, *The New Evolution: Zoogenesis*. In it, he cited fact after fact, disproving the possibility that major types of plants and animals could have evolved from one another. The book was breathtaking and could not be answered by any evolutionist. His alternate proposal, *zoogenesis*, was that every major type of plant and animal must have evolved—not from one another—but directly from dirt and water! (*A.H. Clark, The New Evolution: Zoogenesis, 1930, pp. 211, 100, 189, 196, 114*). The evolutionary world was stunned into silence, for he was an expert who knew all the reasons why trans-species evolution was impossible.

**\*Richard Goldschmidt (1878-1958)**. The same year that **\*Clark** wrote his book (1930), Goldschmidt gave also. An earnest evolutionist, he had dedicated his life to proving it by applying X-rays and chemicals to fruit flies at the University of California, Berkeley, and producing large numbers of mutations in them. After 25 exhausting years, in which he had worked with more generations of fruit flies than humans and their ape ancestors are conjectured to have lived on our planet, Goldschmidt decided that he must figure out a different way that cross-species evolution could occur. For the next ten years, as he continued his fruit fly research, he gathered more evidence of the foolishness of evolutionary theory;—and, in 1940, he wrote his book, *The Material Basis of Evolution*, in which he exploded point after point in the ammunition box of the theory. He literally tore it to pieces (*\*Norman Macbeth, Darwin Retried, 1974, p. 152*). No evolutionist could answer him. Like them, he was a confirmed evolutionary atheist, but he was honestly facing the facts. After soundly destroying their theory, he announced his new concept: a megaevolution in which one life-form suddenly emerged completely out of a different one! He called them "*hopeful monsters*." One day a fish laid some eggs, and some of them turned into a frog, a snake laid an egg, and a bird hatched from it! Goldschmidt asked for even bigger miracles than A.H. Clark had proposed! (*\*Steven M. Stanley, Macroevolution: Pattern and Process, 1979, p. 159*). *American Humanist Association (1933)*. "Humanism" is the modern word for "atheism." As soon as it was formed in 1933, the AHA began working closely with science federations, to promote evolutionary theory, and with the ACLU (American Civil Liberties Union), to provoke legal action in the courts forcing Americans to accept their evolutionary beliefs. Signatories included **\*Julian Huxley** (**\*T.H. Huxley's** grandson), **\*John Dewey**, **\*Margaret Sanger**, **\*H.J. Muller**, **\*Benjamin Spock**, **\*Erich**

Froom, and \*Carl Rogers (\**American Humanist Association, promotional literature*).

\**Trofim Lysenko* (1893-1976) rose to power in the 1930s in the USSR by convincing the government that he could create a State Science that combined Darwinian evolution theory in science, animal husbandry, and agriculture with Marxist theory. With \*Stalin's hearty backing, Lysenko became responsible for the death of thousands, including many of Russia's best scientists. Lysenko banned Mendelian genetics as a bourgeois heresy. He was ousted in 1965 when his theories produced agricultural disaster for the nation. (He claimed to be able to change winter wheat into spring wheat, through temperature change, and wheat into rye in one generation.)

\**Adolf Hitler* (1889-1945) was chancellor of Nazi Germany from 1933 to 1945. He carefully studied the writings of \*Darwin and \*Nietzsche. Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*, was based on evolutionary theory (\**Sir Arthur Keith, Evolution and Ethics, 1947, p. 28*). The very title of the book ("My Struggle" [to survive and overcome]) was copied from a Darwinian expression. Hitler believed he was fulfilling evolutionary objectives by eliminating "undesirable individuals and inferior races" in order to produce Germany's "Master Race" (\**Larry Azar, Twentieth Century in Crisis, 1990, p. 180*). (Notice that the "master race" people always select the race they are in as the best one.)

\**Benito Mussolini* (1883-1945), the Italian Fascist dictator, was also captivated by \*Darwin and \*Nietzsche; and Nietzsche said he got his ideas from Darwin (\**R.E.D. Clark, Darwin: Before and After, 1948, p. 115*). Mussolini believed that violence is basic to social transformation (\**Encyclopedia Britannica, 1962, Vol. 16, p. 27*). *Coelacanth Discovered* (1938). It was once an "index fossil, used to date a sedimentary strata. Evolutionists declared it as having been dead for 70 million years. If their strata theory was correct, no living specimens could occur, since no coelacanth fossils had been found in the millions of years of higher strata. But then, on December 25, 1938, a trawler fishing off South Africa brought up one that was 5 feet in length. More were found later. Many other discoveries helped disprove the evolutionists' fossil/strata theories. Even living creatures like the trilobite have been found! (\**"Living Fossil Resembles Long-extinct Trilobite," Science Digest, December 1957*). *Hiroshima* (1945), is an evolutionist's paradise; for it is filled with people heavily irradiated, which—according to evolutionary mutation theory—should be able to produce children which are new, different, and a more exalted species. But this has not happened. Only injury and death resulted from the August 6, 1945, nuclear explosion. Mutations are always harmful and frequently lethal within a generation or two (\**Animal Species and Evolution, p. 170, \*H.J. Muller, Time, November 11, 1946, p. 38*). *First Mechanism Changeover* (1940s). \*Darwin originally wrote that *random activity naturally selects itself into improvements* (a concept which any sensible person will say is totally impossible). In a later book (*Descent of Man, 1871*), Darwin abandoned

"natural selection" as hopeless, and returned to Lamarckism (the scientifically discredited inheritance of acquired characteristics; if you build strong muscles, your son will inherit them). But evolutionists remained faithful to Darwin's original mechanism (natural selection) for decades. They were called "*Darwinists*." But, by the 1940s, many were switching over to mutations as the mechanism of cross-species change. Its advocates were called "*neo-Darwinists*." The second changeover would come in the 1980s.

*Radiocarbon dating* (1946). \*Willard Libby and his associates discovered carbon-14 (C-14) as a method for the dating of earlier organic materials. But later research revealed that its inaccuracy increases in accordance with the actual age of the material (\*C.A. Reed, "*Animal Domestication in the Prehistoric Near East*," in *Science*, 130, 1959, p. 1630; *University of California at Los Angeles*, "*On the Accuracy of Radiocarbon Dates*," in *Geochronicle*, 2, 1966 [Libby's own laboratory]).*Big Bang Hypothesis* (1948) Astronomers were totally buffaloes as to where matter and stars came from. In desperation, \*George Gamow and two associates dreamed up the astonishing concept that *an explosion of nothing produced hydrogen and helium, which then shot outward, then turned and began circling and pushing itself into our present highly organized stars and galactic systems*. This far-fetched theory has repeatedly been opposed by a number of scientists (\*G. Burbidge, "*Was There Really a Big Bang?*" in *Nature* 233, 1971, pp. 36, 39). By the 1980s, astronomers which continued opposing the theory began to be relieved of their research time at major observatories ("*Companion Galaxies Match Quasar Redshifts: The Debate Goes On*," *Physics Today*, 37:17, December 1984). In spite of clear evidence that the theory is unscientific and unworkable, evolutionists refuse to abandon it.

*Steady State Universe Theory* (1948). In 1948, \*Fred Hoyle, working with \*Hermann Bondi and \*Thomas Gold, proposed this theory as an alternative to the Big Bang. It declared that matter is continually "blipping" into existence throughout the universe (\*Peter Pocock and \*Pat Daniels, *Galaxies*, p. 114; \*Fred Hoyle, *Frontiers of Astronomy*, 1955, pp. 317-318). We will learn that in 1965, the theory was abandoned. \*Hoyle said it disagreed with several scientific facts.

#### 4 - 1949 - PRESENT

*Chinese Communism* (1949-). When the communists took control of China in 1949, the first new text introduced into all the schools was neither Marxist nor Leninist, but Darwinian. Chinese communist leaders eagerly grasped evolutionary theory as a basic foundation for their ideology. The government established the Paleontological Institute in Beijing, with a large staff of paleontologists.

\**Sir Julian S. Huxley* (1887-1975). Grandson of \*Darwin's "bulldog" (\*Thomas Huxley), \*Julian Huxley was the leading spokesman for evolution by natural selection in the mid-20th century. Upon being

named the first director-general of UNESCO, he was able to make evolution the keystone of United Nations scientific policy. He saw it as his opportunity to extend evolutionary thinking to the nations of the world, and he made the most of it (*\*Julian Huxley, UNESCO pamphlet. Piltdown Skull Debunked (1953)*). This piece of skull and separate jaw was the only clear evidence that man was descended from an apelike creature. In 1953, *\*Kenneth Oakley (British Museum geologist), \*Joseph Weiner (Oxford University anthropologist), and \*Le Gros Clark (anatomy professor at Oxford)* managed to get their hands on the Piltdown skull and jaw—and proved it a total forgery. The newly developed fluorine test revealed the bones to be quite recent. Additional research showed the bones had been stained with bichromate, to make them appear aged. Drillings into the bone produced shavings instead of powder. The canine tooth was found to have been filed and stained. Weiner published a book about the Piltdown forgery in 1955 (*\*William L. Straus, Jr., "The Great Piltdown Hoax," Science, February 26, 1954; \*Robert Silverberg, Scientists and Scoundrels: A Book of Hoaxes, 1965. Amino Acid Synthesis (1953)*). When *\*Stanley Miller* produced a few amino acids from chemicals, amid a continuous small sparking apparatus, newspaper headlines proclaimed: "Life has been created!" But evolutionists hid the truth: The experiment had disproved the possibility that evolution could occur.

The amino acids were totally dead, and the experiment only proved that a synthetic production of them would result in equal amounts of left- and right-handed amino acids. Since only left-handed ones exist in animals, accidental production could never produce a living creature (*\*R. Milner, Encyclopedia of Evolution, 1990, p. 274. Discovery of DNA (1953)*). *\*Rosiland Franklin* took some special photographs which were used in 1953 by *\*Francis Crick* and *\*James Watson* (without giving her credit), to develop the astounding helix model of the DNA molecule. DNA has crushed the hopes of biological evolutionists, for it provides clear evidence that every species is locked into its own coding pattern. It would be impossible for one species to change into another, since the genes network together so closely. *It is a combination lock, and it is shut tight*. Only sub-species variations can occur (varieties in plants, and breeds in animals). This is done through gene shuffling (*\*A.I. Oparin, Life: Its Nature, Origin and Development, 1961, p. 31; \*Hubert P. Yockey, "A Calculation of Probability of Spontaneous Biogenesis by Information Theory," Journal of Theoretical Biology, Vol. 67, 1977, p. 398*).

The odds of accidentally producing the correct DNA code in a species or changing it into another viable species are mathematically impossible (*\*J Leslie, "Cosmology, Probability, and the Need to Explain Life," in Scientific American and Understanding, pp. 53, 64-65; \*E. Ambrose, Nature and Origin of the Biological World, 1982, p. 135*).

*Five Polls about Evolution (1954)*. (1) The general public supports the teaching of creation in public schools, not just evolution, by a massive



majority of 86% to 8% (*AP-NBC News poll*). (2) A national poll of attorneys agree (56% to 26%) and find dual instruction constitutional (63% to 26%, *American Bar Association-commissioned poll*). (3) A majority of university students at two secular colleges also agree (80% at Ohio State, 56% at Oberlin, *Fuerst, Zimmerman*). (4) Two-thirds of public school board members agree (67% to 25%, *American School Board Journal poll*). (5) A substantial minority of public school teacher favor creation over evolution (*Austin Analytical Consulting poll; source: W.R. Bird, Origin of Species Revisited, 1954, p. 8*).*Courville's Research* (1956). After 15 years of careful research, Donovan A. Courville, a Loma Linda University biochemist, published an important book, *Exodus Problem and Its Ramifications*. Courville correlated ancient Egyptian and Bible events and dates, providing us with one of the best ancient chronologies available. He showed that Manetho's king-list overlapped, resulting in a major reduction in the duration of Egypt's dynastic history and a placement of its first double-ruler dynasty at around 2150 B.C. This study, along with others reviewed in chapter 21, *Archaeological Dating*, shows that archaeological dating does correlate closely with Bible history.

*\*Thompson's Attack on \*Darwin* (1956). W.R. Thompson, a leading evolutionary scientist, was asked to write the *Introduction* to the 1956 reprint edition of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*. In it, Thompson scathingly attacked Darwin's theories on every essential point as worthless (*\*W.R. Thompson, Introduction to Charles Darwin, Origin of the Species, 1956 edition*).*Children's Books* (1958). While evolutionists secretly recognize that their theory is falling through the floor, to the gullible public it is praised more and more as the scientifically proven answer to the mystery of life and matter. In 1958, the *Wonderful Egg* was published and immediately recommended by the *\*American Association for the Advancement of Science* as a worthwhile science guide for little children. Two major NEA affiliates (the *\*American Council on Education* and the *\*Association for Childhood Education International*) gave it their highest recommendation. The book tells about a mother dinosaur who laid a "wonderful egg" which hatched into a baby bird—"the first baby bird in the whole world! And the baby bird grew up . . . with feathers . . . the first beautiful bird that ever sang a song high in the tree tops . . . of long, long ago" (*quoted in H. Morris and G. Parker, What is Creation Science? p. 148*).*Geoscience Research Institute* (1958). This creationist organization, now located in Loma Linda, California, was organized specifically to carry on research work, in the area of creationism, and produce educational materials for scientists and science teachers.

*Darwinian Centennial Celebration* (1959). As the year 1959 approached, evolutionists saw it as a splendid opportunity to ballyhoo the glories of evolutionary theory. As the 100th anniversary of Darwin's *Origin of the Species* approached, a flood of books and articles appeared. The largest meeting was held at the University of Chicago, where *\*Julian Huxley* gave the keynote address, focusing his attention on a triumphant, total repudiation of God.

The same year, two major books attacking evolutionary theory in great detail were released: The first was \*Gertrude Himmelfarb's *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution*. Holding a doctorate from the University of Chicago, her book was a powerful exposé on the havoc the theory has wrought on the modern world. The second in-depth book was by \*Jacques Barzun, history professor and dean of the Graduate Faculties at Columbia University. His book, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner*, declared that evolutionary theory was directly responsible for European wars from 1870 to 1945.

*Biological Sciences Curriculum* (1959). Another significant event that year was the establishment of a standardized *Biological Sciences Curriculum Study* (BSCS) for public secondary schools. The stated objective was the teaching of evolution, sex education, racial problems, and the need for legalizing abortion (\*A.B. Grobman, *Biological Science: An Inquiry into Life*, p. xv). BSCS quickly received a \$7 million grant from the National Science Foundation, to develop this new series. Shortly afterward, a second major textbook revision project, *Man: A Course of Study*, was given \$7 million by the National Science Foundation. It was filled with humanism and morally objectionable interpretations of personal and social life. *Revolt in France* (early 1960s). A large number of French biologists and taxonomists (species classification experts) rebelled against the chains of the evolutionary creed and declared that they would continue their research, but would no longer try to prove evolution, which they considered an impossible theory. Taxonomists who joined the revolt took the name "*cladists*" (\*Z. Litynski, "Should We Burn Darwin?" in *Science Digest*, Vol. 51, January 1961, p. 61). *First Quasar Discovered* (1962). Telescopes found a mysterious object, which was named 3C273, which had a spectrum that was unintelligible. This peculiar object radiated most strongly in the far blue and ultraviolet fringes of the visible spectrum. It was a total mystery until February 1963, when \*Jesse Schmidt recognized that the problem was that it had a radical 16% shift toward the red. *If the speed theory of redshift, promoted by evolutionists, was correct*,—that meant the object was moving away from us at 16% of the speed of light—and was a massive 3 billion light-years from earth! As more—and apparently "faster"—quasars were discovered, the situation kept worsening. Ultimately, their existence debunked the evolutionist's speed theory of redshift. *Yet the redshift and background radiation were the only two "evidences" of an earlier Big Bang!* For example, in 1977, a quasar was found which, according to the redshift theory, was moving faster (eight times faster) than the speed of light! Of course, scientists know it is impossible for anything to travel faster than the speed of light (\*George Abell, *Exploration of the Universe*, 1973, p. 409; \*Time-Life, *Cosmic Mysteries*, 1990, pp. 68-69; \*Sky and Telescope 53, 1977, p. 1702). *Creation Research Society* (1963). This important creation research organization was founded by doctoral scientists, with the express purpose of conducting research into creation-evolution topics and publishing regular reports on them. Its reports have been of a high scientific caliber.

***Background Radiation (1965).*** Using a sensitive radio astronomy telescope, \*A.A. Penzias and \*R.W. Wilson (researchers at Bell Laboratories), discovered low-energy microwave radiation coming from outer space. Big Bang theorists immediately claimed that this proved the Big Bang! They said it was the last part of the explosion. But further research disclosed that it came from every direction instead of only one; that it was the wrong temperature; and that it was too even. Even discoveries in the 1990s have failed to show that this radiation is "lumpy" enough (their term) to have produced stars and planets.

***Steady State Universe Theory Abandoned (1965).*** \*Fred Hoyle abandoned the steady state theory entirely in a public announcement at a meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. He listed five scientific reasons why it was impossible (*Nature, October 9, 1965, p. 113*). ***The Switzerland Meeting (1965).*** It was not until the 1960s that the neo-Darwinists (those who had given up on natural selection and believed that mutations were the mechanism of cross-species change) began fighting with one another in earnest. At this meeting of mathematicians and biologists, mathematical doubts were raised about the possibility of evolution having occurred. At the end of several hours of heated discussion, it was decided to hold another meeting the next year.

***The Wistar Institute Symposium (1966).*** A milestone meeting was the four-day Wistar Institute Symposium, held in Philadelphia in April 1966. A number of mathematicians, familiar with biological problems, spoke—and clearly refuted neo-Darwinism in several ways. An important factor was that large computers were by this time able to work out immense calculations—showing that evolution could not possibly occur, even over a period of billions of years, given the complexities of DNA, protein, the cell, enzymes, and other factors.

***We will cite one example here:*** \*Murray Eden of MIT explained that life could not begin by "random selection." He noted that, if randomness is removed, only "design" would remain,—and that required purposive planning by an Intelligence. He showed that it would be impossible for even a single ordered pair of genes to be produced by DNA mutations in the bacteria, *E. Coli* (which has very little DNA), with 5 billion years in which to produce it. Eden then showed the mathematical impossibility of protein forming by chance. He also reported on his extensive investigations into genetic data on hemoglobin (red blood cells). Hemoglobin has two chains, called alpha and beta. A minimum of 120 mutations would be required to convert alpha to beta. At least 34 of those changes require changeovers in 2 or 3 nucleotides. Yet, Eden pointed out, if a single nucleotide change occurs through mutation, the result ruins the blood and kills the organism! For more on the Wistar Institute, read the following book: \*Paul Moorhead and \*Martin Kaplan (eds.), *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution, Wistar Institute Monograph No. 5. Antelope Springs Tracks (1968).* Trilobites are small marine creatures that are now extinct.

Evolutionists tell us that trilobites are one of the most ancient creatures that have ever lived on Planet Earth, and they lived millions of years before there were human beings. \*William J. Meister, Sr., a non-Christian evolutionist, made a hobby of searching for trilobite fossils in the mountains of Utah. On June 1, 1968, he found a human footprint and trilobites in the same rock, and the footprint was stepping on some of the trilobites! The location was Antelope Springs, about 43 miles [69 km] northwest of Delta, Utah.

Then, breaking off a large, two-inch thick piece of rock, he hit it on edge with a hammer, and it fell open in his hands. To his great astonishment, he found on one side the footprint of a human being, with trilobites right in the footprint itself! The other half of the rock slab showed an almost perfect mold of a footprint and fossils. Amazingly, the human was wearing a sandal! To make a longer story short, the find was confirmed when scientists came and found more sandaled footprints. Meister was so stunned that he became a Christian. This was Cambrian strata, the lowest level of strata in the world; yet it had sandaled human footprints! (*"Discovery of Trilobite Fossils in Shod Footprint of Human in 'Trilobite Beds,' a Cambrian Formation, Antelope, Springs, Utah," in Why Not Creation? 1970, p. 190*).*The Alpbach Institute Symposium* (1969). A follow-up meeting of scientists was held and given the title, *"Beyond Reductionism."* But it only resulted in fruitless discussions by scientists who had carefully researched the problems, with men who were desperately trying to defend evolutionary theories, against an ever-growing mountain of evidence to the contrary.

*First Moon Landing* (1969). By the 1950s, scientists were able to predict that, if the moon was billions of years old, it would have a thick layer of dust many miles thick. This is due to the fact, as \*R.A. Lyttleton explained, the lunar surface is exposed to direct sunlight and strong ultraviolet light and X-rays from the sun gradually destroying the surface layers of exposed rock, reducing them to dust at the rate of a few ten-thousandths of an inch per year. In 5 to 10 billion years, this would produce 20-60 miles [32-97 km] of dust (\*R.A. Lyttleton, quoted in R. Wysong, *Creation-Evolution Controversy*, p. 175).

Because of this, NASA first sent an unmanned lander, which made the discovery that there is very little dust on the moon's surface. In spite of that, Neil Armstrong feared that he and Edwin Aldrin might suffocate when they landed. But because the moon is young, they had no problem. Landing on July 20, 1969, they found not over 2 or three inches [5.08 or 7.62 cm] of dust on its surface. That is the amount one would expect if the moon were about 6000-8000 years old.

In \*Isaac Asimov's first published article (1958), he predicted that the first rocket to land on the moon would sink ingloriously in the dust, and everyone inside would perish (*Article mentioned in \*Isaac Asimov, Asimov on Science: A Thirty-Year Retrospective, 1989, pp. xvi-xvii*).*Bone Inventory* (1971). A complete listing of all the Australopithecine finds, up

to the end of 1971, was printed in a new book. This included all the African bones of our "half-ape, half-human ancestors" (*\*Time-Life, The Missing Link, Vol. 2*). Although over 1400 specimens are described, most are little more than scraps of bone or isolated teeth. Not one complete skeleton of one individual exists. When parts of bones are found, they, of course, can be moved into various positions and be interpreted as belonging to different creatures with very different skull and jaw shapes. To this day, there is no real evidence of any genuine non-human ancestor of ours. Chapter 13 explains why reputable scientists question or reject the various finds by anthropologists.

*\*Matthews Attacks Darwinism (1971)*. By the latter part of the 20th century, even though the ignorant public continued to be told that evolution was a triumphant, proven success, it was difficult to find any scientist who would defend Darwin's theories before his peers. \*L. Harrison Matthews, another distinguished scientist, was asked to write a new introduction to Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, to replace \*Thompson's 1956 *Introduction* which scathingly attacked Darwinism. In his *Introduction*, Matthews said that Thompson's attacks on Darwin were "unanswerable." Then Matthews proceeded to add more damaging facts (*\*L. Harrison Matthews, Introduction to Charles Darwin, Origin of the Species, 1971 edition*). The evolutionary theory must have run into hard times, when book publishers cannot find a reputable scientist who is appreciative either of its basic teachings or its founder.

*Nice Symposium (1972)*. By the early 1970s, not only were biological evolutionists in turmoil, but cosmologists (astronomical evolutionists) were also. The Nice Symposium met in April 1972, to summarize what had been accomplished and list what was still unknown. The unanswered questions included just about every aspect of evolution in outer space! (See "Nice" in Index for a number of the questions.) How did hydrogen clouds form themselves into stars? How did linear momentum from the theorized Big Bang change itself into angular momentum—and begin circling. How did the planets and moons form? The entire list is mind-boggling. After all these years, the astronomers still do not have answers to any of the basic evolutionary problems (*Review of the Nice Symposium, in R.E. Kofahl and K.L. Segraves, The Creation Explanation, pp. 141-143*). *Institute for Creation Research (1972)*. Henry Morris and associates founded the Institute for Creation Research (ICR) this year. It has since become the leading anti-evolution organization in the world and is located in El Cajon, California.

*Return of the Hopeful Monster (1972)*. \*Stephen Jay Gould, a highly respected paleontologist at Harvard; \*Niles Eldredge, the head paleontologist at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City; and \*Steven M. Stanley, of Johns Hopkins University, have led out in resuscitating \*Richard Goldschmidt's "hopeful monster" theory—and demanding that the community of evolutionary scientists consider it as the only possible mechanism for trans-species changeovers. It was first revived in a cautious science paper presented by \*Gould and \*Eldredge

in 1972 (*Punctuated Equilibria: An Alternative to Phyletic Gradualism*, 1972), but it was not until 1977 that an article by Gould brought it back to center stage ("*Return of the Hopeful Monsters*," in *Natural History*, June-July, 1977). The increasing despondency among evolutionists, over their inability to use natural selection or mutations, to provide even the slightest evidence of cross-species evolution, eventually led large numbers of scientists, in the 1980s, to switch over to this astoundingly ridiculous concept that millions of beneficial mutations occur once every 50,000 years to two creatures, a male and female who are living near each other—thus producing a new species pair!

*Poll of Citizens and Parents* (1973). A survey of 1346 homes found that 89% said creation should be taught in the public schools. In a separate poll of 1995 homes, 84% said scientific evidence for creation should be presented along with evolution ("*A Comparison of Students Studying . . . Two Models*," in *Decade of Creation*, 1981, pp. 55-56). *Dudley's Radiodating Research* (1975). Radiodating of the sedimentary rocks, based on uranium, thorium, and other chains, had become relied on heavily to provide the "millions of years" dates. But a broad variety of research data repeatedly demonstrated that these methods are extremely unreliable (much more on this in chapter 6, *Inaccurate Dating Methods*). \*H.C. Dudley, one of these researchers, found that using pressure, temperature, electric and magnetic fields, stress in monomolecular layers, etc., he could change the decay rates of 14 different radioisotopes. *The implications of this are astounding*. The strata were laid down under great pressure, and samples would vary widely to temperature and other changes. Such discoveries, along with the fact that the dates never agree with one another, greatly reduce the value of radiodating uranium, thorium, and other rocks (\*H.C. Dudley, "Radioactivity Re-Examined," in *Chemical and Engineering News*, April 7, 1975, p. 2).

\**Leakey's Footprints* (1977). Throughout the 20th century, human footprints have been found in supposedly ancient rock, sometimes with dinosaur prints. We will mention only a couple examples in this chapter (see chapter 13, *Ancient Man*, for more). In approximately 1977, \*Mary Leaky found at Laetoli in Africa, 30 miles [48 km] south of Olduvai Gorge, human footprints which, by the strata they are on, evolutionists date at nearly 4 million years in the past. Yet they are identical to modern human footprints. These and other footprints disprove evolutionary theories, especially those in which dinosaur prints are found with human footprints. Dinosaurs are said to be dated from 65 million to 135 million years ago; whereas man is said to have appeared far more recently (*National Geographic*, April 1979; *Science News*, February 9, 1980). *Plesiosaur Discovered* (1977). Scientists have wondered for decades whether an "extinct" dinosaur would ever be found alive. Then, in April 1977, a Japanese fishing vessel caught a 4000 pound [1814 kg], 10 meter [33 ft] creature in its nets off the east coast of New Zealand. A qualified zoologist was on board and photographed and examined it carefully and confirmed that, indeed, it was a *plesiosaur*, a

sea-dwelling dinosaur which supposedly had been dead for 100 million years! They were so thrilled, that they published scientific papers on it and issued a postage stamp! But, recognizing that the creature would disprove their fossil/strata theory, Western scientists said it must have been a sea lion! There was an almost total news blackout on this in the West, with the exception of a few publications (*\*New York Times, July 24, 1977; Nature, July 28, 1977*). For more information and pictures, turn to chapter 12, *Fossils and Strata.Chinese Characters Explained* (1979). Chinese is one of the most ancient written languages in existence. Each Chinese character is a combination of several different words. C.H. Kang and Ethel R. Nelson did extensive research into Chinese words and discovered the characters contain the story of Creation, the Garden of Eden, the fall of Adam and Eve, and the Flood story. For example, the word, "boat," is made up of two words: vessel and eight (Genesis 7:7, 13:8:13). Tempter is devil, cover, and tree (Genesis 3:1-6). In chapter 14, *Effects of the Flood*, will be found several more examples, plus an illustration of what some of them look like (*C.H. Kang and Ethel R. Nelson, The Discovery of Genesis: How the Truths of Genesis Were Found Hidden in the Chinese Language, 1979*).Poll of University Students (1979). A poll of students at Bowling Green State University, Ohio, found a clear majority of both undergraduate and graduate students taking biology classes favored the teaching of both creation and evolution in the schools. Undergraduate students: 91%, graduate students: 71.8% (*Jerry Bergman, "Attitude of University Students toward the Teaching of Creation and Evolution in the Schools, Origins, Vol. 6, 1979, pp. 64-66*).Polystrate Mystery Solved (1980). Upright (polystrate) tree trunks, 10-30 ft [31-95 dm] in length, have often been found in coal beds. Yet the coal beds were supposed to have been laid down over millions of years. Why are vertical tree trunks in them? Just after the Mount St. Helens explosion in May 1980, analysis of nearby Spirit Lake revealed many vertical, floating tree trunks in it. During the Flood, such tree trunks could easily have quickly been surrounded by sediments and buried (*\*Edward L. Hold, "Upright Trunks of Neocalamites form the Upper Triassic," Journal of Geology, 55:511-513, 1947; Steven A. Austin, "Mount St. Helens and Catastrophism," in Impact, July 1986, pp. 1-3*).Sunderland Interviews the Experts (1980-1981). Over a one-year period, and with their permission, Luther Sunderland tape-recorded interviews with three of the most important paleontologists in the world, who are in charge of at least 50 percent of the major fossil collections on the planet, covering every basic fossil discovery in the past 150 years. He found that not one of them could name a single missing link, a halfway species between our regular species (*L.D. Sunderland, Darwin's Enigma, p. 89*). There are no transitional forms. For more on this, see , [Fossils and Strata](#).

*Chicago Evolution Conference* (1980). While the newspapers, popular magazines, and school textbooks emblazoned evolutionary theory as being essentially proven scientifically in so many ways, the evolutionary scientists were discouraged. They knew the truth. The Switzerland, Wistar, and Alpbach meetings had clearly shown them theirs was a

losing cause. However, in yet another futile effort, in October 1980, 160 of the world's leading evolutionary scientists met again, this time at the University of Chicago. In brief, it was a verbal explosion. Facts opposing evolution were presented, and angry retorts and insults were hurled in return. The following month, *\*Newsweek (November 3, 1980)* reported that a large majority of evolutionists at the conference agreed that the neo-Darwinian mechanism (of mutations working with natural selection) could no longer be regarded as scientifically valid or tenable. Neither the origin nor diversity of living creatures could be explained by evolutionary theory (*\*Roger Lewin, "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire," in Science, November 21, 1980; \*G.R. Taylor, Great Evolution Mystery, 1983, p. 55*). Why is the public still told that evolution is essentially proven and all the scientists believe it,—when both statements are far from the truth?

***New York City Evolution Conference (1981).*** The following year, another important meeting was held, this one at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City. *\*Colin Patterson*, senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, read a paper in which he declared that evolution was "positively anti-knowledge" and added, "All my life I had been duped into taking evolution as revealed truth." Yet Patterson is in charge of millions of fossil samples, and he is well-acquainted with the collection. Commenting on the crisis, another scientist, *\*Michael Ruse*, wrote that the increasing number of critics included many with "the highest intellectual credentials" (*\*Michael Ruse, "Darwin's Theory: An Exercise in Science," in New Scientist, June 25, 1981, p. 828*). ***Panspermia (1981).*** Amid the cries of desperation and despair, arising from evolutionary scientists, one of the most famous scientists of the 20th century, a Nobel Prize winner, came up with a new theory. In 1981, *\*Francis Crick*, the co-discoverer of the structure of the DNA molecule, published a book, declaring that "*directed panspermia*" was responsible for life on earth. According to this theory, people from another planet sent a rocket down here, with living creatures on it, in order to populate our planet! Crick admits that this does not explain how nearly all our plant and animal species came into existence. Nor does it explain the transportation problem. Centuries of travel through the cold of outer space would be required. This theory is a desperate, gasping effort to provide a solution to the question of how living creatures originated, a puzzle which thousands of scientists in 150 years of diligent work have not been able to solve. Very few intellectuals have accepted panspermia.

***Cambridge Evolution Conference (1984).*** Desperate for a solution, at a 1984 seminar held at Cambridge University, *\*Stephen Gould's* "hopeful monster" theory was discussed (the wild idea that a lizard laid an egg, one day, and a bird hatched). *\*Karl Popper's* theory of science was also discussed. Popper is the leading expert on the philosophy of science. His position is that a theory must be testable. Evolution, of course, does not meet the test. (See chapter 37, *Philosophy of History*, on our website.)



***Second Mechanism Changeover (1980s).*** The utterly unscientific "hopeless monster" theory, which \*Richard Goldschmidt's proposed in the 1930s, totally astounded the evolutionary world. Yet, as the years passed and a great mountain of evidence surfaced against both natural selection and mutations as mechanisms of cross-species change, the experts felt desperate. —There was nothing left but the theory of sudden, miraculous "million mutation," beneficial changes once every 50,000 years, which \*Gould, \*Stanley, and their associates were increasingly urging. Just as astronomers had, in desperation, accepted the ridiculous Big Bang explosion theory 20 years before as the cause of a universe of orderly galactic systems, so the biological evolutionists now went farther out on their own evolutionary limb. Geneticists, biologists, and paleontologists recognized that the evolution of one species out of another was impossible otherwise. Evolutionists, feeling hopeless, returned to the hopeful monster.

***Answers in Genesis (1980s).*** Ken Ham started Answers in Genesis, a creationist organization now located in Florence, Kentucky. It has rapidly become a powerful voice in unveiling evolutionary errors in meetings on college and university campuses and elsewhere. For every one creationist organization now in operation, there ought to be a hundred.

***\*Halton C. Arp Eliminated (1983).*** A leading astronomer and president of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific in the early 1980s, Arp carried on research for over 30 years, including extensive research time at Palomar and Mount Wilson Observatories. He studied over 260 galaxies in more than 80 groups and tabulated 24 main galaxies and 38 discordant redshift companions, plus much more. All of this refutes the speed theory of redshift which, along with background radiation, was the crutch that evolutionists leaned on to defend the Big Bang (*\*Halton Arp, Quasars, Redshifts and Controversies, 1987, p. 5, plus many scientific articles*). Threatened with disbarment from U.S. observatories, if he did not stop tearing down one of the two Big Bang pillars, he refused. A few eminent astronomers, including the renowned astrophysicist, \*Geoffrey Burbidge, made impassioned pleas for everyone to keep an open mind, but to no avail. In 1983, Caltech's telescope allocation committee decided that Arp's line of research was not worthy of support and he was to receive no more time for his work at the telescopes of the Mount Wilson and Palomar observatories. Refusing to switch over to politically acceptable studies, he left Caltech for a position at the Max Planck Institute in Munich, where he continued to pursue his ideas. Referring to his abrupt and ignoble ouster, Burbidge later wrote, 'No responsible scientist I know, including many astronomers who were strongly opposed to Arp's thesis, believes justice was served' " (*\*Time-Life, Cosmic Mysteries (1990), pp. 67-68*). ***Orce Man Debunked (1984).*** Thrilling news! At last one of our half-ape ancestors had been found in the Andalusia region of Spain. Certified as the "oldest man in Europe" by a distinguished team of paleontologists, it made the headlines as invitations were mailed to scientists throughout the continent to attend a

meeting, where they could deliver learned papers about the matter. But then scientists in Paris discovered that it was a skull fragment of a four-month-old donkey. Spanish officials had to quickly mail 500 letters canceling the meeting ("*Ass Taken for Man*," \**London Daily Telegraph*, May 14, 1984). *Archaeopteryx Debunked* (1985). Although no cross-species (half of one species and half of another) had ever been found, something close to it had been discovered. As mentioned earlier, in 1861 a fossilized feather was found in the limestone deposits in Solnhofen, Germany (near Eichstatt). It was considered valuable since it reportedly came from the late Jurassic strata—and there were not supposed to be any birds back then. Soon another fossil was offered for sale (always from the owners of the same quarry). It was a bird with feathers, with the head and neck missing. The British Museum paid a lot for it. So, in 1877, another bird with feathers was offered for sale—and this one looked like it might have the head of a small dinosaur!

In 1985, six leading scientists, including \*Fred Hoyle, examined the fossil—and found it to be a hoax. For details, see chapter 17, *Evolutionary Showcase*.

*Arkansas Creation Trial* (1981). In December 1981 at the Federal District Court in Little Rock, Arkansas, Judge William Overton presided over a trial to decide whether the State of Arkansas could place concepts about creation in public school textbooks. The courtroom of 200 was packed with reporters. The ACLU had over 50 lawyers and paralegals working on the case. In contrast, the Arkansas Attorney General's office could only commit three of its attorneys to the case. One ACLU witness, \*Francisco J. Ayala, testified that the origin of living creatures from dirt and water, though it occurred, was not part of evolution! That nicely took that evolutionary puzzle out of the court trial. At any rate, on the basis of a variety of dodges and misstatements by the plaintiffs, the judge ruled against Arkansas State. It is a known fact that the ACLU has advised every state legislature, considering enactment of a law permitting equal time for both views, that the ACLU will give them another full-blown "monkey trial," as they did at Dayton, Tennessee in 1925. The evolutionists never defend their position with scientific facts, for they do not have any. Instead, they use ridicule and lawsuits (*Norman Geisler, The Creator and the Courtroom*, 1982; *Robert Gentry, Creation's Tiny Mystery*, 1986). *Radioactive Halos Disprove Molten Earth Theory* (1986). Robert V. Gentry carried on research into radiohalos in granite for years, but was discharged from Oak Ridge Research Laboratory in 1982 because he testified in defense of Arkansas State at the above-mentioned trial. He then put his years of research findings and professional articles into a book (*Creation's Tiny Mystery*, 1986). In brief, billions upon billions of polonium 218 radiohalos are in granite, yet each halo was formed in less than 3 minutes. There is no way the halos could get in there after the granite was formed, yet the granite had to be solid when the halos formed. *This means the granite was created solid in less than three minutes!* Since granite is the basement rock under every continent, it would be impossible for the earth to once have been a

molten mass as conjectured by the evolutionists. Interestingly enough, granite can be melted; but it will reform into rhyolite, never into granite. See , [Origin of the Earth](#), for a brief summary of data on this;

***Poll of Biology Teachers (1988).*** A survey, conducted by the University of Texas, found that 30% of 400 high- school biology teachers believe in Biblical creation and only 19% believe in evolution (*Waco Tribune-Herald, September 11, 1988*). ***Chernobyl (1990)*** is another evolutionist's paradise. Since mutations are today thought to be the leading mechanism for achieving evolutionary change for the better, the intense radiation which the people received on April 27, 1990, should have brought them great benefit because of all the mutations it induced. They should be stronger, healthier, have improved organs, and produce children which are higher forms of life. But this has not happened. Scientists know that even Marie Curie and her daughter died as a result of working with radiation. Mutations result in harm and death, never in evolutionary change (*\*Isaac Asimov, Asimov's New Guide to Science, 1984, pp. 691-692*).

---

"I have often thought how little I should like to have to prove organic evolution in a court of law."—*\*Errol White, Proceedings of the Linnean Society, London (1966) [an ichthyologist (expert on fish) in a 1988 address before a meeting of the Linnean Society in London]*.

"I doubt if there is any single individual within the scientific community who could cope with the full range of [creationist] arguments without the help of an army of consultants in special fields."—*\*David M. Raup, "Geology and Creation," Bulletin of the Field Museum of Natural History, Vol. 54, March 1983, p. 18.*