



UNMASKING EVOLUTION

by *Laurence D Smart* BScAgr, Dip Ed, Grad Dip Ed

The Resource Book

REPRODUCIBLE
BLACK-LINE
MASTERS

Copy freely

Copyright

The copyright for this publication
belongs to Laurence D Smart.

Acknowledgements

All quotes included in this publication are the property
of the various writers. Re-use of these quotes should
include the relevant bibliographic acknowledgement.

Reproduction

This publication may be freely copied for personal use, or
for distribution. Such reproduction must be without
alteration, subtraction or addition, and in the exact format.
The name of this author must always be visible.
Reproduction may be in part or whole. Distribution price
must only cover duplication and postage costs.

Please copy and distribute

ISBN 0-646-36143-0

first edition: - **August 1995**

revised: - **May 1996**

reprinted: - **July 2000**

Web version: - **September 2000**

Published by
Laurence D Smart
PO Box 175, Kippax ACT 2615
Australia

FORWARD

The theory of evolution is believed to be an incontrovertible fact by the general public and most of the scientific community, and is taught as such by most educators. This should not be the case.

The theory of evolution is a valid scientific hypothesis, but the facts are that it has not been proved beyond a shadow of a doubt. To be proven valid, the theory of evolution must undergo the scrutiny (rigours) of the scientific method. This, however, cannot be accomplished because the millions of years required for experimental testing are beyond the reasonable limit of human observation.

The current 'evidence' for the theory of evolution would not stand up in a court of law while undergoing judicial scrutiny. There would be indications that biased interpretation of data had occurred, as alternative theories could be presented to account for observed and tested facts.

The theory of evolution needs its facade of scientific immutability lifted, and exposed for what it really is - an unproven scientific theory.

My university training and experience as a research scientist, led me to do an analysis of the scientific data on evolution. This set of facts and quotes is my expose, and it is a step in the direction of lifting evolution's facade.

L.D.Smart

(15/4/95)

INTRODUCTION

I have been teaching science for over 25 years, but I have had a number of problems with the theory of evolution.

1. I knew that there were no absolute proofs for evolution.
2. Almost all of my colleagues taught evolution as a fact.
3. All the textbooks presented evolution and the geological ages as facts.
4. The media presented evolution as a fact, announcing new 'proofs' with great fanfare, but not reciprocating when 'proofs' were falsified.
5. I knew that many of the 'proofs' of evolution were no longer regarded as proof by the world's leading scientists.
6. I knew that a lot of research was disproving evolution, but the results were either not reaching the teaching profession, or the teachers were biased and refused to present them to their students.

With this background, I decided to write this book. It was written as a resource for science teachers and students, as a collation of information that contradicts what is being taught in schools. I have structured each section by addressing its basic premises and then replying from logic, research, and the world's leading scientists.

Each section is introduced with the statement, "Evolution says". I did this because this is the way it is imposed on school children, i.e. as an irrefutable dictum. I reply with "The facts are", presenting factual material that should be included in lessons in schools.

The material I present in this book represents the factual information that was available at the time of publishing. There will be a myriad of responses regarding their validity, age, etc., however, these will be personal opinions which do not restrict the contents from being considered by others.

Subject Contents

THE BIG BANG	1
C.O.B.E. PROBE.....	2
THE UNIVERSE.....	3
SOLAR SYSTEM - THE SUN	4
SOLAR SYSTEM - THE PLANETS	5
THE EARTH	6
THE MOON	7
NEW PLANETS.....	8
STARS	9
COMETS.....	10
EARTH'S MAGNETIC FIELD.....	11
THE EARTH'S TILT & THE ICE AGES.....	12
GEOLOGIC PROCESSES	13
PLATE TECTONICS	14
CONTINENTAL DRIFT	15
ROCK FORMATION.....	16
LIMESTONE CAVES	17
OIL FORMATION	18
COAL FORMATION	19
GEOLOGIC COLUMN.....	20
RADIODATING	21
RADIODATING ERRORS	22
RADIOCARBON DATING	23
CHEMICAL EVOLUTION	24
DNA.....	25
CAMBRIAN FOSSILS.....	26
PLANTS.....	27
FISH.....	28
AMPHIBIANS	29
REPTILES.....	30
DINOSAURS	31
DINOSAUR EXTINCTION	32
INVERTEBRATES	33
MAMMALS	34
HORSES	35
BIRDS.....	36
ARCHAEOPTERYX.....	37
PRIMATES	38

Subject Contents

PROCONSUL & RAMAPITHECUS	39
AUSTRALOPITHECUS	40
LUCY.....	41
HOMO ERECTUS & HOMO HABILIS	42
JAVA MAN & PEKING MAN	43
PILTDOWN MAN & OTHERS	44
NEANDERTALS	45
STONE AGE HUMANS	46
MODERN HUMANS.....	47
HUMAN EVOLUTIONARY TREE.....	48
HUMAN ORIGINS	49
SIMPLE-TO-COMPLEX	50
FOSSIL EVIDENCE	51
FOSSIL RECONSTRUCTION.....	52
INTERPRETING FOSSILS.....	53
'PRIMITIVE' ANIMALS	54
LIVING FOSSILS	55
MISSING LINKS AND INBETWEEN FORMS	56
EVOLUTIONARY CHANGE.....	57
EVOLUTION IN ACTION	58
COMPUTER SIMULATIONS.....	59
EVOLUTIONARY RELATIONSHIPS	60
VESTIGIAL ORGANS	61
EMBRYOLOGY	62
COMPARATIVE ANATOMY.....	63
MUTATIONS	64
NATURAL SELECTION.....	65
GENETICS	66
THE TESTABILITY OF EVOLUTION	67
THE LOGIC OF EVOLUTION.....	68
ORDER & THE 2ND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS.....	69
THOMAS HUXLEY & CHAOS THEORY	70
DARWIN'S THEORY OF EVOLUTION.....	71
DARWIN	72
DISILLUSIONED EVOLUTIONISTS	73
SCIENTIFICALLY UNPROVEN	74
THE FACTS OF EVOLUTION.....	75
ADDENDUM	last page

"One morning I woke up and something had happened in the night, and it struck me that I had been working on this [evolution] stuff for twenty years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be so misled so long. Either there was something wrong with me or there was something wrong with Evolutionary theory. Naturally, I know there is nothing wrong with me"

"[The] question is: Can you tell me anything you KNOW about Evolution? Any one thing? Any one thing that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of Evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time, and eventually one person said, "I do know one thing - it ought not to be taught in high school"."

Part of a keynote address given at the American Museum of Natural History by Dr Colin Patterson (Senior Palaeontologist, British Museum of Natural History, London) in 1981. Unpublished transcript.



Evolution Says

The universe started with a huge explosion called the 'Big Bang' 20 billion years ago. This formed the stars and galaxies. The galaxies are swirling and rapidly moving apart. This is proof of the Big Bang.

The Facts Are

- (1) The Big Bang is not the only scientific theory on the origins of the universe. The Steady State and Plasma theories are both supported by many scientists who do not accept the Big Bang theory. These theories propose alternative explanations for the 'proofs' of the Big Bang theory. The Big Bang theory cannot therefore be regarded as a fact. Eric Lerner "The Big Bang Never Happened", Times Books: New York, 1992 p:295
- (2) The Big Bang theory requires the input of a tremendous amount of energy at the very beginning. No proof or explanation of the source of this energy has so far been forthcoming. Eric Lerner "The Big Bang Never Happened", Times Books: New York, 1992 p:295
- (3) "..... the fact of galaxies moving apart can be explained by many other states of matter and energy than a primeval atom that exploded. For that matter, the alleged explosion produces radiation and high-speed elementary particles, not galaxies. Galaxies moving apart have nothing whatever to do with the expanding motion of debris from an explosion." Astrophysicist Dr. Harold Slusher contending that the expanding universe is not a result of the 'big bang'. Quoted by Harold S. Slusher in his book, "The Origin of the Universe" (revised ed.), Institute of Creation Research: El Cajon (California), 1980 p:24
- (4) New findings in the realm of optics and plasma physics has thrown doubt on the Big Bang theory, indicating that the origin of the universe is purely a hypothesis, and not a fact. A Yale University physicist is quoted as saying, "There are a lot of fundamental assumptions we base our model [of the Big Bang] on that may be wrong". *Scientific American*, September, 1987 p:18-20
- (5) "The Big Bang Theory is crumbling. But many of my colleagues refuse to believe it But, as in Galileo's day, entrenched ideas are difficult to change It does not bother cosmologists that there is no evidence for such speculation [of the Big Bang Theory] or that none of these ideas solves the problem". A quote by the plasma physicist, Eric Lerner, in the *Manilla Bulletin*, June 5, 1991 p:7
- (6) "As a result of all this, the main efforts of investigators have been in papering over holes in the Big Bang theory, to build up an idea that has become ever more complex and cumbersome I have little hesitation in saying that a sickly pall now hangs over the Big Bang theory." Written by Sir Fred Hoyle, famous British astronomer and cosmologist in "The Big Bang Under Attack", *Science Digest*, Vol. 92, May, 1984 p:84
- (7) "The latest data differ by so much from what theory would suggest as to kill the big-bang cosmologies. But now, because the scientific world is emotionally attracted to the big-bang cosmologies, the data are ignored". Written by Sir Fred Hoyle, famous British astronomer and cosmologist in "The Big Bang in Astronomy", *New Scientist*, Vol. 92, No. 1280, 1981 p:522-523
- (8) "There is no mechanism known as yet that would allow the universe to begin in an arbitrary state and then evolve to its present highly-ordered state." Written by evolutionist and physicist Don A. Page in "Inflation Does not Explain Time Asymmetry", *Nature*, Vol. 304, July 7, 1983 p:40
- (9) "Cosmology is unique in science in that it is a very large intellectual edifice based on very few facts." Written by Astronomer Halton Arp in "The Extragalactic Universe: An Alternative View", *Nature*, Vol. 346, 1990 p:807-812
- (10) "Never has such a mighty edifice been built on such insubstantial foundations". Editorial comment on the Big Bang theory in *New Scientist*, December 21-28, 1992 p:3



Evolution Says

The COBE space probe found ripples in the background of space which proves that the Big Bang occurred.

The Facts Are

- (1) Images of space captured by the Cosmic Background Explorer (COBE) satellite have been labelled as the first hard evidence of the proof of the Big Bang Theory of the origin of the universe. However, the patterns recorded were temperature gradients, which were only about 30 millionths of a degree warmer than the surrounding space - an infinitesimally minute gradient. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25/4/92
- (2) The 30 millionth of a degree fluctuations in the temperature of the universe has recently had its validity challenged. A member of the team who designed the instrument that took the readings has categorically stated that it was not sensitive enough to take readings that small. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1992 p: 14-15
- (3) An article in *Science* says that the variations claimed in the COBE project are well below the level of instrument noise, a type of background interference that would cover up such readings. It went on to say that the readings were obtained by statistical methods which still need careful checking. *Science*, May 1, 1992 p:612
- (4) George Smoot, the man in charge of the COBE project, admitted in *Science* that the readings may not be real, and that even if the measurements were real, they could have been caused by other effects such as the motion of our galaxy through the background radiation. *Science*, May 1, 1992 p:612
- (5) Two Yale scientists have stated in *Scientific American* that the 'bumps' in the readings of background space radiation taken by COBE have no bearing on what the structure of the universe was like billions of years ago. Their theory is that the variations in readings were caused by gravity waves - a prediction of the Theory of General Relativity. *Scientific American*, October 1992, p:15
- (6) An article in *Nature* concludes that all that can be said is that the readings are consistent with the doctrine of the Big Bang, and that it is a cause of some alarm that the media has announced that "we now know" how the universe began. *Nature*, March 30, 1992 p:731



Evolution Says

The universe is 20 billion years old, and it is expanding as a result of the Big Bang. The rotating, spiral galaxies were caused by the Big Bang.

The Facts Are

- (1) The age of the universe under evolutionary theory is not set. Over the seven years to 1987, the various dates for the universe have been 15 billion, 12 billion, 19 billion, 8 billion, 20 billion, and finally 11 billion. *The West Australian*, July 7, 1987; *New Scientist*, February 9, 1984; *NCSE Reports*, Vol. 11, No. 4, 1991 p:17
- (2) The work of Barry Setterfield with the decay of the speed of light has shown from his analysis of the red shift in the light from stars, that the age of the universe is approximately 6,000 years old. Paul D. Ackerman, "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p: 73-76
- (3) The red shift actually occurs in evenly spaced values or jumps, not in a smooth manner as it would be if the universe was expanding. *Scientific American*, December, 1992 p:19-20
- (4) Plasma physicist, Eric Lerner, is on record as saying that the Big Bang theory is not correct. He has stated that the huge conglomeration of galaxies could not have formed in 20 billion years. *Manilla Bulletin*, June 5, 1991 p:7; Eric Lerner, "The Big Bang Never Happened", Times Books: New York, 1992 p:295
- (5) Many world class astronomers are challenging the Big Bang theory of the origins of the universe. They contend that fresh analysis of the data suggests that the enormous clustering of galaxies, the two Great Walls of Galaxies, are too vast to have been formed from such an explosion. *Nature*, Vol. 349, No. 6304, January 3, 1991; *Science News*, November 25, 1989 p:340; *Science*, Vol. 263, March 25, 1994 p:1684
- (6) "The problem of explaining the existence of galaxies has proved to be one of the thorniest in cosmology. By all rights, they just shouldn't be there, yet there they sit. It's hard to convey the depths of frustration that this simple fact induced among scientists." Written by evolutionist James Trefil in "The Dark Side of the Universe", Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1988 p:55
- (7) The evolutionary time-scale for the 'breakup' or dissipation of cluster galaxies is 2-4 million years, as there are too many cluster galaxies. This means that the universe cannot be 20 billion years old. In fact, exhaustive searches of the universe has failed to find any field galaxies - the independent galaxies that cluster galaxies disperse into. Paul D. Ackerman, "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p:68-70
- (8) The observed speed of rotating galaxies is so fast that they cannot be more than a few hundred million years old. This is called the 'Winding-up Dilemma' and evolutionists have tried to explain it with the theory of 'density waves'. This wave theory has conceptual problems, and is a hypothesis which has not been confirmed by observation. H. Scheffler & H. Elsasser, "Physics of the Galaxy and Interstellar Matter", Springer Verlag: Berlin, 1987 p:352-353 & 401-413
- (9) "We know of no process that can maintain a spiral arm [of a galaxy] for more than two galactic revolutions". Written by Hadley Wood in his book "Unveiling the Universe", American Elsevier Publishing Co: New York, 1968 p:188
- (10) "If this theory is true, the universe is young, since it has so many rapidly revolving spirals." Written by C.B. Clason as a logical conclusion to the mechanical fact that galactic spiral arms cannot be maintained for more than 2 revolutions. Expressed in his book "Exploring the Distant Stars", G.P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1958 p:326
- (11) The age of the universe, recently calculated from the Hubble Space Telescope's data, is 8-12 billion years old. However, the objects in the universe are believed to be 16 billion years old. This means that there is a paradox - the objects are older than the universe. *Nature*, Vol. 371, 1994 p:741-742; *Science News*, Vol. 146, 1994 p:232-234; *Science*, Vol. 267, 1995 p:980-983; *Nature*, Vol. 372, 1994 p:304.



Evolution Says

The Sun is 4.5 - 5.0 billion years old. In the past it was fainter. The sun produces light by nuclear-fusion.

The Facts Are

(1) Evidence that the sun is shrinking has come from Professor Wan Lai of the Shanghai Observatory of the Chinese Academy of Science. The rates of shrinkage obtained are 1.5km per year. This was derived from the data that the sun has shrunk 410km in the 273 years from 1715 to 1987. At this rate of shrinkage, if the sun was one million years old it would have been twice its current diameter. Ten million years ago it would have been too hot for life to exist on earth. It would be touching the earth if it was 210 million years old. If this shrinkage has always been constant, then, using uniformitarian thinking, our solar system could not be billions of years old. *The Australian*, April 14, 1990; *Astrophysical Journal*, Vol. 248, 1981 p:1144-1155; *Impact*, No. 82, 1980

(2) Tests indicate that only one third of the amount of neutrino particles are being emitted from the sun, compared to that predicted from our understanding of nuclear physics. The phenomenon has been dubbed 'the missing neutrino problem', and no amount of calculations has been able to explain it. It has been the commitment of astrophysicists to a 4.5-5.0 billion year evolutionary age for the sun that has produced this dilemma, yielding the problem unresolved. If the sun was very much younger, and if it was accepted that the sun was indeed shrinking and that it produces some of its heat and light by gravitational collapse, then the problem would be resolved. *Nature*, Vol.336, 1988 p:615; *Nature*, Vol.334, 1988 p:487-493

(3) Theoretical astronomy, based on the big bang and evolution, says that in the distant past the Sun was cooler and radiated less. This produces the 'faint early sun' problem which means that conditions on earth would not have been favourable for evolution to have occurred. Theoretical climate models, say that if the sun gave off 1% less radiation, it would produce an ice age on earth. Astronomical models predict that 2 billion years ago the earth would have been covered with ice if the solar radiation was 15-20% less than today's level. A study of geology suggests otherwise. These problems arise when the solar system is viewed from an evolutionary perspective. *Geotimes*, Vol. 23, 1978 p:18

(4) The Poynting-Robertson Effect occurs when the particles that make up light (photons) collide with cosmic dust, slowing them down. Over the billions of years of assumed evolutionary time, the cosmic dust moving in orbit around the sun should have been sorted by size by the Poynting-Robertson Effect - the lighter particles being slowed down more quickly than the heavy ones. Careful measurements made of meteor streams by the famous astronomer Fred Whipple (Harvard University) showed, however, that there is no sorting whatsoever. This investigation adds weight to the idea that the universe is not billions of years old. Paul D. Ackerman, "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p:33-35

(5) Sputtering, the phenomenon where photons collide with tiny particles of cosmic dust eventually destroys them, should eventually remove tiny particles from the solar system. If the solar system is as old as the theory of evolution says, then all tiny cosmic dust particles should have been 'swept' away long ago. This is not the case, showing that a young age for the solar system is closer to the truth. Paul D. Ackerman, "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p:35

(6) "There is no evidence based on solar observation that the Sun is 4.5-5.0 billion years old. I suspect that the Sun is 4.5×10^9 [ie 4.5 billion] years old. However, given some new and unexpected results to the contrary, and some time for frantic recalculation and theoretical readjustment, I suspect that we could live with Bishop Ussher's value for the age of the Earth and Sun. I don't think we have much in the way of observational evidence in astronomy to conflict with that." Written by solar investigator John Eddy in his article "It's About Time: 4.5 Billion Years", *Geotimes*, Vol. 23, 1978 p:18



Evolution Says

The solar system formed 5.0 billion years ago, with the Sun and all the planets in their place. Life has also evolved

The Facts Are

(1) The data sent back from the Magellan spacecraft as it scanned the planet Venus amazes scientists. The data revealed a landscape with evidence of neither crater degradation, nor highly eroded terrain, nor local volcanic activity. The lack of ancient terrain is surprising as it indicates that the planet is young. *Chicago Sun-Times*, March 11, 1994 p:26; *EOS*, Vol. 72 No. 25, June 18, 1991 p:265-7

(2) Photographs taken of a volcano on Jupiter's moon, Io, by the Voyager space probe in 1979, indicate that the moon is geologically active. If Jupiter and its moons were formed 5 billion years ago, the moons should have become cold and inactive long ago. This continuing volcanic activity indicates that the moon, and therefore Jupiter, are not that old. *Life*, May, 1979 p:46

(3) In the 1980's, the Voyager 1 & 2 spacecrafts took close-up photos of Saturn. They showed that the planet actually had many hundreds of rings in its 255,000 Km halo. Reflectivity tests on the rings suggest that the particles which make them up are most likely coated with fine, dust-like ice. Micro-meteoroids would gradually erode and darken the particle surfaces, and even if they were pure ice they would be blackened after about 100 million years. Evolution demands that the planet is 5 billion years old, but the data from the space probe gives an upper limit of 100 million years to the rings. If Saturn had its rings when it was formed, then it is not 5 billion years old. *Sky and Telescope*, July 1989 p:10-11

(4) Analysis of the data collected from Uranus by Voyager 2 in 1986, has led to the planet being classified in the same class as Neptune. Its composition is somewhere between the hydrogen and helium rich planets of Jupiter and Saturn, and the rocky, metal and oxygen rich planets of the inner solar system. The planet's composition is not what was expected, based on the evolutionary model of the origin of our solar system. The model predicts that the lighter elements should increase with the planets distance from the vaporizing heat of the sun. Uranus, however, contains heavier material like Jupiter and Saturn, which are both closer to the sun. Neptune contains even heavier material still. The evolution of the solar system is undermined by these findings. *Scientific American*, January, 1987 p:30-38

(5) Evolutionists have proposed a theory that the Saturn's rings were formed from a breakup of one of its moons. Astronomer Wing-Huan Ip (Max Planck Institute for Astronomy), concludes from analysis, that this is not feasible. The moon would have to be 100 kilometres wide and would have to be shattered by a comet of at least 2 km in diameter. Ip calculates that the chances of such a ring-forming event happening is one in 30 billion years. This is twice the assumed age of the universe and probably could not have occurred. *Sky and Telescope*, July 1989 p:10-11

(6) The presence of life on Mars is not a proven fact. Even after the Viking I planetary module examined Mars' surface in 1976, argument about life on the planet has not abated. One experiment formally concluded that there was no life in the soil. Another experiment's results could be explained by either biological or non-biological processes. Mars cannot be conclusively used as an example of the evolution of life in the universe. *The Australian*, July 23, 1986

(7) The evidence for a huge shadowed human face on Mars has largely rested on the existence of a 'city' nearby. However, imaging specialist Gene Cordell found that the 'honeycomb' patterns which were supposed to be the 'city' were actually caused by the film processing technique - they were not on



Evolution Says

The earth is known to be nearly 5.0 billion years old. It formed as a consequence of the Big Bang.

The Facts Are

(1) The age of Earth is not known, as it is calculated indirectly. Its age depends on which indirect method is used to calculate it. Some alternative scientific calculations of the age of the earth are:-

(i) Build-up of Aluminium in the oceans from rivers	100 yrs	[4]
(ii) Build-up of Titanium in the oceans from rivers	160 yrs	[4]
(iii) Build-up of Manganese in the oceans from rivers	1,400 yrs	[4]
(iv) Movement of Helium-4 into the atmosphere	1,750-175,000 yrs	[1]
(v) Decay of Carbon-14 in pre-Cambrian wood	4,000 yrs	[2]
(vi) Build-up of Silicon in the oceans from rivers	8,000 yrs	[4]
(vii) Build-up of Nickel in the oceans from rivers	9,000 yrs	[4]
(viii) Movement of Uranium into the oceans from rivers	10,000-100,000 yrs	[1]
(ix) Build-up of Mercury in the oceans from rivers	42,000 yrs	[4]
(x) Build-up of Copper in the oceans from rivers	50,000 yrs	[4]
(xi) Build-up of Barium in the oceans from rivers	84,000 yrs	[4]
(xii) Decay of Palaeomagnetism	100,000 yrs	[2]
(xiii) Formation of Carbon-14 on meteorites	100,000 yrs	[3]
(xiv) Build-up of Carbonate in the oceans	100,000 yrs	[5]
(xv) Leaching of Chlorine from the continents	1,000,000 yrs	[5]
(xvi) Build-up of Calcium in the oceans	1,000,000 yrs	[5]
(xvii) Build-up of Potassium in the oceans from rivers	11,000,000 yrs	[4]

[1] *Nature*, Vol. 179, January 26, 1957 p:213

[2] Melvin A. Cook, "Prehistory and Earth Models", Max Parrish: London, 1966

[3] *Journal of Geophysical Research*, Vol. 77, No. 2, 1972 p:367-368

[4] J.P. Riley & G. Skirrow (eds), "Chemical Oceanography" (Vol. 1), Academic Press: New York, 1965 p:164

[5] Dudley J. Whitney, "The Face of the Deep", Vantage Press: New York, 1955

[see also Theodore W. Rybka, "Geophysical & Astronomical Clocks", American Writing & Pub. Co: Irvine (USA), 1992

(2) Most of the earth's land mass, according to evolutionary theory, is supposed to have been above sea-level for hundreds of millions of years. Yet, analysis of erosion data indicates that all the land should have been eroded away within 15 million years. This is based on an estimated rate of the removal of soil and rock by wind and water of the order of 25 billion tonnes per year. Even if the land rises as it erodes, it would not be enough to extend the age from 15 million years to 5 billion years. Gordeyev V.V. et al, "The Average Chemical Composition of Suspensions in the World's Rivers and the Supply of Sediments to the Ocean by Streams", *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR*, Vol. 238, 1980 p:150

(3) The earth receives an estimated 14 million tonnes of cosmic dust each year. At this rate, if the earth was 5 billion years old, there should be a 60m layer of this dust on the surface of the earth. Evolutionary theory dismisses this by saying that erosion and mixing has removed it from the surface. This hypothesis is unsatisfactory as there is not enough cosmic dust on Earth to support it. Meteoric dust is rich in nickel, approximately 300 times more than in earth's rocks. Nickel is rare in both the earth's crust and the oceans, indicating that the earth is young. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:22-23

(4) The speed of rotation of the earth is gradually slowing down due mainly to the gravitational pull of the sun and moon. If the earth is billions of years old, then the spin of the earth would have had to have been so fast at the start, that the continents would have been forced to the equator and the planet would be flatter rather than oval-shaped. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:25



Evolution Says

The origin of the moon is a known fact. The moon is 3 billion years old.

The Facts Are

(1) The origin of the moon is not a known fact, and the argument about its origin still rages among scientists. Some believe it came from the earth's crust (or mantle), and others, that it was a space object captured by the earth's gravity. Others believe that it formed as a result of the collision between a planetary body and the earth. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, October 20, 1990 p:23

(2) If the moon was 3 billion years old, then there should be a layer of dust on its surface at least 50m deep. The landing of space craft on the moon has shown the dust layer to be very small, indicating that the age of the moon is nowhere near this multi billion figure. Robert T. Dixon "Dynamic Astronomy", Prentice Hall: New Jersey, 1971 p:149; John W. Salisbury & Peter Glaser (eds) "The Lunar Surface Layer", Academic Press: New York, 1964; *Royal Astronomical Society of London: Monthly Notices*, Vol. 115, 1955 p:598-599; G.S. Hawkins (ed.) "Meteor Orbits and Dust, Smithsonian Contributions to Astrophysics" (vol. 2), Smithsonian Institute and NASA: Washington DC., 1976; *Scientific American*, Vol. 202, 1960 p:132

(3) There is a 30,000 trillion (30×10^{15}) tonne gravitational force between earth and the moon. The land and sea bulges on the earth in a slightly delayed response to the moon's gravitational field, causing a slightly forward 'pull' on the moon. This causes the moon to spiral slowly outwards, away from the earth, at a measured rate today of 4 cm per year. Using the appropriate differential equation which takes into account that the gravitational force varies with the distance of the moon from Earth, a date can be calculated that indicates when the moon was supposed to be part of Earth. The calculated maximum ceiling date is 1.4 billion years. This differs greatly from the 3 billion years of evolutionary time currently assigned to our earth-moon system. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 14, No. 4, 1991 p:43

(4) It is a recognised fact that glass slowly flows out of shape over hundreds of years. This is true of all solids, including rock. Most scientists believe the moon to be 3 billion years old, but a study of the basaltic rocks brought back from the moon by the Apollo astronauts rules out the age of lunar craters being anything over a million years old. The viscosity or flow rate used by scientists reveals that the craters could not have lasted for 3-4 billion years. If the upper limits of flow rates are used, the craters cannot be more than a few thousand years old. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 20, 1983 p:105-108

(5) Reports to the Fourth Lunar Science Conference included information that the moon has relatively abundant amounts of the short-lived radioisotopes Uranium-236 and Thorium-230. If the moon was billions of years old, as evolution demands, these isotopes would have long since decayed and disappeared. Their presence today indicates a young age for the moon. R.L. Wysong, "The Creation-Evolution Controversy", Inquiry Press: Midlands (Mississippi), 1976 p: p:177-178

(6) Analysis of data collected from the 2 month orbit of the spacecraft Clementine around the moon suggests that it is not a 4 billion year old cold object. It is believed from the analysis that the moon may have a molten core, but more tests will be required to confirm this. A molten core is inconsistent with long-age evolutionary development. *Science*, Vol. 264, 1994 p:1666-1667. *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1995 p:5

(7) "..... the moon is still active geologically. It is not the cold, dead body that the pre-space-age theories had depicted. Yet, it should be cold and dead if it is indeed billions of years old." Written by John Whitcomb and Donald DeYoung in "The Moon: Its Creation, Form and Significance", BMH Books: Winona Lakes (Indiana), 1978 p:126



Evolution Says

There are planets elsewhere in the universe. Some of these are like earth and will have evolved life on them. Finding other planets is proof of the evolution of the universe.

The Facts Are

(1) It has been stated that there are 100 billion billion (10^{20}) planets in the universe, with 10,000 of these evolving life like Earth. To reach this number, firstly there is a guess that there are 10^{22} stars in the universe; then a guess that one in a million suns is like our sun; then a guess that one in a million of these sun's has a solar system like ours; then a guess that one in a million of these solar systems has a planet like Earth. These numbers are guess-work based on pure supposition, they are not facts. *New Scientist*, January 17, 1980

(2) Scientists in 1983 claimed that they had discovered another solar system around Vega, the fifth brightest star in the sky. Their evidence for this was infra-red radiation detected from the sun's vicinity which had travelled the 7.4 billion miles from there. This they interpreted to represent energy re-radiated by solid particles heated up by Vega. Note that this is pure speculation based on the interpretation of data which cannot be seen to be verified. *Science News*, Vol. 124, August 13, 1983

(3) Claims in 1984 that the first 'planet' had been discovered outside the solar system has turned out to be a ball of gas orbiting star VB-8, some 21 light years away. The ball of gas is estimated to be as large as Jupiter, and to have a temperature of 2000°F. Robert Harrington of the US Naval Observatory has stated, "Only Don McCarthy [its discoverer] would call something that warm and that big a planet". *Discover*, February, 1985 p:11; *The Blade* (Toledo, Ohio), October 5, 1986

(4) A planet which was reportedly the first one discovered outside our solar system in July 1991 has since been declared as a mathematical error by its discoverers. When they re-worked their analysis of the radio signals coming from Pulsar PSR1829-10 (assessed as 30,000 light years away) they found they had not taken into account the correction for the slightly oval nature of Earth's orbit. No visible sightings have actually been made of this 'planet'. *Nature* 16/1/92 reported in *Sun Herald*, 26/1/92 p:46

(5) "On July 25 [1991] the three astronomers announced in *Nature* their observations of the regularly-varying radio beeps from a pulsar, known as PSR1829-10. They concluded that the variations could only be explained by the pulsar wobbling from the gravitational effect of a planet about 10 times the mass of Earth circling it once every six months. This six-month figure was later to prove the undoing of the original conclusion. *Nature* rushed the paper into print within three weeks and forewarned science journals of something big coming up. People and institutions almost tumbled over each other to be part of the action. The Australian Academy of Science added its weight, accelerating the local media into action. The 'planet' was acclaimed around the world as "the astronomical discovery of the decade". The headquarters in Sydney of CSIRO's Australia Telescope, where Dr Bailes [the discoverer] had come to work with his mentor, Dr Dick Manchester, became the nerve centre for a major media operation. Dr Bailes was accorded star treatment. In the past week, the individual scientists involved have been impressively open and frank about the situation. In contrast, the institutions have not been rushing into print to disassociate themselves from their official promotion of the "discovery"." Written by Peter Pockley in the "Science" Section, *The Sun-Herald*, 26/1/92 p:46

(6) "It is an act of faith, based on rather shaky probabilistic arguments, to say that other planets like Earth exist in the universe." Written by Dr Michael Rowan-Robinson in his article "The Infrared Landscape", *New Scientist*, January 31, 1980 p:325



Evolution Says

Stars evolved and are still evolving, just like the universe. This evolution takes millions of years.

The Facts Are

- (1) The theory that the sun and the stars produce their radiation from gravitational collapse was replaced by the nuclear-fusion theory in 1930. This change was to account for the billions of years that evolution demands for the age of the universe, but which the old theory could not accommodate. The failure of the neutrino catching experiment to verify the nuclear-fusion theory means that it must now be concluded that stars radiate due to gravitational collapse. As a logical consequence of this, stars must be nowhere near as old as evolution demands. *Science*, Vol. 191, 1976 p:264
- (2) The chemical composition of stars should change if they go through an evolutionary thermonuclear life cycle. The observations are, that stars of supposedly vastly different ages, have roughly the same chemical composition. This indicates that the evolutionary theory is in error, and places in doubt the vast ages of the universe. Paul D. Ackerman "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p:59-60
- (3) Stars are said to 'evolve' over millions of years, 'proof' of the evolution of the universe without observation. Star FG Sagittae, however, has been observed to change from a blue star to a yellow star in only 36 years. *New Scientist*, September 14, 1991 p:28-41
- (4) In 2000 B.C. the star Sirius was described by the Egyptians as being red in colour. Cicero in 50 B.C. described it as red, as did Ptolemy in 150 A.D. Sirius today is described as a 'white dwarf' - not a 'red giant'. According to evolutionary theory on the life cycle of stars, it should have taken at least 100,000 years for Sirius to collapse into a white dwarf. There is obviously error in the evolutionary theory of the ages of the stars. Paul D. Ackerman "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p:67
- (5) If the thermonuclear evolutionary life cycle of the sun was factual, it would have been fainter and cooler in the distant past. The estimated energy output at that time would have only been 5% less than today, however, it would have caused the earth to be solidly frozen in a crust of ice. These would be conditions unsuitable for life to evolve. *Science News*, Vol. 111, 1977 p:154
- (6) "For the past 15 years we have tried, in collaboration with many colleagues in astronomy, chemistry, and physics, to understand and test the theory of how the sun produces its radiant energy (observed on the earth as sunlight). All of us have been surprised by the results: there is a large, unexplained disagreement between observation and the supposedly well established theory. This discrepancy has led to a crisis in the theory of stellar evolution; many authors are openly questioning some of the basic principles and approximations in this supposedly dry (and solved) subject." Written by John N. Bahcall and Raymond Davis, Jr. in their article "Solar Neutrinos: A Scientific Puzzle", in *Science* Vol. 191, 1976 p:264



Evolution Says

Short period comets come from the Oort Cloud outside the solar system. Their continual supply from the Oort Cloud is proof that the solar system is billions of years old. Life from elsewhere in the universe has been discovered on comets.

The Facts Are

(1) The problem for evolution is that if short period comets only last about 10,000 years, and the solar system is 5 billion years old, then there should not be any of these comets left in existence. As short-period comets have been visible this century (eg Halley's comet), the solar system must be considerably younger than the date assigned to it by evolutionary theory. [based on logic]

(2) The belief in a 5 billion year old solar system has led to a hypothesis that these comets must be resupplied from outside the solar system - an example of a preconceived idea determining scientific belief. A vast shell of 100 billion comets, called the 'Oort Cloud' is theorized to exist at the outer edge of the solar system. Passing stars are supposed to disturb the cloud enough to knock a comet into an inner orbit. This is a theory that is not based on any observed facts. *Astrophysics and Space Science*, Vol. 31, 1974 p:385-401

(3) The facts about the Oort cloud are:- (1) It has never been observed, and should be regarded as an evolutionary prediction; (2) The calculated motions of comets do not match well with any predictions based on the Oort Cloud; and (3) Cometary evidence does not support the existence of an Oort cloud. *Astrophysics and Space Science*, Vol. 31, 1974 p:385-401

(4) Some researchers believe that if the Oort theory is true, then some comets from our solar system should have escaped. Likewise, we should have seen about six comets over the past 150 years from other star systems. *Science Frontiers*, May-June, 1990 p:1; *Sky & Telescope*, Vol. 79, 1990 p:254

(5) As the Oort Cloud has not been discovered yet, new theories are rising to explain the existence of short-life comets. The latest theory is that "Halley's comet comes from a second much closer belt of millions of comets just outside the solar system left over as debris and junk when the outer planets formed 5 billion years ago". This theory is spoken of in a factual manner, yet is not based on fact. *The Advertiser* (Adelaide), May 14, 1988 p:20

(6) A theory put forward for the origins of short-period comets states that they are belched out of volcanoes, most probably on Jupiter. But, (1) the theory is not supported by observation; (2) there is no planetary mechanism that would impart the force needed to expel the comets; (3) the physical makeup of comets does not match this origin; and (4) the comet would need to be travelling at over 700 Km/sec to escape a large planet, a speed which would cause it to vaporize in the process. Harold S. Slusher, "Age of the Cosmos: ICR technical Monograph #9", Institute for Creation Research: San Diego, 1980 p:49

(7) The evidence of life on comets is based on infra-red analysis of Haley's Comet which indicated that organic matter was pouring out of its head and tail. A study of the data, however, suggests that these organic molecules are not the kind associated with living organisms. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, April 3, 1986 p:2



Evolution Says

The strength of Earth's magnetic field is constant, and proves that the earth is billions of years old. The magnetic field measurements of rocks prove that the direction of Earth's magnetic field has gone through about 50 reversals. This confirms the age of the earth. The Dynamo Theory describes exactly the origin of Earth's magnetic field.

The Facts Are

- (1) There are basically two ages for the earth based on the strength of Earth's magnetic field and rock magnetic polarity. The calculated ages are - a young age (6,000 - 10,000 years) and an old age (over 600 million years). As there are two interpretations of the same data, neither calculations can be used as 'proof' of the age of the earth. [based on logic]
- (2) Over the past 1,000 years, the energy stored in the earth's magnetic field has decreased by a factor of 2.7. If this rate of decay has continued since the beginning, then the earth could be no more than 10,000 years old. Merrill, R.T. & McElhinney, M.W. "The Earth's Magnetic Field", Academic Press: London, 1983 p:101-106
- (3) The NASA Magsat satellite launched in 1979 has produced data which indicates that the earth's magnetic field has a half-life of only 830 years. This totally contradicts the uniformitarian evolutionary idea that the earth's magnetic field has remained largely unchanged during geological time. *Science News* Vol. 117, No. 26, 1980 p:407
- (4) As the earth's magnetic field is decaying, evolutionary theories relying on a constant field strength are erroneous. For example, as the magnetic field was stronger in the past, less cosmic radiation would have entered the atmosphere. This would have resulted in lower Carbon-14 production. Any estimates of age based on Carbon-14 are therefore grossly over estimated. *Science News*, Vol. 117, No. 26, 1980 p:407
- (5) Evolutionary theory tries to overcome the fact that the weakening strength of the earth's magnetic field is evidence for its very young age by inventing the reversal hypothesis. This says that the weakening magnetic field is part of a normal cycle of changes in the earth's poles. This hypothesis is not based on any observed or tested fact, and it has no valid scientific basis. Rock magnetism cannot be used to verify this theory as there is a self-reversal process known to exist in rocks which is completely independent of the earth's magnetic field. [based on logic]
- (6) Under evolutionary assumptions and time frames, the 50 or so reversals of magnetic polarity found in rocks are assigned a period of 600 million years. However, palaeomagnetic measurements of a lava flow at Steens Mountain (Oregon, USA) show that magnetic polarity reversals can take place in two weeks - the time period during which the lava cooled. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, Vol. 229, 1989 p:296-297
- (7) Dynamo theorists acknowledge that their theories concerning the source of the earth's magnetic field are incomplete, very complex, and not very successful in making predictions. *Nature*, Vol. 319, 1986 p:174-5
- (8) "... you would have thought we would have given up guessing about planetary magnetic fields after being wrong at nearly every planet in the solar system". Written by F. Bagenal in "The Emptiest Magnetosphere" *Physics World*, October, 1989 p:18-19



Evolution Says

The great variation in the earth's tilt is proof that the earth is billions of years old. The earth has been through 6 ice ages over the last billion years. They have occurred about every 150 million years and have lasted about 50 million years. The last ice age began 65 million years ago.

The Facts Are

(1) The great variation in the earth's tilt does not necessarily mean that the earth has been around for billions of years. Measurements of its changing tilt over the past 3,000 years can be explained very satisfactorily by an asteroid impact which formed the Pacific Ocean Basin, uplifted surrounding mountains and caused associated volcanic activity and earthquakes. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1990 p:38

(2) Meteor impact can easily explain every geological feature on earth. An analysis of the earth's geology suggests that there is no subsurface energy source capable of sustaining enough power for 5 billion years so that it could create new landforms and mountains, cause earthquakes and volcanoes, or renew the continental uplifts. According to one theory, geological phenomena are created immediately as a result of meteor collision, with basins at the point of impact and the force instantly building mountains and uplifting continents. If this theory is correct, the age of the earth is not enough to justify evolution. *American Association of Petroleum Geologists Explorer*, April 1989 p:18

(3) Australian astronomer George Dodwell, using reverse projections of the movement of the axis of the earth, has found that the earth had a sudden, dramatic tilt of its axis in 2345 B.C. The resultant wobble of the axis produced a curve that allowed the readings to fit perfectly the solar calendars of Eudoxus, Stonehenge, and the Solar Temple of Amen-Ra (these have been regarded by modern astronomers to be grossly in error). He believes that a possible explanation for the axial shift is an asteroid impact in the Pacific Ocean. Paul D. Ackerman, "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p:88-96

(4) The idea of Ice Ages has been widely propagated by geologists to explain certain geological formations. The common belief expressed is that these Ice Ages were caused by periods of incredible cold caused by sunlight being blocked from striking the earth's surface. Logical analysis of this scenario shows that the existence of a vast expanse of ice containing millions of cubic kilometres of water could only have formed if the world was actually warmer, where the energy input could produce such consistently large volumes of precipitation over an extended period. [Based on logic]

(5) "The skin of the mammoths show that they were almost certainly not particularly adapted to Arctic conditions any more than the great cats, bison, wolves, bears and horses which have been found buried in the same layers. Thus, when we think of mammoths, there is no reason to see them as necessarily associated with ice while they were alive. Mammoth bones have been found in Mexico." An editorial in *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1989 p:13

(6) The fact that mammoths have been 'snap-frozen' with food remaining in their mouth and stomach is not satisfactorily answered by the Ice Age theory. The Ice Age is believed by evolutionists to have started about two million years ago and terminated about 11,000 years ago. The mammoth cryogenic entombment suggests a rapid rather than a protracted freezing event. [based on logic]

(7) What happened to the earth during the Ice Ages is not a known fact, but rather, supposition and postulation. For example, it was once commonly believed that North America was covered with multiple, huge ice sheets. There is evidence that the area was only covered by one thin sheet of ice, and that there was only one Pleistocene Ice Age. *Geology*, Vol. 22, 1994 p:683-686.



Evolution Says

The geological processes of the earth take millions of years to occur. This proves that the earth is billions of years old.

The Facts Are

- (1)** Within a few months of the formation of the island of Surtsey as a result of an undersea volcanic eruption in 1963, it already had a mature landscape. By 1964 geologists observed that it had sandy beaches, precipitous crags, boulders worn almost round by the surf, gravel banks, lagoons, sheer cliffs, hollows, glens, and soft undulating land. All these geological structures had been formed while the island was still spewing lava from an active volcano. Sigurdur Thorarinsson, "Surtsey: The New Island in the North Atlantic", Viking Press, 1967 p:39-40; *National Geographic*, Vol. 127, No. 5, 1965 p:726
- (2)** "..... in one week's time we witness changes that elsewhere might take decades or even centuries Despite the extreme youth of the growing island, we now encounter a landscape so varied that it is almost beyond belief." Icelandic geologist Sigurdur Thorarinsson describing how geological processes can actually occur over extremely short periods of time. Written in his article "Surtsey: Island Born of Fire" in *National Geographic*, Vol. 127, No. 5, 1965 p:726
- (3)** "..... the timescale he had been trained to attach to geological developments is misleading when assessments are made of the forces - constructive and destructive - which have molded and are still molding the face of Iceland. What elsewhere may take thousands of years may be accomplished here in one century. All the same he is amazed whenever he comes to Surtsey, because the same development may take a few weeks or even days here." Icelandic geologist Sigurdur Thorarinsson describing the occurrence of very rapid geological processes. Written in his book "Surtsey: The New Island in the North Atlantic", Viking Press, 1967 p:39-40
- (4)** As a result of the Mount St. Helens volcanic eruption on March 19, 1982:- (1) a mudflow eroded a canyon system up to 43 m deep in the Toutle River Valley; (2) a flat plain of pumice deposited on May 18, 1980, was eroded to a depth of 30 m by August, 1984; (3) a 30 m deep canyon, known as 'Little Grand Canyon', formed from a mud-flow in just one day during the eruption; & (4) new strata, 183m deep and made of thousands of tiny layers a few millimetres thick, was formed in just one day. *Origins*, Vol. 11, No.2, 1984 p:90-98; *Confident Living*, Vol. 45, No. 4, 1988 p:45
- (5)** An investigation of 'precambrian' granite rocks by chemistry researcher Robert Gentry (Oak Ridge National Laboratory) has revealed that they contain polonium radiohalos which are isolated from any uranium. As polonium is a radio-breakdown product of uranium, uranium should be found with the polonium. But, as there is no associated uranium, the polonium would have had to migrate there when the granite was still molten. Polonium-218, however, has a very short life-span of 3 minutes, so perfect halos would not have formed in the long time periods inferred from evolutionary geology. Paul D. Ackerman "It's a Young World After All", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1993 p:108-110
- (6)** Evolutionary theory attributes Lake Eyre's past to a rainforest 45 million years ago. This age assessment is based on the age attributed to fossilized leaves, wood, seeds and fruit found in the area. Some of these 'ancient' specimens, however, have been found preserved in mud that was still soft enough to put a spade through. These mummified plant specimens were in "almost the same condition as any growing today". The leaves have been reported to be totally unchanged, with no mineralization, "exactly like living leaves". This exposure of fossil evidence provided by a government laboratory technical officer is evidence pointing to the erroneous age-dating methods, and the fallacy of long geologic periods. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, May 19, 1994 p:7



Evolution Says

The ocean floors are 200 million years old. The earth's crustal plates are moving apart from the mid ocean ridges. The paleomagnetism of sea-floor rocks, and potassium-argon dating techniques prove that the sea's floor is spreading out. The millions of years for this movement is added proof of the old age of the earth.

The Facts Are

(1) If the ocean's floors are 200 million years old, then at the present rate of sedimentation (25 billion tonnes per year), the sediments should be many kilometres deep, yet on average they are only 250 m thick. This indicates that the sea floors are not as old as the theory purports. The slow rate of subduction could only account for about 10% of this incoming sediment, so subduction cannot be used as a defence. More importantly, there are areas of the sea floor which are not part of any subduction zone (eg the Tasman Sea, off Australia), where the depth of sediment is similar to the average. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1991 p:29

(2) The subduction of the ocean floor under the continents is seen as proof of the continental drift theory. Subduction however is not a rapid process that can be observed, rather it is inferred from geological and volcanic data. If subduction is occurring, then all the ocean trenches near the subduction should have compressed, deformed, and thrust-faulted sediments on their floors. However, the floor of the Peru-Chile and East Aleutian Trenches are covered with soft, flat-lying sediments which are devoid of these structures. *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, Vol. 81, 1970 p:1339-1360; *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, Vol. 83, 1972 p:3613-3626

(3) Measuring the paleomagnetism of sea-floor rocks has not conclusively proved that plate movement is a fact. Deep crustal drilling in the North Atlantic Ocean has helped put this theory into disrepute. *Science*, Vol. 204, 1979 p:573-586; *International Geology Review*, Vol. 10, 1968 p:765-766; R. Doell & A. Cox "Magnetization of Rocks" in "Mining Geophysics", (Vol. 2), Society of Exploration Geophysics, 1967 p:452; J.A. Jacobs "The Earth's Core and Geomagnetism", Pergamon Press: Oxford, 1967 p:106

(4) "..... paleomagnetic data are still so unreliable and contradictory that they cannot be used as evidence either for or against the hypothesis of the relative drift of continents or their parts." I.A. Rezanov in the article "Paleomagnetism and Continental Drift" in *International Geology Review*, Vol. 10, 1968 p:765-766

(5) One of the linchpins of the plate tectonics theory is the 'proof' from potassium-argon (K-Ar) age assessments that the oldest rocks are furthest from the ridge crests. There are a number of scientists who have examined the K-Ar data, and believe that when correctly interpreted, they show no evidence of an increasing age with distance from the ridges. *Journal of Geology*, Vol. 80, 1972 p:185-197; *Science*, Vol. 162, 1968 p:265-267; *Science*, Vol. 161, 1968 p:1132-1135

(6) There are at least 4 theories to explain how the crust plates move. However, each of these mechanisms (either alone or together) cannot provide enough force to overcome the drag of the plates as they move over the magma. Also, they cannot explain how the plate boundaries originally formed. *Journal of Geology*, Vol. 80, 1972 p:185-197

(7) Satellite interferometry measurements taken by NASA, between 1979 and 1983, failed to show any plate movement. *Science News*, Vol. 123, No. 2, 1983 p:20



Evolution Says

All the continents were originally part of one large land mass called Gondwanaland. The movement of the earth's crustal plates has moved the continents to their present position. The millions of years for this movement is proof of the old age of the earth.

The Facts Are

- (1) Continental drift is enthusiastically endorsed by the majority of today's geologists. There are, however, a number of very eminent geologists who do not support the theory. *EOS*, Vol. 60, 1979 p:207-211; *American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin*, Vol. 56, 1972 p:269-336
- (2) One study in very-long-baseline interferometry seems to show that the continents are drifting in relation to each other. A set of published data gives a rate of movement of around 1cm per year. The reported information does not say how the rate was obtained, how far the plates really moved, and over what period of time the measurements were taken. The analysis of the baseline from which the data was taken, however, shows that it has random fluctuations as big as the rates stated for the continental movement. With such errors in measurement, no confidence should be placed in the data, or in the results derived from it. *Scientific American*, Vol. 255, No. 5, 1986 p:44-52
- (3) The limit of reading of the interferometer used in the tectonic plate movement experiment by Carter & Robinson ((2) above), is one centimetre in relative position. If the limit of reading is equal to the size of the values being measured, then the data from the experiment is absolutely meaningless, and cannot be used to scientifically prove continental drift. *Scientific American*, Vol. 255, No. 5, 1986 p:44-52
- (4) "..... the baseline lengths are increasing at a rate of between one centimetre and two centimetres per year. On the other hand, the baseline lengths also exhibit equally large random fluctuations; hence from these data alone we would be reluctant to conclude that we had really measured plate motions." Written by W.E. Carter & D. Robertson in "Studying the Earth by Very-Long-Baseline Interferometry", in *Scientific American*, Vol. 255(5), 1986 p:51
- (5) The most intriguing outcome of one set of measurements of continental movement is that Texas and Massachusetts are moving towards each other at 1.0cm/yr. This is not possible, as the two sites are on the same rigid continent. This throws doubt on the exactness of the data collected during the experiment. *Scientific American*, Vol. 255, No. 5, 1986 p:44-52
- (6) The idea of continental drift where the continents fit together like a jigsaw puzzle into one super-continent, is based on the apparent fit of the eastern bulge of South America into the south-western curve of Africa. Even with the use of computers, there is an inconsistency of an overlap of the continents. There are a number of ways to fit the continents together, but only one of these must be correct if the theory is true. Even with the possibility of some matching, plate tectonics cannot explain the drift of the continents, especially the rotation of Australia to fit into eastern North America. S.W. Carey (ed.), "Continental Drift: A Symposium", University of Tasmania: Hobart (Aust), 1958 p:162-171; *Royal Society of London Philosophical Transactions (Series A)*, Vol. 258, 1972 p:269-336
- (7) "Why has such a profound change occurred in the short space of a decade? Most scientists maintain - or at least argue for public consumption - that their profession marches towards truth by accumulating more and more data, under the guidance of an infallible procedure called 'the scientific method'. If this were true, my question [about continental drift] would have an easy answer". Written by biologist Stephen Gould about the shift in geological opinion from fixed to shifting continents, in his book "Ever Since Darwin", W.W. Norton, 1977 p:161
- (8) "Strictly speaking, then, we do not have a scientific hypothesis [with regard to continental drift], but rather a pragmatic model obviously, this kind of model is not testable in any rigorous scientific sense." J.C. Maxwell in the article "The New Global Tectonics" in *Geotimes*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1973 p:31



Evolution Says

Sedimentary rocks are millions of years old, as they take millions of years to form. Gemstones and petrified wood also takes millions of years to form. These are all proof of the old age of the earth.

The Facts Are

- (1)** A metal hammer, with its fossilized wooden handle, has been found in sandstone at Paluxy River (Texas, USA). The sandstone has been dated as being 400 million years old. This is 399 million years before the first human is supposed to have evolved. Also found inside rock has been a pair of pliers, a bolt, and a set of car keys. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1984 p:16; *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1992 p:20; *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986 p:10; *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1995 p:45 [photographs included]
- (2)** A petrified orange has been found in a creek near Gayndah (Queensland). The orange cannot be more than about 25 years old, as the first oranges were not produced in the area until 1968. This short period of time for an organic object to turn into rock nullifies the evolutionary hypothesis that millions of years are required for the process to occur. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 1988 p:11 [photographs included]
- (3)** A felt hat left in a spray mine in Tasmania (Australia) was found 50 years later. The minerals in the water that covered the hat had turned the hat to stone. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986 p:10 [photo included]
- (4)** Recent research has shown that diamonds may not take millions of years to form. They are believed to form rapidly, rising from a depth of 150-250 Km, taking just 8-25 hrs to form. *Geoscience Canada*, Vol 18, No. 1, 1991 p:1-16
- (5)** Australia's CSIRO Division of Material Science succeeded in producing opals in the laboratory over time-spans less than a generation. Similar success has been achieved by researchers in Japan. The theory that geologic processes take millions of years is not supported by these developments. *Nature* Vol. 204, No. 4964, 1964 p:1151-1153; *The Australian Gemmologist*, No. 66, 1966 p:5-9; *Australasian Post*, February 6, 1988 p:18-20
- (6)** Perfect opals have been produced in a laboratory in Lightning Ridge (NSW) by Dr Len Cram. These opals grow at a rate of 1cm per 3 months, at room temperature, without any pressure or mechanical assistance. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 12, No. 1, 1990 p:10-15; *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1995 p:14-17
- (7)** A bowler hat was buried in the volcanic eruption of Te Wairoa village (North Island, New Zealand) on June 10, 1886. It was discovered 20 years later, and found to have turned to stone. A leg of ham had also been petrified after being buried in the same catastrophe. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986 p:10 [photos included]
- (8)** In the 1780's a Maori chief was buried by being placed in a burial cave at Cavern Head (NZ). The remains of the chief were discovered by Walter Traill in 1877, and were found to have turned to stone. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986 p:10
- (9)** Rocks composed of iron-rich limestone, sand and mud are forming in a Norfolk (UK) marsh in as short a time as 6 months. The limestone which cements the material together is being created by bacteria which are thriving on the rotting vegetation. Rocks do not necessarily take millions of years to form, nor do the fossils within them. *Eastern Daily Press (UK)*, October 5, 1994
- (10)** Fuming volcanoes are known to produce around 500 gm of gold per day in the fluids coming out of them. This is the equivalent of 18 tonnes of gold per century from just one volcano. *New Scientist*, November 5, 1994 p:6



Evolution Says

Limestone caves and their formations take millions of years to form. This is proof of the very old age of the earth.

The Facts Are

(1) Stalagmites do not necessarily take many thousands of years to form. They have been forming under the Melbourne Shrine of Remembrance since 1934, due to water seepage. They are now up to 45 cm long. *Herald Sun* (Melbourne), November, 1993

(2) Structures in limestone caves have been observed to form rapidly. For example:- (1) A 3mm thick coating developed on cuttings in Jenolan Caves (NSW) in the 55 years; (2) Water seepage formed stalactites under the Lincoln Memorial (Washington DC) growing 1.5m in the 45 years since its construction; (3) Formations from hot water springs in Yellowstone National Park (Wyoming) grew about 2.5cm per year; and (4) Stalactites in the Sequoyah Caverns (Chattanooga, Alabama) have grown at a rate of 2.5cm per year. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1987 p:6-8

(3) In a disused mine shaft in Mt. Isa (Queensland), some very long stalagmites and stalactites have grown over the past 10 years. These are mineral sulfate columns, rather than the normal carbonate ones, and they are growing at a rate of 30 cm per year. This growth rate indicates clearly that these cave structures can grow rapidly, not requiring thousands or millions of years to form. *The Courier-Mail* (Brisbane), October 19, 1987 p:14

(4) Stalactites have been discovered in 40 year old coal mines in Newcastle (NSW). They have been estimated to be growing at the rate of 1 cm per year. This shows that limestone formations do not have to take hundreds of thousands of years to form. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986 p:10

(5) It has been calculated by geologist Dr Steve Austin, from a study of water flow rates in the Mammoth Cave region of central Kentucky, that a limestone cave 59m long and 1m square could form in one year. If this rate is remotely similar to the rates at which caves form elsewhere, then huge caverns could form in a very short time. The evolutionary tens of thousands of years are demolished by these findings. Steven Austin "Origin of Limestone Caves", Impact article #79, Institute of Creation Research: San Diego, 1980

(6) A limestone cave called "It Wasn't There Last Year Cave" in the Murray Valley (Australia) did not take millions of years to form. The cave was actually formed, according to locals, during one rain season. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 1986 p:10



Evolution Says

Oil takes many millions of years to form. This is proof of the very old age of the earth.

The Facts Are

(1) Proof that crude oil forms in periods markedly less than millions of years is seen in the situation where oil is currently being formed on the seabed. In the Guaymas Basin area of the Gulf of Mexico, in a series of fractures filled with a 500 m layer of sedimentary ooze, 1-2 cm droplets of oil are being discharged into the ocean water. The catalyst for the conversion of this organic matter to oil is a flow of hydrothermal materials from within the rock, which has a temperature of around 315°C. Analysis of the oil shows that it resembles crude oil in its composition. *Nature*, Vol. 295, 1982 p:198-202; *Science Frontiers*, July-August, 1991 p:3; *New Scientist*, April 6, 1991 p:19

(2) A type of crude oil was discovered just below the ground in a Brisbane suburb in 1978, near the site of an old leather works. The oil had been produced from the decomposition of leather. The leather had been dumped in the gully and covered over, some 80-90 years earlier when the leather works closed down. There was no smell of rotting material at the unearthed site, only the presence of decomposed leather, and a layer of dark oil about 10 cm deep. Oil is another example of where a natural phenomenon is given an exaggerated age for its development, to comply with the million of years demanded by evolutionary theory. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1990 p:29

(3) Oil has been found developing rapidly under the ocean along the East Pacific Rise. It appears that escaping hot lava is causing the reactions that turn the organically rich waters into oil. This adds to the evidence that vast time periods are not required to produce oil. *Science News*, Vol. 127, March 23, 1985 p:180

(4) Evolutionary theory demands that it takes millions of years for oil to form under the ground. This is based on the notion that the rocks are themselves millions of years old. The Batelle Laboratories in Richland (Washington State, USA), in conjunction with the American Fuel and Power Corp. has developed a method to produce oil from sewage in one to two days. The method is simple, uses no electronics, and produces an oil with the same heating value as diesel fuel. Heat, pressure and hot alkali decomposes the sewage, converting complex organic material into the long-chain carbon compounds of crude oil. *The Age* (Melbourne), March 1, 1989

(5) In a series of experiments conducted by the CSIRO (Australia), scientists have simulated the production of oil under conditions similar to that of a naturally subsiding sedimentary rock basin. Using samples of the oil producing rocks (oil shale and brown coal), sealed in stainless steel tubes and subjected to slowly increasing temperatures, they were able to produce oil in 4-6 years. This time variation was determined by the rock source and the end temperature, and led to varying qualities and quantities of crude oil and natural gas. This simulation indicates that the assumed age of rocks is not confirmed by the need for millions of years for crude oil to form. *Nature*, Vol. 308, 1984 p:177-179; *Science News*, March 24, 1984; *Organic Geochemistry*, Vol.9, No. 2, 1986 p:69-81

(6) Waste Resource Recovery Inc. (Wichita, USA), has discovered a way to produce oil in 10-15 minutes. Using heat and pressure, they can turn any organic matter (such as food scraps, grass clippings, newspapers or saw dust) into burnable oil. This chemical process, which mimics the way crude oil is believed to form in the earth's crust, testifies that the evolutionary millions of years for oil formation are grossly in error. *The Wichita Eagle*, April 24, 1994 p:1F



Evolution Says

Coal takes many millions of years to form. This is proof of the very old age of the earth.

The Facts Are

- (1) Peat of a quality similar to certain coal beds of the Eastern USA has been formed over a period of 3 years at the bottom of Spirit Lake. When Mount St. Helens erupted, a huge layer of pine debris was deposited in the lake and turned into coal at considerable depths. This formation contradicts the evolutionary model which says that peat forms in swamps (not lakes) in a slow process taking about 400 years to produce each centimetre of coal. *Confident Living*, Vol. 45, No. 10, 1987 p:41
- (2) Professor Martini (Guelph University, Ontario, Canada), a world authority on peat formation asked himself the following question during his keynote address at the Australian National Coal Conference at Newcastle University (NSW) - "What is the relationship of peat to coal?" His reply - "I don't know". Educators teach that coal comes from peat, obviously in contradiction to known facts. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1985 p:25
- (3) Coal has been formed in the laboratory from the heating of lignin in periods ranging from 2 weeks to one year. The lignin was heated with clay to a temperature of 150°C, the clay apparently acting as a catalyst. Coal clearly does not need millions of years to form. *Science News*, Vol. 124, August 6, 1983
- (4) Examination of radiohalos in coal deposits from the Colorado Plateau by chemistry researcher Robert Gentry (Oak Ridge National Laboratory) indicate that the coal was formed in less than 25-50 years. This is considerably less time than the millions of years demanded by evolution. *Science*, Vol. 194, 1976 p:315-317
- (5) "Such extraordinary values [discovered from radiohalos] admit the possibility that both the initial Uranium infiltration and coalification could possibly have occurred within the past several thousand years." Written by Robert V. Gentry, et al, in their article "Radiohalos in Coalified Wood: New Evidence Relating to the Time of Uranium Introduction and Coalification", in *Science*, Vol. 194, 1976 p:316-317
- (6) International authority on solar energy, Mary Archer, has calculated that the energy content of the world's known supply of fossil fuels is equivalent to the solar energy falling on the earth's surface in 14 days. Only about 0.03% of the solar energy reaching the earth's surface is stored as chemical energy in vegetation as a result of photosynthesis. Therefore it would take 128 years of solar input via photosynthesis to produce the energy in today's known coal reserves. *Journal of Applied Electrochemistry*, Vol. 5, 1975 p:17



Evolution Says

The youngest rocks are near the surface of the earth, and contain the younger, more complex fossils. The oldest rocks are at the bottom, and contain the older, simpler, primitive fossils. This geologic column shows a gradual aging of the rocks towards the bottom. The column can be found perfectly intact everywhere around the world. The column provides a continuous gradient of fossils which prove that all plants and animals evolved.

The Facts Are

(1) "[There are 10 fallacies about the geologic column:-]

1. The geologic column was constructed by geologists who, because of the weight of evidence that they had found, were convinced of the truth of uniformitarian theory and organic evolution.
2. Geologists composed the geologic column by assembling the 'periods' and 'eras' which they had recognised.
3. The strata systems [ie rock layers] of the geologic column are world-wide in their occurrence with each strata system being present below any point on the earth's surface.
4. Strata systems always occur in the order required by the geologic column.
5. Because each strata system has distinctive lithologic [rock/mineral] composition, a newly discovered stratum can be assigned easily to its correct position in the geologic column.
6. Fossils, especially the species distinctive of specific systems, provide the most reliable method of assigning strata to their level in the geologic column.
7. Sedimentary evidence proves that periods of millions of years' duration were required to deposit individual strata systems.
8. Radiometric dating can supply 'absolute ages' in millions of years with certainty to systems of the geologic column.
9. The environmental 'pictures' assigned to certain portions of the geologic column allow us to accurately visualize what its 'geologic ages' were like.
10. The geologic column and the positions of fossils within the geologic column provide proof of amoeba-to-man evolution." Written by geologist Steven A. Austin in his article "Ten Misconceptions About the Geologic Column", in *Acts & Facts*, Impact Series No. 137, November 1984

(2) The geologic time scale is not a fact which has been derived from the examination of harmonious world-wide geological data. It is interesting to note that:- 66% of the earth's land surface has only 5 or fewer of the 10 geologic periods in place; 80%-85% of the earth's land surface does not even have 3 geologic periods appearing in 'correct' consecutive order; a significant percentage of every geologic period's rocks do not overlies rocks of the next older geologic period; and, some percentage of every geologic period rests directly on top of Precambrian rock. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 1, June 1981 p:46-71

(3) An examination of the best-known and most numerous examples of the Cambrian fossils (assessed at 500 million years old) in Canada's Yoho National Park reveals that older fossils are not simpler, or more primitive. Scientists have commented that these fossils are more diverse and just as highly-specialized as today's creatures. Some of the fossil molluscs have eyes which are as complex as the human eye, and the trilobite fossil's eyes have been described as "a marvel of optical engineering". *Highline*, 1990 (the official Yoho newsletter put out by the Environment Canada Parks Service)

(4) There are numerous places where fossils in rocks do not fit evolutionary theory. For example:- (1) Spores and bits of wood in Cambrian rocks that formed before plants are supposed to have evolved; (2) Logs protruding through millions of years of strata; and (3) Fossil ammonites protruding through millions of years of strata. I.E. Weier, "Botany", 1974; D. Ager, "The Nature of the Stratigraphic Record", 1973; *Chemical and Engineering News*, October 11, 1976 p:40



(5) In many places, the oceanic sediment of which mountains were composed, has been found to be inverted - ie. older sediment lying on top of younger sediment. This sort of anomaly is common in many sites around the world and is usually recorded in literature in inconspicuous places.

William R. Corliss, "Remarkable Unconformities, Unknown Earth: A handbook of Geologic Enigmas", The Sourcebook Project: Glen Arm, Maryland, 1980; & "Strange Planet: A Sourcebook of Unusual Geological Facts", Vol. E-1, The Sourcebook Project: Glen Arm, Maryland, 1975 p:177-184; *Science News*, Vol. 98, No. 16, October 1970 p:316;

(6) "The great differences in the estimates of maximum thickness of many of the systems [geologic periods] manifestly indicate that thicknesses are unreliable measures of geologic time. As long ago as 1936 the conclusion had already been reached by Twenhofel that estimates of time based on thickness of strata 'are hardly worth the paper they are written on' rocks generally give no internal evidence of the rate at which they were formed." Written by J.F. White in "Study of the Earth", Prentice-Hall: New Jersey, 1962 p:46

(7) "I wonder how many of us realize that the [geologic] time scale was frozen in essentially its present form by 1840? How much world geology was known by 1840? A bit of western Europe, none too well, and a lesser fringe of North American. All of Asia, Africa, South America, and most of North America were virtually unknown. How dared the pioneers [of this theory] assume that their scale would fit the rocks in these vast areas, by far most of the world? Only in dogmatic assumption - a mere extension of the kind of reasoning developed by Werner from the facts in his little district of Saxony. And in many parts of the world, notably India and South America, it does not fit. But even there it is applied! The followers of the founding fathers [of evolution] went forth across the earth and in Procrustean fashion made it fit the sections they found, even in places where the actual evidence literally proclaimed denial. So flexible and accommodating are the 'facts' of geology." Written by the eminent evolutionist Edmund Spieker in an attempt to set the record straight that there isn't strong global evidence for the evolutionary time-scale. In his article "Mountain-Building and the Nature of Geologic Time-Scale", in the *Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists*, Vol. 40, August 1956 p:1803

(8) "And this poses something of a problem: If we date the rocks by their fossils, how can we then turn around and talk about patterns of evolutionary change through time in the fossil record?" Written by evolutionist and palaeontologist Niles Eldredge (American Museum of Natural History, New York) in his book "Time Frames: The Rethinking of Darwinian Evolution and the Theory of Punctuated Equilibria", Simon & Schuster: New York, 1985 p:52. Paul S. Taylor, "The Illustrated Origins Answer Book" (4th. ed.) Eden Publications: Mesa (Arizona), 1992 p:102

(9) "The procession of life was never witnessed, it is inferred. The vertical sequences of fossils is thought to represent a process because the enclosing rocks are interpreted as a process." Written by J.E. O'Rourke in the article "Pragmatism Verses Materialism in Stratigraphy" in *American Journal of Science*, Vol. 276, January, 1976 p:53

(10) "If you ask, "What is the evidence for continuity?" you would have to say, "There isn't any in the fossils of animals and man. The connection between them is in the mind"." A statement by the palaeoanthropologist Dr Colin Patterson and recorded by Luther Sunderland in his book "Darwin's Enigma", Master Books: El Cajon (California), 1988 p:90



Evolution Says

The age of rocks can be accurately calculated by measuring the radioactive minerals in them. Radiodating using isochron measurement, proves that the earth is billions of years old.

The Facts Are

- (1) Radiodating of rocks is based on three assumptions:- (1) the initial conditions are known, (2) no radioactive material has been added since the beginning, and (3) the radioactive decay rate has always been the same. These points can never be proved true as no one was present at the beginning, and no one has assessed the radioactivity at intervals since the beginning. Rock ages calculated from these methods must always be cultivated guess-work. [based on logic]
- (2) Isochron age measurements of rocks use such tests as the Strontium/Strontium, Rubidium/Strontium, Summarium/Niobium & Uranium/Lead relationships. Due to mixing, these tests are meaningless and cannot be used to accurately calculate the age of rocks. There is no way to prove that the amount of radioactive material in the rocks came from the original lava material. *Chemical Geology*, Vol. 80, 1989, p:1-16
- (3) The US Geological Survey has documented that as much as 90% of the radioactive elements in some granites could be removed by leaching the rock with a weak acid. They also state that as much as 40% of the uranium in fresh-appearing igneous rocks is readily leachable. K.R. Klepper & D.G. Wyant, "Notes on the Geology of Uranium", *US Geological Survey Bulletin*, No. 1046-F, 1957 p:93
- (4) The Committee on the Measurement of Geological Time expressed their lack of confidence in radioactive dating as far back as 1950. They said that the 'dates' were like railway timetables in that they are subject to change without notice. "The Penguin Dictionary of Geology", Penguin Books: Middlesex (England), 1972 p:378
- (5) "There has been in recent years the horrible realization that radiodecay rates are not as constant as previously thought, nor are they immune to environmental influences. And this could mean that atomic clocks are reset during some global disaster, and events which brought the Mesozoic [era] to a close may not be 65 million years ago but, rather, within the age and memory of man." Written in Frederic B. Jueneman, "Secular Catastrophism", *Industrial Research and Development*, June 1982 p:21
- (6) "It is obvious that radiometric techniques may not be the absolute dating methods that they are claimed to be The uncertainties inherent in radiometric dating are disturbing to geologists and evolutionists" Written by Dr William D. Stansfield (Instructor of Biology, California Polytechnic State University) in his book "The Science of Evolution", Macmillan: New York, 1977 p:84
- (7) "One serious consequence of the mantle isochron model is that crystallization ages determined on basic igneous rocks by the Rb-Sr whole-rock technique can be greater than the true age by many hundreds of millions of years. This problem of inherited age is more serious for younger rocks, and there are well-documented instances of conflicts between stratigraphic age and Rb-Sr age in the literature." Written by Dr C. Brooks (Professor of Geology, University of Montreal, Canada) and others, in their article "Ancient Lithosphere: Its Role in Young Continental Volcanism", in *Science*, Vol. 193, September 17, 1976 p:1093
- (8) "Much still remains to be learned of the interpretation of isotopic ages and the realization that in many instances the isotopic age is not necessarily the geological age of a rock has unfortunately led to an over-sceptical attitude by some field geologists." Written by Peter E. Brown and John A. Miller in their article "Interpretation of Isotopic Ages in Orogenic Belts" in "Time and Place in Orogeny", *Geological Society of London Special Publication*, No. 3, 1969 p:137



Evolution Says

Radiodating techniques assess the age of rocks and fossils perfectly.

The Facts Are

- (1) Eleven distinct types of microbes have been identified in rock samples from Marble Bar (W.A.) dated at 3.5 billion years old, in evolutionary terms. This date puts the rock at forming only 400 million years after the earth cooled enough for life to exist - according to evolutionary theory. The assessed age of these organisms is in total conflict with the current ages assigned by evolutionists to the origin of life on Earth. *Time* (Australia), May 10, 1993 p:15; *Science*, April 30, 1993 p:640-646
- (2) In the 1960's, scientists took ten samples of lava from both vegetated and unvegetated sites on Mount Rangitoto (Auckland), and had their ages calculated using the Potassium-Argon method. The ages of the ten samples ranged from 146,000-500,000 years. Not only did the tests produce a discrepancy in age of the rocks, but the rock formed when the volcano erupted around 200 years ago, according to Maori legend. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 33, 1969 p:1485-1520
- (3) In 1968 scientists dated the rocks of a Hawaiian volcano called Hualalai, using Potassium/Argon radiometric techniques. They knew that the volcano had erupted in 1800 and that the rocks were around 170 years old, but the ages they determined ranged from 160 million to 3 billion. This method of dating rocks obviously produces erroneous ages, and should not be used to factually age the earth and its geology. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, Vol. 73, No. 14, 1968 p:4601-4607
- (4) Different radioactive dating methods used on volcanic rock samples from Reunion Island (Indian Ocean) gave conflicting results that varied from 100,000 to 4.4 billion years. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, Vol. 35, 1971 p:261-288 & Vol. 36, 1972 p:1167
- (5) Radiocarbon and Uranium-Thorium dates calculated by the Lamont-Doherty Geological Laboratory (New York) for samples of Caribbean coral have been found to differ by 3,500 years. These tests show how inaccurate, and artificial, age assessments from radio-dating are. *Science News*, June 9, 1990 p:356
- (6) Lava flows on the Uinkaret Plateau north of the Grand Canyon are a most recent formation, being only a few thousand years old. Radiodating of this rock using Rubidium-Strontium and Lead-Lead methods has produced ages from 1.5 - 2.6 billion years. Clearly, the age assessment techniques are vastly inaccurate if the young lava flow is assessed as being older than the sedimentary rock on which it lies. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 1989 p:37
- (7) Radiodating of minerals collected from a drill core in Northern Australia, using the Uranium-Thorium-Lead method, has produced conflicting ages. One sample was dated as 862 million years old, while three other samples were each assessed as being 0 (zero) million years old. This adds to the confirmation that radiodating techniques are highly variable, and therefore cannot be used to accurately date objects. *Search*, Vol. 3, 1972 p:382-385; *Mineralium Deposita*, Vol. 11, 1976 p:133-154.
- (8) Radiometric dating of fossil 'skull 1470' show that the various methods do not give accurate measurements of ages. The first tests gave an age of 221 million years. The second, 2.4 million years. Subsequent tests gave ages which ranged from 290,000 to 19.5 million years. Palaeomagnetic determinations gave an age of 3 million years. All these readings give a 762 fold error in the age calculations. Given that only errors less than 10% (0.1 fold) are acceptable in scientific calculations, these readings show that radiometric assessment should never ever be used. John Reader, "Missing Links", BCA/Collins: London, 1981 p:206-209



Evolution Says

Radiocarbon dating accurately measures the age of plant and animal material. This method proves the evolution of life on earth.

The Facts Are

(1) Carbon-14 calculations are based on 7 assumptions, concerning the past 20-30 thousand years. 1/ The balance between Carbon-14 production and decay has always been the same; 2/ The rate of Carbon-14 decay has not altered; 3/ Organic material tested has not been contaminated by Carbon-14 since its death; 4/ Earth's magnetic field intensity has not changed; 5/ There have only been small variations in ocean depths; 6/ Ocean temperature changes have only been minor; and 7/ Cosmic ray intensity has not changed. Measurements based on assumptions are guesses, not fact. Willard F. Libby, "Radiocarbon Dating", University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1955 p:8, 10, 19-31

(2) Examples of where C-14 dating has been shown to be erroneous:-

- (i) A living water snail taken from an artesian spring in Nevada was given as assessed age of 27,000 years. *Science*, Vol. 224, April 6, 1984 p:58-61
- (ii) Shell from living clams was 'dated' thousands of years old. *Science*, Vol. 141, August 16, 1963 p:634
- (iii) Dried seal carcasses less than 30 years old were 'dated' as 4,600 years old. *Antarctic Journal of the United States*, Vol. 6, October, 1971 p:210+
- (iv) A freshly killed seal was assessed at 1,300 old. *Antarctic Journal of the United States*, Vol. 6, October, 1971 p:210+
- (v) A 15,000 year difference appeared in the assessment of samples from a single sample block of peat. *New Zealand Journal of Geology and Geophysics*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1978 p:463-466

(3) Thirty eight laboratories world-wide carbon-dated samples of wood, peat and carbonate, and produced differing dates for similar objects of the same age. The overall finding of the comparative test was that radiocarbon dating was 'two to three times less accurate than implied by their error terms'. Ages of objects assessed by this method cannot therefore be viewed as being credible. *Nature*, September 28, 1989 p:267; *New Scientist*, September 30, 1989 p:10

(4) "In the light of what is known about the radiocarbon method and the way it is used, it is truly astonishing that many authors will cite agreeable determinations as 'proof' for their beliefs

The radiocarbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. There are gross discrepancies, the chronology is uneven and relative, and the accepted dates are actually selected dates. "This whole blessed thing is nothing but 13th century alchemy, and it all depends upon which funny paper you read".

Written by Robert E. Lee in his article "Radiocarbon: Ages in Error" in *Anthropological Journal Of Canada*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1981 p:9

(5) "Materials which give radiocarbon dates of tens of thousands of radiocarbon years could have true ages of many fewer calendar years." Personal correspondence from Gerald E. Aardsma to Paul Taylor. Quoted in Paul S. Taylor, "The Illustrated Origins Answer Book" (4th. ed.) Eden Publications: Mesa (Arizona), 1992 p:59

(6) In Dr Sheridan Bowman's book for the British Museum, "Radiocarbon Dating", it states: "Radiocarbon is not quite as straightforward as it may seem. The technique does not in fact provide true ages, and radiocarbon results must be adjusted (calibrated) to bring them into line with calendar ages". *Diggings*, August, 1990 p:8

(7) "If a C-14 date supports our theories, we put it in the main text. If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a footnote. And if it is completely 'out of date', we just drop it." Professor Brew, quoted by T. Save-Soderbergh (Egyptologist) & Ingrid Olsson (Physicist) in "C-14 Dating and Egyptian Chronology" in *Proceedings of the Twelfth Nobel Symposium*, John Wiley & Sons: New York, 1970 p:35; [see also *Diggings*, August, 1990 p:8]



Evolution Says

The early atmosphere had no oxygen. The gases that were present then combined during lightning strikes to form amino acids. The mixture of amino acids and sea water is called the 'primordial soup'. The amino acids combined to form proteins, which grouped to form living cells. Cells came together to form micro-organisms. All life came from these first microbes.

The Facts Are

- (1) The classic experiment carried out by Stanley Miller (& Urey) in 1953 where amino acids were synthesized in the laboratory, is now largely regarded as a dead end. Similarly regarded today is Sydney Fox's production of proteinoids, which were circular blobs that he claimed were protocells. *Scientific American*, February, 1991 p:100-109
- (2) "The problem of the origin of life has turned out to be much more difficult than I, and most other people, envisaged." A statement by Stanley Miller (the researcher who rose to world fame in 1953 by creating amino acids in the laboratory) in *Scientific American*, February 1991, p:100-109
- (3) A study of rocks of all ages shows overwhelmingly that they were formed under the influences of an atmosphere containing oxygen. As this is the case, the early atmosphere definitely contained oxygen. Therefore, the 'primordial soup' could never have happened. Nobel Prize winner Francis Crick acknowledges this fact. *New Scientist*, Vol. 87, July 10, 1980 p:112; *Geology*, Vol. 10, March 1982 p:141
- (4) "It is suggested that from the time of the earliest dated rocks
- Earth had an oxygenic atmosphere." Written by Harry Clemmey & Nick Badham in their article "Oxygen in the Precambrian Atmosphere: An Evaluation of the Geological Evidence" in *Geology*, Vol. 10, March 1982 p:141
- (5) The 'first cells' could not have survived the high solar ultraviolet radiation levels that would have existed in an oxygen-less environment, as there would have been no ozone to absorb the rays and shield them. *Science News*, December 24 & 31, 1988 p:423
- (6) "..... in the atmosphere and in the various water basins of the primitive earth, many destructive interactions would have so vastly diminished, if not altogether consumed, essential precursor chemicals, that chemical evolution rates would have been negligible. The soup would have been too dilute for direct polymerization to occur. Even local ponds for concentrating soup ingredients would have met with the same problem." Written by biochemists Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley & Roger L. Olsen as a statement that biogenesis (chemical evolution) could not have formed in the way evolutionary theory demands. Written in their book "The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories", Philosophical Library: New York, 1984 p:66
- (7) The chemical reaction in biogenesis that is supposed to have joined amino acids into peptides is a reversible reaction. This means that the reaction goes backwards and turns the peptides immediately back into amino acids. In the non-living environment both the forward and reverse reaction would have been going on at the same time. If the conditions were such that the reverse reaction went faster, then the effect over a long period of time would be that no amino acids would have formed. A.E. Wilder-Smith, "The Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution", Master Books: San Diego, 1981 p:9-14
- (8) Although amino acids may form in watery conditions, the next step where amino acids spontaneously joining to form peptides, requires dry conditions. Under dry conditions, the subsequent steps to form cells containing a large percentage of water could not proceed. *Science News*, Vol. 134, 1988 p:117; *Nature*, August 18, 1988 p:609-611
- (9) "The probability that at ordinary temperatures a macroscopic number of molecules is assembled to



give rise to the highly ordered structures and to the co-ordinated functions characterizing living organisms is vanishingly small. The idea of spontaneous generation of life in its present form is therefore highly improbable, even on the scale of the billions of years during which prebiotic evolution occurred." Written by Ilya Prigogine, Gregoire Nicolis & Agnes Babloyants in "Thermodynamics of Evolution", *Physics Today*, Vol. 25, November 1972 p:23.

(10) "There is a hitch proteins cannot form without DNA, but neither can DNA form without proteins. To those pondering the origins of life, it is a classic chicken-and-egg problem?" From John Horgan's article "Trends in Evolution: In the Beginning", in *Scientific American*, February 1991, p:100-109

(11) "Considering the way the prebiotic soup is referred to in so many discussions of the origin of life as an already established reality, it comes as something of a shock to realize that there is absolutely no positive evidence for its existence." Written by Michael Denton in his book "Evolution: A Theory in Crisis", Alder & Alder: Bethesda (Maryland), 1986 p:261

(12) "Furthermore, no geological evidence indicates an organic soup, even a small organic pond, ever existed on this planet. It is becoming clear that however life began on earth, the usually conceived notion that life emerged from an oceanic soup of organic chemicals is a most implausible hypothesis. We may therefore with fairness call this scenario 'the myth of the prebiotic soup'." Written by biochemists Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley & Roger L. Olsen in their book "The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories", Philosophical Library: New York, 1984 p:66

(13) "The notion that not only the biopolymers, but the operating programme of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial soup here on Earth is evidently nonsense of a high order." Written by Sir Fred Hoyle in his article "The Big Bang in Astronomy" in *New Scientist*, Vol. 92, No. 1280, November 19, 1981 p:527

(14) "In short there is not a shred of objective evidence to support the hypothesis that life began in an organic soup here on the Earth." Written by world-famous physicist and astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle in his book "The Intelligent Universe", Michael Joseph: London, 1983 p:23

(15) "However, the macromolecule-to-cell transition is a jump of fantastic dimensions, which lies beyond the range of testable hypothesis. In this area all is conjecture. The available facts do not provide a basis for postulating that cells arose on this planet." Written by David E. Green (Institute for Enzyme Research, University of Wisconsin, USA) & Robert F. Goldberger (National Institutes of Health, Maryland, USA) in their book "Molecular Insights into the Living Process", Academic Press: New York, 1967 p:406

(16) "It is therefore a matter of faith on the part of the biologist that biogenesis did occur and he can choose whatever method of biogenesis happens to suit him personally; the evidence for what did happen is not available." Written by Professor G.A. Kerkut (Department of Physiology and Biochemistry, University of Southampton) in the book "Implications of Evolution", Pergamon Press: London, 1960 p:150

(17) The probability that a self replicating protein (one with at least 400 linked amino acids) forms by chance has been calculated as 1 chance in 10^{450} . The rational probability for this is zero. If as the theory of evolution proposes, these amino acids come together through chance step-by-step processes, then the probability for this protein forming is the sum of the probabilities for the formation of each step. The probability for this is enormously larger than the 10^{450} probability for it happening in one step. This means that it is even more unlikely to have occurred. *Analytical Chemistry*, Vol. 33, June, 1961 p:23

(18) Without oxygen in the atmosphere there would be no ozone to filter out most of the cosmic rays. As a result, all of the ammonia and methane would have been destroyed in a few thousand years. NASA Atmospheric Scientists' opinion in *Origins of Life*, Vol 12, 1982



Evolution Says

DNA formed in the first cells, allowing them to reproduce. The DNA in fossils remains intact forever, and can be used to test the age of fossils. Viruses move DNA from one species to another, creating new species. Fossils can be brought to life by taking their DNA and culturing it.

The Facts Are

- (1) Laboratory experiments show that DNA spontaneously and progressively disintegrates over time. Estimates indicate that DNA should completely break down within 10,000 years. Any fossil DNA remaining after this period (especially more than say 100,000 years) must of necessity indicate that the method of dating the fossil is in error. *Nature*, Vol. 352, August 1, 1991 p:381
- (2) The classic evolutionary problem of 'which came first, protein or DNA' has not been solved by the 'self-reproducing' RNA theory as many textbooks imply. The theory is not credible as it was based on laboratory simulations which were highly artificial, and were carried out with a 'great deal of help from the scientists'. *Scientific American*, February, 1991 p:100-109
- (3) DNA can only be replicated in the presence of a specific enzyme which can only be manufactured by the already existing DNA. Each is absolutely essential for the other, and both must be present for the DNA to multiply. Therefore, DNA has to have been in existence in the beginning for life to be controlled by DNA. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:93-94
- (4) There is no natural chemical tendency for the series of base chemicals in the DNA molecule to line up a series of R-groups in the orderly way required for life to begin. Therefore being contrary to natural chemical laws, the base-R group relationship and the structure of DNA could not have formed by random chemical action. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:94
- (5) "The origin of the genetic code is the most baffling aspect of the problem of the origins of life and a major conceptual or experimental breakthrough may be needed before we can make any substantial progress." Written by biochemist Dr Leslie Orgel (Salk Institute, California) in the article "Darwinism at the Very Beginning of Life" in *New Scientist*, April 15, 1982 p:151
- (6) Computer scientists have demonstrated that information does not, and cannot arise spontaneously. Information only results from the input of energy, under the all-important direction of intelligence. Therefore, as DNA is information, it cannot have been formed by natural chemical means. P. Moorhead & M. Kaplan (eds.), "Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution", Wistar Institute: Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), 1967
- (7) The transformation of one species into another by viruses transferring small sections of the DNA of another species could not cause evolution for three reasons:- (1) if genes for a particular feature or action were transmitted as a small piece of DNA, the animal would not be able to utilize the code unless it had all the other structures present to support that feature, (2) there is no guarantee that without the rest of the supporting DNA code, that the feature would appear in the right place, and (3) the information transmitted would already be in existence and would not lead to the formation of a species with totally new features. *Reader's Digest*, March 1980
- (8) "A scientist who won the Nobel Prize for his discovery of the DNA technique that inspired [the film] Jurassic Park was asked how likely it was that in the future, a dinosaur could be re-created from ancient DNA trapped in amber, as in the movie. Dr Kary Mullis replied in essence that it would be more realistic to start working on a time machine to go back and catch one." From *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 16, No. 2, March 1994, p:8, summarizing *The Salt Lake Tribune*, December 5, 1993



Evolution Says

The first life occurred ½ billion years ago during the Cambrian Period. These were simple organisms that evolved gradually from the 'primordial' cells.

The Facts Are

(1) The 'Cambrian Explosion' is an evolutionary conundrum. Fossils of animals found in Cambrian rock assessed as 500-600 million years old seem to have appeared suddenly. They have no fossil ancestors, and they have no different body plans to animals existing today. *Scientific American*, November, 1992 p:52-59

(2) It is not widely known among the general public, nor is it taught by educators, that Cambrian rocks actually contain complex life forms. Mostly, Darwinian philosophy rather than pure fact is presented by educators, in an effort to maintain the geologic column. Actually, even vertebrate fossil material has been discovered in Cambrian rocks. Barbara J. Stahl, "Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution", Dover Publications: New York, 1985 p:34

(3) "Finding vertebrate bone in Cambrian rocks, for instance, has proved that the backboned animals are as old as most of the known invertebrates." Written by evolutionary biologist Professor Barbara Stahl (St. Anselm College) in her book "Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution", Dover Publications: New York, 1985 p:vii

(4) An expedition to the Grand Canyon in October 1984 resulted in the discovery of numerous sets of fossil tracks. The tracks were believed to have been made by vertebrate animals and were found in sandstone, assessed as being 500-600 million years old. These tracks indicate that vertebrates were alive during the evolutionary Cambrian period, in total contradiction to evolutionary theory. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1985 p:13-14 [photos included]

(5) Fossil burrows have been found in the Frere Ranges, 120 km north of Wiloona (WA) in pre-Cambrian rocks. According to evolutionary theory, complex organisms had not evolved by the Pre-Cambrian period. *West Australian*, January 23, 1983

(6) One thing the fossil record does show is the huge imbalance between the variety of life in the so-called Cambrian explosion (500 million years ago) and that following the great Permian extinction (200 million years ago). Palaeontologists note that all existing phyla were present as fossils in Cambrian rock, and that no new ones followed Permian extinction. This means that no new animal body plans have evolved for 500 million years. The fossil record therefore shows that macroevolution has not occurred as it was supposed to, according to evolutionary theory. *Science Frontiers*, November-December, 1988 p:2, *Science*, Vol. 241, 1988 p:20

(7) It is a widely held belief, and taught by educators as a fact, that as we dig down through the layers of rock, the fossils uncovered are much simpler, and more and more primitive. Examination of the best-known and most numerous examples of the Cambrian fossils (assessed at 500 million years old), which are found in the Burgess Shale of Canada's Yoho National Park, reveal the exact opposite. Scientists have commented that these fossils are more diverse and just as highly-specialized as today's creatures. Some of the fossil molluscs have eyes which are as complex as the human eye, and the trilobite fossil's eyes have been described as "a marvel of optical engineering". *Highline*, 1990 (the official Yoho newsletter put out by the Environment Canada Parks Service)

(8) "[Burgess Shale fossil Cambrian animals were] more diverse and no less highly-specialised than today's living creatures. Life today is less, not more, complicated than it was half a billion years ago". Written in "Burgess Shale Continues to Confound" in *Highline* 1990, the official Yoho newsletter put out by the Environment Canada Parks Service



Evolution Says

Land plants evolved one third of a billion years ago. The fossil evidence shows how they evolved.

The Facts Are

(1) Dr Clifford Burdick has found fossil pollen grains in Hatatai Shale deposits of the Grand Canyon which have been classified as Precambrian. Pollen from seed-bearing plants should not be found in rock this old because evolutionary theory states that the Precambrian period was long before seed plants were supposed to have evolved. Dr Burdick conducted a controlled experiment when he analysed the rock samples to ensure that the pollen was not contamination from the air. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 3, 1966 p:38-50; *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 9, 1972 p:25-36

(2) According to evolutionary theory, pine trees could not have appeared any earlier than 350 million years ago. However, fossil pine pollen has been found in shale layers of the Grand Canyon which are assessed at 1.5 billion years old. This is definitely well before the theoretical time of the appearance of pines, and indicates how erroneous age-dating methods are, and therefore the evolutionary timetable. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 1991 p:30

(3) "As yet we have not been able to track the phylogenetic history of a single group of modern plants from its beginning to the present." Written by palaeobotanist and evolutionist Professor Chester Arnold (Professor of Botany and Curator of Fossil Plants, University of Michigan) in his book "An Introduction to Paleobotany", McGraw-Hill: New York, 1947 p:7



Evolution Says

Fish evolved from simple organisms in the oceans. Fish eventually evolved lungs and then evolved into amphibians. The fossil evidence proves this. The extinct Coelacanth and Rhipidistian were the fish that evolved into the amphibians. Dipnoi is the immediate ancestor of the amphibians.

The Facts Are

(1) The rhipidistian fossil fish could not be the ones that evolved into amphibians. A close examination of rhipidistian and amphibian fossils show that there are enormous differences between them. Michael Denton, "Evolution: A Theory in Crisis", Burnett Books: London, 1985 p:180

(2) Some scientists have dismissed the lungfish *Dipnoi* as the immediate ancestor of amphibians because its fins would have been too weak to become legs. Its skull is said to be too unlike an amphibians to have turned into it. The evolution of amphibians is not a fact, only a guess. Arthur C. Echternacht, "How Reptiles and Amphibians Live", Galley Press: Leicester (England), 1977 p:27

(3) Before the discovery of the coelacanth (a Crossopterygian fish), their fossil predecessors were held to be the evolutionary link between fish and amphibians. An examination of these living fish showed that there was no evidence that their internal organs were being adapted for use on land. They are no longer referred to as missing links. *Nature*, December 22/29, 1988 p:727-732; *National Geographic*, January, 1989; "World Book Encyclopedia", (Vol. 4), World Book Inc: Chicago, 1984 p:602; Michael Denton, "Evolution: A Theory in Crisis", Burnett Books: London, 1985 p:178-179

(4) Lungs in fish are not a modern evolutionary development as there is evidence that the most 'ancient' fish already had functioning lungs (eg *Placodermi* sp). Romer & Parsons, "The Vertebrate Body", Philadelphia: Saunders Co., 1978 p:329

(5) "Since the fossil material provides no evidence of other aspects of the transformation from fish to tetrapod, paleontologists have had to speculate how legs and aerial breathing evolved" Written by Barbara J. Stahl (St Anselm's College, USA) in her book "Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution", McGraw-Hill: New York, 1974 p:195

(6) "The origin of all these fishes is obscure" It is not possible to demonstrate unequivocally the descent of any group of the higher fishes from a specific stock of placoderms or acanthodians." Written by evolutionist and vertebrate specialist Professor Barbara Stahl in her book "Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution", Dover Publications: New York, 1985 p:126

(7) "There are no intermediate forms between finned and limbed creatures in the fossil collections of the world". Written by the famous science writer Gordon Rattray Taylor in his book "The Great Evolution Mystery", Harper & Row: New York, 1983 p:60

(8) "..... none of the known fishes is thought to be directly ancestral to the earliest land vertebrates." Written by Barbara J. Stahl (St Anselm's College, USA) in her book "Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution", McGraw-Hill: New York, 1974 p:148

(9) "The geological record has so far provided no evidence as to the origin of the fishes" Written by zoologist and evolutionist J.R. Norman (Assistant Keeper of the Department of Zoology, British Museum of Natural History) in his section "Classification and Pedigrees: Fossils" of P.H. Greenwood's book "A History of Fishes" (3rd. ed.), Museum of Natural History: London, 1975 p:343



Evolution Says

Amphibians evolved from fish. They evolved into the reptiles. The fossil evidence proves this. Acanthostega, Seymouria and Ichthyostega are intermediates between amphibians and reptiles.

The Facts Are

- (1) The *Ichthyostega* is said to be a four-legged intermediate between amphibians and land animals. Fossils of this creature, however, have well-developed legs rather than half leg-like fins. The hypothetical fish that gave rise to all four legged creatures is still unknown. David Attenborough, "Life on Earth", Reader's Digest: Sydney, 1980 p:157
- (2) *Acanthostega gunnari*, a four-legged fossil found in Stensiö Bjerg (Greenland) in 1987, is often quoted as being an intermediate between fish and amphibians. Like the fossil, *Ichthyostega*, it has no fins and its leg bones are nothing like those of fossil fish (eg *Eusthenopteron*). It does have a mixture of fish-like and animal-like characteristics, but like a platypus, a mosaic of characters does not mean that it actually was an evolutionary intermediate. It would be better to think of it as a four-legged amphibian like the salamander or newt. J.A. Clack & M.I. Coates, "Acanthostega - A Fish out of Water?", in D. Vézina & M. Arsenault (eds), "7th International Symposium on Studies of Early Vertebrates", Abstracts, p:12
- (3) The fossil species *Seymouria* is offered as proof of the transition of amphibia to reptiles. However, its assessed age according to the geologic column is some 20 million years after reptiles are supposed to have already appeared. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:45
- (4) "Evolution of this [complex] kind must always need long periods of time, but in spite of this the fossils give us little evidence of its course in the evolution of the Amphibia. Even the most primitive amphibians we know, the Ichthyostegalia, were as adults fully adapted to terrestrial life in many of their characters, for instance in their pentadactyl limbs." Written by Evolutionist G.S. Carter in his book "Structure and Habit in Vertebrate Evolution", University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1967 p:263
- (5) "The origins of the modern amphibia, such as frogs, has been the subject of considerable debate, a fact indicating the difficulty involved in tracing their ancestry back to the early amphibia that roamed the earth, and also to the fish stocks from which they, in turn, had evolved Just when and how the first frogs evolved remains unknown". Written by Michael J. Tyler in "Australian Frogs", Viking O'Neil: South Yarra (Victoria), 1989 p:1-2



Evolution Says

Reptiles evolved from amphibians. Amphibians evolved into mammals and birds. The fossil evidence proves this. Modern reptiles evolved from the dinosaurs. Snakes evolved from legged reptiles, losing their legs to conserve energy.

The Facts Are

- (1) Dinosaurs like all other fossil animals appear in the fossil record intact, without predecessors, and without ancestors after their extinction. There are similarly no intermediate dinosaurs between the first small ones and the giant varieties, as the theory of evolution would dictate. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1988 p:14-18
- (2) "Unfortunately not a single specimen of an appropriate reptilian ancestor is known prior to the appearance of true reptiles. The absence of such ancestral forms leaves many problems of the amphibian-reptilian transition unanswered." Written by evolutionist Robert L. Carroll in his article "Problems of the Origin of Reptiles", in *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, Vol. 44, No. 3, July 1969 p:393
- (3) "Each species of mammal-like reptile that has been found appears suddenly in the fossil record and is not preceded by the species that is directly ancestral to it. It disappears some time later, equally abruptly, without leaving a directly descended species" Written by evolutionist Dr Tom Kemp (Curator of Zoological Collections, Oxford University Museum, England), in his article "The Reptiles that Became Mammals" in *New Scientist*, Vol. 92, No. 4, 1982 p:583
- (4) An examination of the myriads of reptilian fossils, especially the massive numbers found on the Swiss-Italian border, give no clue to their evolution. One palaeontologist has said about this dilemma, "Why, given the wealth of fossil material, should the evolution of reptiles prove so evasive? deciphering the past is not an easy task." Reptilian fossils do not give any of the hoped-for clues to how they fit into the scheme of evolution, despite reptilian evolution being spoken about as a fact. *Scientific American*, June 1989 p:50-57
- (5) Scientists at the University of California have tested the snake energy advantage theory by measuring the metabolism of snakes which wore tiny oxygen masks as they slithered on treadmills. The scientists concluded that the evolutionary prediction was false as limbless movement did not conserve energy. *San Francisco Examiner*, August 12, 1990



Evolution Says

There was an enormously large variety of dinosaurs during the all-dinosaur era named the Dinosaur Age. The first dinosaurs were the small Coelurosaurs. The fossil evidence proves their evolution.

The Facts Are

(1) Calculations by Palaeontologist Peter Dodson of the University of Pennsylvania indicates that dinosaurs were not as diverse as evolution says. He estimates that there were only 285 genera and 336 species. *New Scientist*, December 1, 1990 p:14

(2) Some other of Dodson's findings after the examination of the data on the 2100 dinosaur fossils existing world-wide in museums are that; (i) Most of the genera described are represented by a single species; and (ii) Almost 500 species of the total 800 once described cannot now be accepted. *New Scientist*, December 1, 1990 p:14

(3) The 'Age of Dinosaurs' is said to have covered the geological time known as the Mesozoic era, ie. for the period of 200 to 60 million years ago. It is claimed that no mammals had evolved at that time, yet a small percentages of dinosaur specimens uncovered have been found with mammalian outer coverings. Some findings have been:- [1] pterosaur's skin was covered with a type of fur (a feature of mammals); and [2] hadrasaur's skin was leathery (not a feature of reptiles). The reconstruction of dinosaurs all with scaly skin, is not supported by fact, and so, the 'Age of Dinosaurs' is really a **misnomer**. David Norman, "The Illustrated Encyclopedia of Dinosaurs", Hodder & Stoughton: Sydney, 1985 p:170; Adrian J. Desmond, "The Hot-blooded Dinosaurs", Blond & Briggs: London, 1975 p:149

(4) The coelurosaurs could not have been the first dinosaurs to appear in the late Triassic period as their shape is the furthest away from that of the reptiles and amphibians. This assessment is made on the basis that their legs are positioned under their body, a site which provides full support. Reptiles and amphibians on the other hand, sprawl on the ground with their legs on their sides. The site of coelurosaurs' hind legs are more in line with that of modern animals. M. Tweedie, "The World of Dinosaurs", Weidenfeld & Nicolson: London, 1977 p:49, 84, 109

(5) Dinosaur bones have been discovered along with the bones of hoofed animals, near Bug Creek fossil site. This discovery totally overthrows the evolutionary theory that dinosaurs developed into hoofed animals over many millions of years. *New Scientist*, November 8, 1984

(6) A set of fossil footprints of a three-toed dinosaur were discovered in a layer of Silurian rock on a cliff in Berks County (Pennsylvania) in October 1962. The Silurian period was supposed to have existed 450 million years ago, but dinosaurs were not supposed to have evolved until the Triassic period, 230 million years ago. This places the evolution of dinosaurs and the dating method some 200 million years out of kilter. *Pursuit*, January 1971; *INFO (International Fortean Organisation) Journal*, Spring 1968; *Reading Times*, September 14 & 15, 1966

(7) A 24 cm fossil lizard was discovered in southern Scotland in the late 1980's. It was found in rocks classified as 'lower Carboniferous', and has had it's age assessed as 340 million year old. This reptile is about 40 million years older than any other found, and was found in rocks below those allocated by evolutionists to the reptile ancestors. This indicates that evolutionary theory is based solely on the limits of current knowledge and is not a fact, or a law. *The Arizona Republic*, Vol. 99, No. 186, November 20, 1988 p:AA-4



Evolution Says

The dinosaurs died out when the climate radically changed, becoming colder due to the onset of the ice ages.

The Facts Are

(1) Two dilemmas in evolutionary theory which haven't been answered yet are:- (i) How did dinosaurs lose their 'dominance' to mammals; and (ii) How did dinosaurs achieve their success in the first place? Recent theoretical studies by Mike Benton (Queen's University, Belfast, Ireland) suggest that competition had nothing to do with it. The puzzle of how dinosaurs gained their dominance, and how they died out, still remains. *New Scientist*, September 3, 1987 p:28

(2) There are approximately 60 theories proposed as an explanation for the sudden extinction of the dinosaurs. Not one of these can be called a fact. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 2/5/88

(3) Meteor collision is one of the theories presented to explain the rapid extinction of the dinosaurs. The analysis of fossilized dinosaur manure has led some researchers to develop another theory that it was their flatulence that was responsible. The theory proposes that the methane produced by their intestinal microbes, combined with methane gas, plus extensive volcanic eruptions, contributed to ancient climatic warming and the demise of the dinosaurs. This latter theory is not based on factual evidence, and would require the analysis of atmospheric samples taken at the time of the dinosaur's extinction to prove it. *Lafayette Journal and Courier*, October 23, 1991

(4) A study by the US Geological Survey Team showed that a rash of micro tektites in sediments indicates that there is no apparent connection with the extinction of life forms on earth. These micro tektites are thought to be produced by large meteorite collisions, and their study has suggested that large impacts occur without significant destruction of life forms. *New Scientist*, August 4, 1983

(5) Another theory has been developed to explain the extinction of the dinosaurs, indicating that the truth is currently unknown. The latest hypothesis suggests that magnesium deficiency was the culprit. An examination of dinosaur eggs in China has revealed that they are abnormally low in the element. Magnesium is vital for egg-laying animals, with large deficiencies producing heart attack. *Newcastle Morning Herald*, February 7, 1991

(6) Another hypothesis put forward in 1987 said that acid rain was the cause. The hypothesis stated that sulfur from volcanic activity eroded the ozone layer, turned into acid rain, cooled the climate and wiped out the dinosaurs. *The West Australian*, June 13-14, 1987 p:24

(7) In 1983 Dr Allan Charig (Natural History Museum, London) and Dr Beverley Halstaed (Geological Department, Reading University) successfully debunked almost every one of the 40 theories on the extinction of the dinosaurs. *The Times (London)*, August 27, 1983



Evolution Says

The evolution of insects, worms, arthropods and other small organisms is known. Peripatus is the intermediate between worms and arthropods. Permotipula is the intermediate link of modern flies. Intermediate fossils have been found which prove this evolution.

The Facts Are

(1) Until recently, the oldest known 4-winged fly, *Permotipula*, was highly regarded as an in-between form - an evolutionary link of modern 2-winged flies (Diptera). The only fossil, found in Australia 50 years ago, actually consists of just one wing, not a complete insect specimen. Recent studies of the wing and its veins has revealed that one character which was believed to indicate a close relationship to the Diptera is absent. It cannot now be regarded as a direct ancestor of modern flies. *Nature*, #139 1937; *Naturwissenschaften* Vol. 76, 1989 p:375-377

(2) Many evolutionists point to the onychophorans, such as *Peripatus*, as being transitional between the worms and the arthropods. They are seen as proof of the evolution of insects and the like. World renowned evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould does not share this belief, pointing out that the appearance of arthropods should have occurred more than 550 million years ago. He believes *Peripatus* could not have remained in existence for that long and to have remained largely unchanged. Again evolutionary 'proofs' are just a matter of interpretation. Stephen Jay Gould, "Wonderful Life", W.W. Norton & Co, 1989 p:168

(3) Three fossils found in Shropshire (Britain) are now claimed to be the earliest known land-dwellers. These are 2 fossil centipedes and an arachnid, and are claimed to be 414 million years old. This is 20 million years older than any previously known land animals. As the centipedes are predators, there must have been land animals that evolved before they did. *New Scientist*, November 3, 1990

(4) Evolutionary theory states that insects and flowers evolved at the same time, as their interdependence today necessitates their evolution together. A detailed investigation of the fossils of 1263 families of insects by John Sepkowski Jnr. (University of Chicago) has led him to conclude that, in evolutionary terms, insects evolved 120 million years before the appearance of flowering plants. *Nexus*, Nov/Dec, 1993 p:16

(5) Millions of years of 'evolution' has not produced any visible signs of change in the social behaviour of ants. Samples of fossil ants found in amber show the following modern attributes:- (a) they grasp their pupae and eggs in the same way; (b) have a symbiotic relationship with nematode worms; (c) are parasitised by leg mites; (d) have all the same subcasts and stages of development; and (e) tend aphids as a source of food. W.M. Wheeler, "Social Life Among The Insects", Constable & Co.: London, 1922; *Natural History*, June 1982; *Psyche*, June, 1964; *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology*, January 1980

(6) "It must be significant that nearly all the evolutionary stories I learned as a student, from Trueman's *Ostrea/Gryphaea* to Carruthers' *Zaphrentis delanouei*, have now been 'debunked'. Similarly, my own experience of more than twenty years looking for evolutionary lineages among the Mesozoic Brachiopoda has proved them equally elusive." Written by Dr Derek V. Ager (Department of Geology & Oceanography, University College, UK) in the article "The Nature of the Fossil Record" in *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 1976 p:132



Evolution Says

Mammals evolved from the dinosaurs. Sea mammals evolved from land animals that returned to the sea. The fossil evidence proves all this.

The Facts Are

(1) Many textbooks, lectures, and articles written in defence of Darwinian evolution contain reference to the 'fact' that there are many significant examples of links in the fossil record between whales and land animals. What is often cited as the 'proof' is a picture in a book which displays a whale-like creature which has legs. Quoting a drawing by an artist, which is an expression of their own interpretation of a particular fossil, is not scientific proof. Moreover, the specimen from which pictures are often drawn is named *Pakicetus*, a fossil known only from an incomplete skull. No other parts of the skeleton were found. *Pakicetus* was described as a whale that walked on land, a set of ideas not based on fossil facts. *Journal of Geological Education*, Vol. 31, 1983 p:140-144; *Science*, Vol. 220, 1983 p:403-406

(2) A fossil which has been described as being a whale with feet, is a snake-like skeleton (often called a 'king lizard') found in an Egyptian lake bed. Its finders have stated that the supposed feet could never have been used for walking or even as rudders to stabilize swimming. Palaeontologists have stated that the limb bones are a vestige of a time when the whale's ancestors walked on land. Apart from not being a whale, there are problems with the hind limb structure. The drawings displayed of the hind 'leg' are actually from other specimens. Some of these bones have not even been found, they are just 'reasonably inferred'. *The Press-Enterprise*, July 1, 1990 p:A-15

(3) Scientists have claimed recently that they have found a 'walking whale' which they say is the ancestor of modern whales. The skeleton of the fossil is very incomplete, with no hip bones, humerus or shoulder-blades. Most of the backbone is missing, and there is no guarantee that all the bones came from the same species. The reconstruction from these scant parts would not be sufficient to confirm whether the animal swam or walked. *Science*, January 14, 1994 p:210-212

(4) Fossil intermediates used in the past to 'prove' the evolution of pinniped marine animals (seals etc) have been rejected by André Wyss of the American Museum of Natural History (New York). His examination of the flippers of true-seals, sea-lions and walrus has led him to believe that they came from a common ancestor - a land mammal like the otter. This shows that intermediate forms shown in textbooks are not really intermediates, and that evolution is not proved by fossil evidence. *Nature*, August 4, 1988 p:383-384, 427-428

(5) The platypus has long been held up as a transitional form between mammals and birds because of its mixture of physical characteristics. It is interesting to note, that the more typical mammals are found in much lower rock layers than the egg-laying platypus. Thus, using evolutionary reasoning, mammals actually evolved before the platypus. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:110

(6) "Because of the nature of the fossil evidence, paleontologists have been forced to reconstruct the first two-thirds of mammalian history in great part on the basis of tooth morphology." Written by Barbara J. Stahl (St Anselm's College, USA) in her book "Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution", McGraw-Hill: New York, 1974 p:401

(7) "The [evolutionary] transition to the first mammal, which probably happened in just one or, at most, two lineages, is still an enigma." Written by evolutionist and science writer Roger Lewin in his article "Bones of Mammals' Ancestors Fleshed Out", in *Science*, Vol. 212, No. 4502, June 1981 p:1492



Evolution Says

The horse evolved from the tiny Eohippus 65 million years ago. Its evolution is known from the fossil record. Pliohippus, Meryhippus and Meshippus were intermediates in this evolution.

The Facts Are

- (1) The fossils said to form the ancestral tree of the modern horse have been put in order of ascending height, the number of their toes, and their assumed evolutionary age. These specimens have a few problems which negate their inclusion in the sequence:- the number of ribs varies within the series, from 15, to 19, and then down to 18; and the number of lumbar vertebrae changes from 6, to 8, and back to 6. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 14, No. 1, 1992 p:50
- (2) As an example of the fact that evolution is not scientifically proven, there are not one, but twenty different genealogical trees of the so-called horse fossil series. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:106
- (3) Fossils of three-toed and one-toed animals, which are said to be evolutionary ancestors of the modern horse, have been found preserved in the same rock formation (Nebraska, USA). This proves that they lived together at the same time, and it is obvious that one could not have evolved into the other. Evolution demands that there has to be many millions of years between the three-toed and the one-toed species in the 60-65 million year evolution of the horse. *National Geographic*, January 1981 p:74
- (4) Two modern-day horses, *Equus nevadensis* & *Equus occidentalis*, have both been found in the same fossil strata as the so-called "Dawn Horse", *Eohippus*. This fact is fatal to the notion of the evolution of the horse, as both horses are equally as old as *Eohippus*, and therefore could not have evolved from it. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:106
- (5) "The supposed pedigree of the Equidae [ie horses, asses, zebras etc] is a deceitful delusion, which in no way enlightens us on the palaeontological origin of the horse". Written by French palaeontologist and evolutionist Charles Deperet in "Transformations of the Animal World", Arno Press: New York, 1980 p:105
- (6) "Classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information". Written by palaeontologist and evolutionist Dr David Raup (Curator of the Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago) in his article "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology", in *The Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Vol. 50, No. 1, January 1979 p:25
- (7) "The uniform, continuous transformation of *Hyracotherium* into *Equus*, so dear to the hearts of generations of textbook writers, never happened in nature" Written by ardent evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson in his book "Life of the Past", Yale University Press: New Haven (Connecticut), 1953 p:125
- (8) "I admit that an awful lot of that has gotten into the textbooks as though it were true. For instance, the most famous example still on exhibit downstairs [in the American Museum] is the exhibit on horse evolution prepared perhaps 50 years ago. That has been presented as literal truth in textbook after textbook. Now I think that that is lamentable, particularly because the people who propose these kinds of stories themselves may be aware of the speculative nature of some of the stuff. But by the time it filters down to the textbooks, we've got science as truth and we've got a problem". The view of horse evolution expressed by Dr Niles Eldredge, curator at the American Museum of Natural History. Recorded in an interview with Luther Sunderland, and written in his book "Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems", Master Books:California 1988 p:78
- (9) David Raup of the Field Museum of Natural History urges all to " ..abandon belief in the evolution of the horse". *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1979



Evolution Says

The fossil evidence shows that birds evolved from reptiles. The Archaeopteryx & Mononychus are intermediates which prove the evolution. Feathers evolved from reptile scales. Birds are primitive because they lay eggs.

The Facts Are

- (1) The fossil evidence which is used to show a structural gradient between reptilian scales and feathers is a single specimen of a feather fragment. However, the specimen is for all intentional purposes, a true feather - it bears no transitional (half-way) characteristics at all. It is said to be an evolutionary intermediate because its assessed age pre-dates *Archaeopteryx*. *Paleontological Journal*, No. 4, 1978 p:520-528
- (2) The Meyer feather which was said to have come from the same quarry as the two *Archaeopteryx* specimens, was assigned to the Jurassic period. Both rock halves were sold to different museums, a practice unheard of, as they must always be kept together. Sir Fred Hoyle's investigation of photographs of these two halves show a marked difference in the background texture of the rocks. His conclusion is that they are almost certainly forgeries. Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe, "Archaeopteryx, The Primordial Bird: A Case of Fossil Forgery", Christopher Davies Ltd: Swansea, 1986 p:42
- (3) An experiment where pieces of chicken skin were grafted onto a living reptile did produce feathers because the chicken tissue contained the DNA information for the ability to produce feathers. The feathers had nothing to do with the reptiles ability to produce feathers, and is no proof of evolution at all. P. Sengel, "Morphogenesis of Skin", Cambridge University Press, 1976
- (4) "Feathers are features unique to birds, and there are no known intermediate structures between reptilian scales and feathers the elongated scales found on such forms as *Longisquama* are very interesting, highly modified and elongated reptilian scales, and are not incipient feathers." Written by evolutionist Alan Feduccia in the section "On Why Dinosaurs Lacked Feathers" of the book "The Beginning of Birds", Jura Museum: Eichstatt (West Germany), 1985 p:76
- (5) "The problem [of feather evolution] has been set aside, not for want of interest, but for lack of evidence. No fossil structure transitional between scales and feathers is known, and recent investigators are unwilling to found a theory on pure speculation How feathers arose initially defies analysis." Written by vertebrate palaeontologist and evolutionist Professor Barbara J. Stahl (St Anselm's College, USA) in her book "Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution", McGraw-Hill: New York, 1974 p:350 (also Dover Publications: New York, 1985 p:349-350)
- (6) *Mononychus* is a bird-like dinosaur with a keeled breastbone and bird-like wrists. It has been touted as the 'link' between birds and dinosaurs, and is pictured in scientific articles as having feathers. No feathers, however, have ever been found with this fossil. *Science News*, Vol. 143, No. 16, 1993 p:245; *Time* (Aust), April 26, 1993
- (7) "It is obvious that we must now look for the ancestors of flying birds in a period much older than that in which *Archaeopteryx* lived." Written by evolutionist Dr John Ostrom, in his article "Bone Bonanza: Early Bird and Mastodon", in *Science News*, Vol. 112, No. 13, September 1977 p:198
- (8) "The [evolutionary] origin of birds is largely a matter of deduction. There is no fossil evidence of the stages through which the remarkable change from reptile to bird was achieved." Written by W.E. Swinton (British Museum of Natural History, London) in A.J. Marshall (ed.), "Biology and Comparative Physiology of Birds", Vol. 1, Academic Press: New York, 1960 p:1
- (9) Birds do not lay eggs because they are primitive, but because their breeding and survival depends on it. A bird's high body temperature of 40°C, would result in the death of most of their embryos. *Science*, January 20, 1988 p:465; *American Naturalist*, Vol. 130, 1987 p:941



Evolution Says

Archaeopteryx is the evolutionary intermediate between reptiles and birds.

The Facts Are

- (1) In 1984, in Eichstätt (Germany), at the International Archaeopteryx Conference, there was a major world-wide gathering of scientists who specialized in avian (bird) evolution. The outcomes of their meetings were that:- (i) they disagreed on just about everything about the creature, and (ii) they had broad agreement amongst themselves that Archaeopteryx was a true bird. Bird evolution is only a theory, and even the experts agree that Archaeopteryx is not a link between birds and reptiles. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 1994 p:16
- (2) The possession of teeth was considered by evolutionary anatomists to be proof that Archaeopteryx evolved from reptiles. This is considered to be fanciful reasoning when it is considered that:- (i) some fossil birds do have teeth and some do not; (ii) some vertebrates have teeth and some do not; and (iii) most reptiles do not have teeth. Crocodiles are basically the only group of reptiles that consistently have well-developed teeth. Having teeth is therefore, not proof of Archaeopteryx's relationship. *[based on logic]*
- (3) Archaeopteryx possessed a robust furcula (wishbone), a flexible bone that is absolutely essential for birds to be able to fly. Therefore, it was not half way between a reptile and a bird, it was a true flying bird. Dr John Ostrom in "The Beginning of Birds", Jura Museum: Eichstatt (West Germany), 1985 p:174
- (4) "Is *Archaeopteryx* the ancestor of all birds? Perhaps yes, perhaps no: there is no way of answering the question. It is easy enough to make up stories of how one form gave rise to another, and to find reasons why the stages should be favoured by natural selection. But such stories are not part of science, for there is no way of putting them to the test". Contents of a letter written on April 10, 1979, by Dr Colin Patterson, a senior palaeoanthropologist at the British Museum of Natural History. Recorded in Luther Sunderland's "Darwin's Enigma", Master Books: El Cajon (California), 1988 p:88-90
- (5) "Palaeontologists have tried to turn *Archaeopteryx* into an earth-bound, feathered dinosaur. But it is not. It is a bird, a perching bird. And no amount of 'palaeobabble' is going to change that." Written by Alan Feduccia of the University of North Carolina in *Science*, Vol. 259, February 5, 1993 p:764
- (6) "..... we are not even authorized to consider the exceptional case of the *Archaeopteryx* as a true link. By link, we mean the necessary stage of transition between classes such as reptiles and birds, or between smaller groups. An animal displaying characters belonging to two different groups cannot be treated as a true link as long as the intermediary stages have not been found" Noted by Lecomte de Nouy in the book "Human Destiny", New American Library of World Literature Inc: New York, 1957 p:58
- (7) "No doubt it can be argued that *Archaeopteryx* hints of a reptilian ancestry but surely hints do not provide a sufficient basis upon which to secure the concept of the continuity of nature. Moreover, there is no question that this archaic bird is not led up by series of transitional forms from an ordinary terrestrial reptile through a number of gliding types with increasingly developed feathers until the avian condition is reached." Written by Michael Denton in his book "Evolution: Theory in Crisis", Burnett Books Ltd: London, 1985 p:176
- (8) Charles Darwin, who was alive at the time of the acquisition of the Archaeopteryx specimen by the London Museum, did not regard it as convincing evidence for his theory of evolution. In the sixth edition of his book he dismissed it as a 'strange bird'. Charles Darwin, "The Origin of Species", (6th ed. 1859), Senate: London, 1994 imprint, p:284



Evolution Says

Humans evolved from primates, including the insectivorous tree shrews, lemurs and tarsiers. This evolution is proven by the fossil record.

The Facts Are

- (1) The fossils do not show a gradual change from insectivores to primates to pre-humans. There is not, as evolution leads people to believe, a smooth transition which proves that humans evolved. [a summary of the facts]
- (2) Examination of the fossil record is said to show that insectivores appeared first, then the marsupials, then the primates. This must be accepted on the say-so of writers who promote evolution, and actively filter out all information which does not support it. We cannot accept this evolutionary program for primates, as we must see all the raw data from the fossil record to be able to assess the truth of it. Experience leads us to place no confidence in the 'facts' presented in writings, as enlightenment in other areas of the fossil study has shown that fossils can be selectively excluded from supporting evidence if their calculated ages do not fit in with the theoretical ages that are used to 'prove' evolution'. (eg. see M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Baker Book House Co: Michigan (1992)) [based on logic]
- (3) It has been stated that the early primates who moved to the trees to escape predators changed their anatomy. They are said to have not needed a keen sense of smell, so their nose (olfactory organs) radically reduced in size. Also, as there was little danger from predators, their teeth reduced to being small and simple. It is a common fallacy that an organ that is not needed is reduced and eventually discarded by evolution. To do this, evolution must remove the genes for that structure, but there is no known selection mechanism to do this. [based on logic]
- (4) "By comparing the fossil prosimians with the prosimians surviving today in the forests of Madagascar, Africa and southeast Asia, we can infer the characteristics and ways of life of these early primates." Inference is not truth. It is not scientifically correct to assign behavioural characteristics from a known source to an unknown (historical) source that no one has ever seen, and then proceed to label the assignment as fact. Evolution cannot be proved in this fashion. David Morgan (ed.) "Biological Science: The Web of Life" (2nd ed.), Australian Academy of Science: Canberra (Australia), 1973 p:738
- (5) "One of the implications of the idea of evolution is that organisms which are very similar in characteristics, and therefore classified together, may have descended from a common ancestor." An admission that this reasoning is inference, not fact. David Morgan (ed.) "Biological Science: The Web of Life" (2nd ed.), Australian Academy of Science: Canberra (Australia), 1973 p:736
- (6) Biologists have noted that if the living primates are arranged in the sequence, tree shrew, lemur, tarsius, monkey and ape, there is a progressive increase in the number of characteristics that they possess that are believed to be essential for life in trees. From this they conclude, that the series is the actual sequence for the evolution of these animals. This cannot be used as scientific proof for evolution, as any set of things (living or dead), can be put in a logical, graded sequence if the person knows what the first and last ones should look like. [based on logic]
- (7) "..... the transition from insectivore to primate is not documented by fossils. The basis of knowledge about the transition is by inference from living forms." Written by A.J. Kelso (Professor of Physical Anthropology, University of Colorado) in his book "Physical Anthropology" (2nd ed.), J.B. Lippincott: New York, 1974 p:142
- (8) "In spite of recent findings, the time and place of origin of order Primates remains shrouded in mystery." Written by Elwyn L. Simons (Department of Geology and Geophysics, Yale University, USA) in his article "The Origin and Radiation of the Primates" in *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, Vol. 167, 1969 p:319



Evolution Says

Proconsul evolved from the apes 20-25 million years ago. The fossil evidence proves that Proconsul evolved into Ramapithecus, which evolved into Australopithecus. The existence of these part ape, part humans, proves that humans evolved.

The Facts Are

- (1) Proconsul is a collection of bones unearthed in Kenya, some of which have been assessed at 18 million years old. In the 1930's and 40's its human-like features led to speculation that it was the common ancestor of humans and apes. Later finds led to its description being changed to that of an animal which walked on four legs with its palms down like monkeys, was tailless, and lived in trees. Today, Proconsul is not accepted as proof that humans and apes came from a common ancestor. "Reader's Digest Book of Facts", Reader's Digest Ltd: Sydney, 1985 p:11; J. Whitfield Gibbons, "Britannica Book of the Year", Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc: Chicago, 1986 p:296; Hermann K. Bleibtreu "Britannica Book of the Year", Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc: Chicago, 1985 p:163
- (2) A recent analysis of the hip bones of Proconsul indicate that the creature should not be regarded as a 'missing link'. A complete Proconsul left hip bone was compared to 275 hip bones of modern monkeys and apes, showing that it was generally monkey-like, sharing features common with the baboons. *Science News*, Dec 15, 1990 p:380
- (3) Until 1979 *Ramapithecus* was called a human ancestor. This was based on an assessment of a few teeth and small skull fragments. Reconstruction of a full skull, found in the Himalayan Mountains, suggests that *Ramapithecus* are fossil ancestors of the Orangutan, not humans. *New Scientist*, Vol. 28, January, 1982 p:233; Richard Leakey, "The Making of Mankind", Abacus: London, 1982 p:48
- (4) Analysis of the teeth and dentition of *Ramapithecus* by such experts as Richard Leakey, Roger Lewin and W.C.O. Hill have led them to conclude that their characteristics were very similar to those of the Gelada Baboon (*Theropithecus gelada*). This indicates that they should be considered to be an extinct species of apes or baboons, rather than half-human ancestors. Richard Leakey & Roger Lewin, "Origins", MacDonald & Janes: London, 1977 p:68+; W.C.O. Hill, "Primates: Comparative Anatomy and Taxonomy", Vol. VIII - Cynopithecinae, Edinburgh University Press: Edinburgh, 1970 p:536-538
- (5) Analysis of *Ramapithecus* fossil material led palaeontologists David Pilbeam and Peter Andrews to the conclusion that they were not part of human lineage, but rather that of the Orangutan. *Nature*, Vol. 295, No. 5846, 1982 p:185-186; *Science News*, Vol. 121, No. 5, January 30, 1982 p:84
- (6) Some palaeontologists have discovered that Louis Leakey incorrectly pieced together the skull fragments of *Ramapithecus*. This made the jaw more closely resemble that of a human. *Natural History*, Vol. 88, No. 7, 1979 p:86-91
- (7) "The case for *Ramapithecus* as an ancestral human has been weak from the start and has not strengthened with the passage of time." Written by Adrienne L. Zihlman & Jerold M. Lowenstein in their article "False Start of the Human Parade", in *Natural History*, Vol. 88, No. 7, 1979 p:91
- (8) *Ramapithecus* was initially considered to be partially human. It is now known to be fully ape-like, and cannot be used as a missing link. *Scientific American* Vol. 226, 1972 p:94, 101



Evolution Says

Ramapithecus evolved into Australopithecus 10 million years ago. Australopithecus evolved into Homo erectus. The fossil evidence proves this. The existence of these part ape, part humans, proves that humans evolved.

The Facts Are

(1) Australopithecine theories have been based on the meagre evidence of:- a single front face; several lower jaws; numerous teeth; a nearly complete skull; portions of a pelvis; fragments of long bones, and the ends of a few limb bones. These few totally unrelated specimens have been lumped together to produce the hypothetical features of fully grown animals. There is no guarantee that these fragments all came from the same species of individual, so any statements are pure speculation. Malcolm Bowden, "Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy", (2nd ed.), Sovereign Publications: Kent (UK), 1981 p:177-178

(2) Observation of Australopithecine fossils by some respected anthropologists has revealed that they are most likely apes rather than intermediates between apes and humans. Their brain size is similar to a chimpanzee; the teeth wear pattern is like that of a fruit-eating chimpanzee; the canine teeth are definitely ape-like; the skull of *Australopithecus afarensis* looks like a small female gorilla; the foot bone of *Australopithecus afarensis* is curved like a chimpanzee; and their hind limb structure is most like that of the orangutan. Richard Leakey, "The Making of Mankind", Abacus: London, 1982 p:69-70, 74-75, 131-133; *Science*, Vol. 213, July 17, 1981 p:348-349; *New Scientist*, September 3, 1981 p:595; *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, Vol. 41, 1974 p:191

(3) Computerized X-ray scans of Australopithecine skulls have been conducted in an attempt to examine their inner ear. The shape of the bones in the inner ear are directly related to the pattern of movement of the individual. Australopithecine structures indicate that they walked decidedly ape-like. They are therefore not intermediates between humans and apes. *New Scientist*, July 30, 1994 p:26-29; *Nature*, Vol. 369, June 23, 1994 645-648

(4) "The first impression given by all the skulls from the different populations of *Australopithecus* is of a distinctly ape-like creature

The ape-like profile of *Australopithecus* is so pronounced that its outline can be superimposed on that of a female chimpanzee with a remarkable closeness of fit

Australopithecus stands in strong contrast to modern *Homo sapiens* [ie. humans]. Written by evolutionist and palaeontologist Professor Joseph Weiner in his book "The Natural History of Man", Universe Books: New York, 1971 p:45 & 46

(5) "The Australopithecine skull is in fact so overwhelmingly simian [ie. ape-like], as opposed to human that the contrary proposition could be equated to an assertion that black is white." Written by anatomist Sir Zolly Zuckerman (once Professor of Anatomy, University of Birmingham, Secretary of the Zoological Society of London, and Chief scientific adviser to the British Government) in his book "Beyond the Ivory Tower", Taplinger Pub. Co: London, 1970 p:78

(6) "In each case although initial studies suggests that the [australopithecine] fossils are similar to humans, or at the worst intermediate between humans and African apes, study of the complete evidence readily shows that the reality is otherwise." Written by evolutionist, anatomist & biologist Dr Charles Oxnard (Professor of Anatomy and Human Biology, University of W.A.) in his book "Fossils, Teeth and Sex: New Perspectives on Human Evolution", University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1987 p:227

(7) "As far as geologically more recent evidence is concerned, the discovery in East Africa of apparent remains of *Homo [sapiens]* in the same early fossil sites as both gracile and robust australopithecines has thrown open once again the question of the direct relevance of the latter to human evolution. So one is forced to conclude that there is no clear-cut scientific picture of human evolution." Written by Dr Robert Martin (Senior Research Fellow, Zoological Society of London) in his article "Man is not an Onion" in *New Scientist*, August 4, 1977 p:285



Evolution Says

'Lucy' is an Australopithecus that walked upright. The fossil evidence proves this. The existence of this part ape, part human, proves that humans evolved.

The Facts Are

- (1) The fossil *Australopithecus afarensis* (alias 'Lucy') was assembled by anthropologist Donald Johanson from fossil fragments found in Ethiopia in 1974. The bones pieced together to form 40% of a possibly female skeleton that was assessed to be 3.5 million years old. At a lecture at the University of Missouri (Kansas City) on November 20, 1986, Johanson confessed that the knee-joint was found 60-70 m lower in the strata than the rest of the bones, and 2-3 kilometres away. Johanson said that he put the joint on 'Lucy' because it was anatomically similar, not because it actually belonged to the skeleton. The only reason Johanson and others say the 'Lucy' walked upright, and that it was a human ancestor, is because of the presence of this wrongly added knee-joint. *CSA News*, February 1987
- (2) The arm/leg ratio of a human is 0.75, while an ape's is 1.00. Johanson has given Lucy's ratio as 0.83, half-way between human and ape. This seems to give credence to the theory that Lucy is a missing link. However, Johanson has confessed that he estimated the leg length because the only leg found was broken in two places, and one end was crushed. This estimate makes his 'precise' proof ratio useless, and negates it from being a human missing link. M. Bowden, "Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy", (2nd ed.), Sovereign Publications: Kent (UK), 1981 p:222
- (3) 'Lucy' walked on two legs according to its discoverer, Donald Johanson, because of "the angle of the thigh bone and the flattened surface at its knee joint end....." It is interesting to note that this conclusion was drawn from a 40% complete skeleton, whose femur had a severely crushed knee joint end. *National Geographic*, Vol. 150, No. 6, 1976 p:790-811
- (4) Anthropologist Richard Leakey doubts the reconstruction of 'Lucy', believing that the skull may be two separate skull fragments mistakenly put together. He has described the reconstruction of Lucy's incomplete skull as "imagination, made of plaster of Paris". Leakey doubts that 'Lucy' has any part in human evolution. *The Australian*, August 8, 1986 p:3; *The Weekend Australian*, May 7-9, 1983 p:3
- (5) A new analytical technique which uses a scanning electron microscope to 'read' the patterns of bone deposits on skulls has been used on 'Lucy' to factually analyse its fossil relationships. Analysis of Lucy's skull deposition pattern indicates that it is the same as the chimpanzee, and all together different from humans. *New Scientist*, January 11, 1992 p:35
- (6) Palaeontologist Adrienne Zihlman (University of California), has stated that "Lucy's fossil remains match up remarkably well with the bones of a pigmy chimp", even though he did find some differences between them. *New Scientist*, Vol. 104, No. 1430, November 1984 p:39-40
- (7) A comparison of the pelvis of 'Lucy', with that of a chimpanzee and a human has revealed that 'Lucy' was only capable of giving birth to young the size of a newborn chimp. This investigation lends further weight to the idea that 'Lucy' was just a species of ape. *Science News*, December 14, 1985 p:376
- (8) A growing number of evolutionary anatomists who have studied the bones of 'Lucy' have concluded that the creature is not related to humans. They do not believe that it is an intermediate between humans and apes, or that it walked upright in a human manner. Charles Oxnard, "Fossils, Teeth and Sex - New Perspectives on Human Evolution", University of Washington Press: Seattle. 1987 p:227



Evolution Says

Australopithecus evolved into Homo erectus. Homo erectus evolved into Homo habilis. Homo habilis evolved into Sinanthropus. The fossil evidence proves this. The existence of these part ape, part humans, proves that humans evolved.

The Facts Are

(1) Fossilised human remains have been recently discovered in Tanzania. They have been dated as 6 million years old. This is older than all the fossil remains of *Homo erectus* and the Australopithecines, which are believed to be the evolutionary 'predecessors' of humans. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 12/9/92

(2) Mass graves have been uncovered in Kow Swamp (northern Victoria) which contained modern human skeletons buried alongside *Homo erectus* skeletons. Such burial techniques are a modern innovation (relatively speaking) and indicate that the individuals existed side-by-side, probably living and eating together. With this cultural evidence, *Homo erectus* should not be seen as different to humans. *North West Magazine*, April 22, 1991 p:11

(3) *Homo habilis* was first constructed from fossil bones discovered in 1964. The bones were found scattered among stone tools and other bones of pigs, horses, catfish and tortoises. The scattered bones were put together and *Homo habilis* was invented. Recent examination of the finger bones of this fossil has led scientists to conclude that, in overall structure, the hand is similar to that of a chimpanzee or a female gorilla. *Science*, Vol. 217, September 3, 1982 p:931-934: John Reader, "Missing Links", BCA/Collins: London, 1981 p:182-192

(4) Bones found in Tanzania in 1986 by Donald Johanson, consisting of 300 pieces, were identified as a female *Homo habilis* who died 1.8 million years ago. Later analysis of the bones indicated a different scenario. The creature is now believed to have stood 1 m tall, had upper arm bones almost as large as its thigh bone, with hands that came almost down to its knees, and hand bones that curved. All these later admissions indicate that the animal was an ape, not a human as originally announced to the public. *New Scientist*, May 21, 1987 p:27; *Nature*, May 21-27, 1987 p:205-209

(5) Unknown to most people, human fossils have been excavated in the same area as fossils designated as *Homo habilis*. These human fossils have been automatically assigned an age several hundred thousand years later than the other fossils, as evolutionary theory demands such age differences. M. Bowden, "Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy", (2nd ed.), Sovereign Pub: Kent (UK), 1981 p:187-193

(6) Richard Leakey (Director of the National Museum in Kenya, Africa), has confessed that he agrees with others who have criticised his father's reconstructions of *Homo habilis* skulls. *The Weekend Australian*, May 7-9, 1983 p:3

(7) "In this case there would be no problem from a palaeontological point of view in downgrading *H. habilis* to a variety of *A. africanus*." Evidence that *Homo habilis* exists only in the minds of palaeontologists. Written in G. Clark, "World Prehistory in New Perspective", (3rd. ed), Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1977 p:5, 22

(8) The oldest human-like fossil found so far is a modern human humerus dated by evolutionists at around 4 million years old. It is older than any supposed human ape-like ancestors such as *Australopithecus*. M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Baker Book House Co: Michigan (USA), 1992 p:52-58



Evolution Says

Homo habilis evolved into Sinanthropus. Sinanthropus evolved into Pithecanthropus. Pithecanthropus evolved into Eoanthropus. The fossil evidence proves this. The existence of these part ape, part humans, proves that humans evolved.

The Facts Are

- (1) Peking Man (*Sinanthropus*), must reasonably be considered as one of the many evolutionary hoaxes. These fossils were discovered in 1923, but ten skeletons mysteriously disappeared in 1925, and the rest of the collection was 'lost' in transit to America in 1941. The controversial interpretation of these bones has never undergone modern scientific scrutiny to confirm their status as human ancestors. W.R. Thompson, "New Challenging 'Introduction' to the Origin of Species", Everyman Library No. 811, 1956
 - (2) The reconstruction of Peking Man skull #11 became known as 'Nellie'. Few people know that there were problems with its reconstruction. These were:- (i) the skull was badly broken and far from complete; (ii) the facial bones that were added to the skull were found a metre or so away and may not have belonged to the skull; and (iii) the toothless jaw came from a part of the excavation 25m higher up than the skull. Paul S. Taylor, "The Illustrated Origins Answer Book" (4th. ed.), Eden Publications: Mesa (Arizona), 1992 p:92
 - (3) The general public, plus most of the scientific community, are not aware that there was evidence of ancient human activity at the Peking Man site. Ten human fossil remains were found, along with tools and fire places. There was also evidence that the humans had been mining limestone at the site and that they had transported thousands of quartz stones there. Malcolm Bowden, "Ape Men: Fact or Fallacy" (2nd. ed.), Sovereign Publications: Bromney (UK), 1981
 - (4) Almost every expert today agrees that each Peking Man had been eaten and killed by human hunters. Each skull had been bashed inwards in a way that would allow the brain to be taken out. There were no bodies at the site, which logically leads to the conclusion that the heads were brought there to eat. All these facts indicate that *Sinanthropus* was a variety of ape which is now extinct. Malcolm Bowden, "Ape-Man: Fact or Fallacy", Sovereign Publications: Bromney (UK), 1981; Marcellin Boule & Henri Vallois "Fossil Men", Dryden Press: New York, 1957 p:145
 - (5) The world famous fossil, Java Man (*Pithecanthropus*), was re-constructed in 1891 from just a thigh bone and a skull cap. Dr Eugene Dubois, the discoverer, found the thigh bone 15 metres away from the skull cap, yet he combined them together into the one individual. M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Michigan: Baker Book House Co. (1992) p:86
 - (6) Dubois found 2 real human skulls in the same strata, and close to the two bones of Java Man. Dubois never mentioned that he had found these human skulls all the time he promoted Java Man. If he had, nobody would have accepted his claims that Java Man was the 'missing link'. It was not until 1920, 30 years later, that he publicised this fact to the world. Malcolm Bowden, "Ape-Man: Fact or Fallacy", Sovereign Publications: Bromney (UK), 1981 p:131
 - (7) "*Pithecanthropus* ['Java Man'] was not a man, but a gigantic genus allied to the gibbons
- I still believe, now more firmly than ever, that the *Pithecanthropus* of Trinil is the real "missing link". Eugene Dubois contradicting himself in 1932, after pushing since 1892 that *Pithecanthropus* was half-ape and half-human. Recorded by Stephen J. Gould in "Men of the Thirty-Third Division", *Natural History*, April 1990 p:12-24



Evolution Says

Pithecanthropus evolved into Eoanthropus. Eoanthropus evolved into Hesperopithecus. Hesperopithecus evolved into the Neandertals. The fossil evidence proves this evolution and provides evidence of many other intermediates between them. The existence of these part ape, part humans, proves that humans evolved.

The Facts Are

(1) Many fossils have been 'sold' to science, and to the world, as the true missing link in human evolution. These have all been subsequently displaced or disproved by later discoveries. This shows that human evolution is only a theory. W.R. Fix, "The Bone Peddlers - Selling Evolution", Macmillan Publishing Co: New York, 1984

(2) Pitdown Man (*Eoanthropus*), of which only skull fragments were found, was proved to be a hoax in 1982. An examination of the real bones showed that the teeth had been filed down. Collagen tests conducted more recently, show that the jaw came from an orangutan. M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Michigan: Baker Book House Co., 1992 p:16, 39-44; Frank Spencer, "Pitdown: A Scientific Forgery", Oxford University Press: Oxford (UK), 1990

(3) Nebraska Man (*Hesperopithecus*) was constructed from just one tooth, and many scientists have differed with its discoverer's classification. Over successive years, more teeth were found, and were positively identified as belonging to an extinct pig. Nebraska Man never existed, and can never be used to prove human evolution. *Nature*, Vol. 109, 1922 p:750; John Reader, "Missing Links", Book Club Associates: London, 1981 p:110

(4) The Taung skull has been dated as being 2-3 million years old (according to evolutionary dating), but it was found in a cave that is estimated to have been formed less than 870,000 years ago. M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Michigan: Baker Book House Co., 1992 p:50

(5) 'Boxgrove Man', a recently discovered fossil, has been dubbed the 'oldest European'. It has been described as a hairy ape-like creature by the Chief Government Archaeologist at the excavation. These descriptions have been made from hand tools found at the site, and from a single shin-bone which has both ends missing. The fossil has been assigned the age of 500,000 years old, yet the shin-bone is indistinguishable from that of a modern human. *New Scientist*, May 28, 1994 p:5

(6) 'Nutcracker Man' and 'East Africa Man' are the popular names given to Louis Leakey's fossil skull, found in 1959. It was given the name *Zinjanthropus boisei* and was publicised by Leakey's sponsor (the National Geographic Society) as man's ancestor. Artist's drawings in their journal showed it to have ape-like features, an intelligent 'look' in its eyes, a hairy body, walking upright, and holding a club over its shoulder. This artistic depiction helped to convince many people that human evolution was a fact. Today, the specimen has been renamed to belong to the genus *Australopithecus*, a robust variety of southern apes. It is no longer promoted as a human ancestor. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1991 p:22

(7) 'Southwest Colorado Man' was another mythical human predecessor now not considered as proof of human evolution. This individual was constructed from a tooth which is now believed to have come from a horse. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:98

(8) True human fossil remains have been found along with many supposed human ancestors. Human fossil remains have also been dated the same age as some 'human ancestors'. A sample of such fossils are:- Petralona Man, Castenedolo Man, Oldoway Man, Swanscombe Man, Vertesszollos Man, Fontechevade Man, Foxhall Man, Natchez Man, Galley Hill Man, Clichy Man, and Calaveras Man. Malcolm Bowden, "Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy?", Sovereign Publications: Bromney (UK), 1977 p:16-182



Evolution Says

Hesperopithecus evolved into the Neandertals. The Neandertals evolved into humans (Homo sapiens). The fossil evidence proves this. The existence of these human-like creatures with large ape-like skulls, proves that humans evolved.

The Facts Are

- (1) The first reasonably complete fossil Neandertal skeleton was reconstructed by Boule in 1908 with an ape-like stoop. It took 40 years for scientists to correct this error. Even so, many teachers still teach Boule's original interpretation of the Neandertal's stooping physique as fact, as it lends weight to human evolution. M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Baker Book House Co: Michigan, 1992 p:59-62
- (2) Neandertal's primitive features are now considered to be the result of nutritional deficiencies and pathological conditions. They are now classified as fully human. *Nature*, Vol. 227 p:577
- (3) Fossils of modern humans and Neandertals have been found together, at the same level, in the same fossil sites. It is therefore scientifically improper to state that modern humans evolved from Neandertals. M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Baker Book House Co: Michigan, 1992 p:180
- (4) In 1924 two skulls identified as *Homo sapiens* (ie. modern human) were found lower than the tools of Neandertals. This makes humans older than Neandertals, and shows that Neandertals could not logically evolve into humans. *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 67, December 1948 p:436-439
- (5) There are a number of palaeoanthropologists who believe that today's interpretation of Neandertals is not correct. These researchers believe that Neandertal's bigger than average brain means that they were almost certainly capable of articulate speech as we are today. Anthropologist Anne-Marie Tillier (Bordeaux University) believes that Neandertals should be assumed to be 'just like us, until proven otherwise'. *New Scientist*, February 15, 1992 p:9
- (6) Neandertal bones found in some Israeli caves have been found in some places above human bones, and in others along side them. Anthropologists regard both types of bones as being "one big anatomically variable population". *Science News*, Vol. 139, June 8, 1991 p:360-363
- (7) A world-wide study has shown that many modern Danes and Norwegians have identical cranial features to Neandertals - ie. a short narrow skull, large cheekbones and nose, and a bun-like bony bulge on the back of their heads. Their skulls are also about the same height and length as a Neandertal skull. *The Arizona Republic*, Vol. 99, No. 186, November 20, 1988 p:B-5
- (8) "If modern cranial form is appraised world-wide in regard to these same [Neandertal-like] attributes, then it is clear that northwest Europeans can be distinguished from the rest of the people in the world by precisely the same set of characteristics." Written by Carle Hodge his article "Neanderthal Traits Extant, Group Told", in *The Arizona Republic*, Vol. 99, No. 186, November 20, 1988 p:B-5
- (9) An announcement was made at the American Anthropological Association in Washington DC, in 1985, which confirmed that Neandertals were human. Data on the birth canal of the pelvis of Neandertal females showed that it was the same size as those of modern humans. *Science News*, December 14, 1985 p:376
- (10) "Evolutionary models centred on a direct ancestor-descendant relationship between Neandertals and modern *Homo sapiens* must surely now be discarded". Written by Chris Stringer, an evolution specialist at the British Museum, in *Nature*, February 18, 1988 p:614-616; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19/2/88



Evolution Says

The first humans were extremely primitive hunters and gatherers. They were stooped, hairy and carried around clubs to kill animals and protect themselves. They lived in caves and only used stone tools. The fossil evidence and cave paintings prove this. The development of stone tools shows increasing mental ability, and supports evolution

The Facts Are

(1) Cro-Magnon humans are believed by many evolutionists to be our primitive ancestors in the long trail of our development from apes. Because of this basic assumption, and from very meagre evidence, Cro-Magnons are portrayed in art and text as a club-swinging brute who lived in caves. This was to show that they had not progressed very far from the life-style of their allegedly subhuman ancestors. The facts are that Cro-Magnon people possessed a high level of technology and culture. They did not just live in caves, but built huts, made stone paving floors, constructed kilns, and baked pottery. They made tools of bone, flint, ivory, antler and wood. They had instruments (eg. bone flutes), wore jewellery, sewed clothing, had rituals and ceremonies, and produced some high quality paintings. Cro-Magnon bears all the resemblance to a primitive race of humans. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1990 p:12-14

(2) 'Stone Age' culture was believed to be very primitive, where people ate raw or barbecued meat. Yet, stone ovens estimated to be 28,000 years old have been discovered in Noumea (Japan). *The Sun-Herald*, December 20, 1992 p:23

(3) Many primitive 'Stone Age' tribes which used Stone Age technology and lived as primitive hunters and gatherers, have had to be re-classified. Archaeological studies have shown that they are often descendants of previous civilizations, where a sophisticated culture, fine pottery and advanced agriculture were casualties of wars, plagues and catastrophes. Basic technology and a non-farming life-style can not be used to extrapolate a culture to a Stone Age past. This is true both of living tribes and 'fossil' cultures (those deduced from relics left by extinct groups of alleged Stone Age humans). *New Scientist*, February 20, 1993 p:8

(4) One of the most popular myths of human evolution is that stone tools testify to the increasing mental and conceptual abilities of humans as they evolved. They were once considered an almost independent confirmation of evolutionary development. For example, Acheulean tools were associated with *Homo erectus*, and Oldowan tools with *Homo habilis*. However, now, almost every basic style of tool has been found with almost every category of human fossil material. *Nature*, Vol. 351, June 27, 1991 p:701

(5) The reason why anthropologists believe absolutely that early humans were hunters is because hunting puts a premium on foresight and dexterity. This is believed to have favoured the evolution of larger brains and nimbler hands, which in turn would increase the capacity for technology. It is hunting, they say, that separated early man from apes. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19/9/92

(6) A newer philosophical theory suggests that early man was not a hunter but a scavenger. Complex signal pointing, sharing food, gathering and dividing food is supposed to have catalysed human social and intellectual evolution. These sets of theories show that the nature of early humans is still a matter of conjecture. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19/9/92

(7) Cave paintings found in Spain in 1990, depicting the first extinct rhinoceroses seen in Europe, have been exposed as frauds. Specialists called in to examine the paintings declared them to have been painted within 5 years of their discovery. *Diggings*, September 1992 p:15



Evolution Says

Modern humans (Homo sapiens) first evolved from Neandertals 35,000-40,000 years ago.

The Facts Are

- (1)** Human fossil skulls and bones have been found in anthracite coal. The assessed age of the rock is hundreds of millions of years older than the time when humans are said to have evolved. *Science Frontiers*, September/October, 1991 p:3
- (2)** Two fossils, most definitely human, have been found in a copper mine in Moab (Utah, USA). They still had their bones joined together by sinews, and were stained green from the copper ore. The sandstone rock in which the skeletons were found was assessed by evolutionary methods as being 65 million years old, yet evolutionists teach that modern humans evolved less than 100,000 years ago. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1973 p:109-110
- (3)** A 4 cm baked clay figurine was extracted from a well being dug in Nampa (Idaho) in 1889. It was found some 90m below the surface, in so-called Pliocene sediment (2.5-7.0 million years old). The Nampa Image has fallen into disfavour among antiquarians, not because it was thought to be fake, but because evolutionary dogma forbade that an artifact that ancient could have been made by humans. *Scientific American*, November 9, 1889; *Popular Science Monthly*, No. 37, 1890; *INFO Journal*, Autumn, 1967
- (4)** A hammer has been found embedded in Ordovician rock in London (Texas, USA), and has been assigned the age of 400-500 million years. The handle of the hammer is wooden, and the head is steel. An analysis of the head by Batelle Laboratories (USA) indicates that it was not prepared by any known modern process of steel production. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1985 p:14-16 [photos included]
- (5)** Some man-made items recovered from coal seams include:- (a) a gold chain [1891], (b) an iron thimble [1883], (c) a drill bit or borer [1853], (d) coins [1901], (e) a cuboid-shaped tool [1885], and (f) a carved stone plate bearing the image of a man's face. These discoveries have never been widely announced, as they contradict the evolutionary time-frames for rock formation and human evolution. (a) *Morrisonville Times*, June 11, 1891; (b) *American Antiquarian*, Vol. 5, 1883; (c) *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of Scotland*, Vol. 1, Part 2, 1853; (d) *Strand Magazine*, Vol. 21, 1901; (e) *INFO Journal*, Autumn, 1967; (f) *The Daily Bee* Newspaper, April 3, 1897
- (6)** As far back as 1940, scientists have been aware of human footprints in rocks older than the supposed time of human evolution. Prints discovered at that time were assigned to the Carboniferous Age, a time before the theorized evolution of even the dinosaurs. *Scientific American*, Vol. 162, No. 1, 1940 p:14
- (7)** Human-like fossil footprints have been discovered in numerous places - eg. at Laetoli (East Africa), at the Paluxy River (Texas), and in Russia. All footprints were found in rock of similar age to those bearing dinosaur fossils, or were discovered near dinosaur tracks. These tracks indicate that humans and dinosaurs were alive at the same time. M.D. Leakey & J.M. Harris (eds), "Laetoli - A Pliocene site in Northern Tanzania", Clarendon Press: London, 1987 p:503-523; *Moscow News*, No. 24, 1983 p:10; *Acts & Facts*, April, 1987 p:5
- (8)** Fossils of trilobites have been found inside fossilized human footprints at several locations. This is impossible according to the evolutionary timetable, as trilobites were supposed to have become extinct some 230 million years before the appearance of humans. W.A. Criswell, "Did Man Just Happen?", Zondervan Pub. Co: Grand Rapids (USA), 1973 p:87; A.E. Wilder-Smith, "The Natural Sciences Know Nothing of Evolution", Master Books: San Diego (USA), 1981 p:166
- (9)** In Arizona (USA) and Rhodesia (Africa) there are places where dinosaur pictures have been drawn on cave and canyon walls by humans. It would be impossible for a human to draw a dinosaur if dinosaurs died out hundreds of millions of years before humans were supposed to have evolved. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (USA), 1983 p:17



Evolution Says

The whole evolution from primates to humans is a known fact, described perfectly in the fossil record. The size of the brain is a very accurate indicator of a fossil's evolution in regards to thought, morality, culture & behaviour.

The Facts Are

(1) There is nothing in the size of the brain to indicate morality, behaviour, or any degree of culture. Brain size should not be used to infer these characteristics on fossil remains. M. L. Lubenow, "Bones of Contention", Michigan: Baker Book House Co. (1992) p:84

(2) "The fossils that decorate our family tree are so scarce that there are still more scientists than specimens. The remarkable fact is that all the physical evidence we have for human evolution can still be placed, with room to spare, inside a single coffin." Written by evolutionary anthropologist Dr Lyall Watson, in his article "The Water People", in *Science Digest*, Vol. 90, No.5, May 1982 p:44

(3) "The entire hominid collection known today would barely cover a billiard table, but it has spawned a science because it is distinguished by two factors which inflate its apparent relevance far beyond its merits the collection is so tantalizingly incomplete, and the specimens themselves often so fragmentary and inconclusive, that more can be said about what is missing than about what is present." Written by John Reader (author of "Missing Links") in his article "Whatever Happened to Zinjanthropus?" in *New Scientist*, Vol. 89, No. 1246, March 1981 p:802-805

(4) "Biologists would dearly like to know how modern apes, modern humans and the various ancestral hominids have evolved from a common ancestor. Unfortunately, the fossil record is somewhat incomplete as far as the hominids are concerned, and it is all but blank for the apes." Written by world-renowned palaeoanthropologist, Richard Leakey in "The Making of Mankind", Michael Joseph Press Ltd: London, 1981 p:43

(5) "The fossil record pertaining to man is still so sparsely known that those who insist on positive declarations can do nothing more than jump from one hazardous surmise to another and hope that the next dramatic discovery does not make them utter fools As we have seen there are numerous scientists and popularizers today who have the temerity to tell us that there 'is no doubt' how man originated. If only they had the evidence" Written by evolutionist William R. Fix in his book "The Bone Peddlers", MacMillan Pub. Co: New York, 1984 p:150

(6) "..... from the actual structure of the chromosome we can demonstrate that the human species did not come from a progressive humanisation of a pre-human." Professor Jerome Lejeune (Chair of Fundamental Genetics, University of Paris), from his conference paper "The Beginning of Life", October 1975.

(7) "Amid the bewildering array of early fossil hominoids, is there one whose morphology marks it as man's hominid ancestor? If the factor of genetic variability is considered, the answer appears to be no." Written by Dr Robert B. Eckhardt (Professor of Anthropology, Pennsylvania State University, USA) in his article "Population Genetics and Human Origins", in *Scientific American*, Vol. 226, No. 1, 1972 p:94

(8) "..... in the present state of our knowledge, I do not believe it is possible to fit the known hominid [human-like] fossils into a reliable pattern." Written by world-renowned palaeontologist Mary Leakey, in "Disclosing the Past", Doubleday & Co: New York, 1984 p:214

(9) "So one is forced to conclude that there is no clear-cut scientific picture of human evolution." Written by Dr Robert Martin (Senior Research Fellow at the Zoological Society of London) in the article "Man Is Not An Onion", in *New Scientist*, Vol. 75, No. 1063, August 1977 p:285



Evolution Says

The first humans evolved in Africa from a single female 100,000 years ago.

The Facts Are

(1) There are numerous and diverse theories of human origin - not just an African one. There are two main groups providing hypothetical scenarios of human development based on the interpretation of existing data. The 'Out of Africa' camp are mostly geneticists who use data from mitochondrial DNA. The second group, the 'Separate Evolution' camp, are mostly palaeoanthropologists who interpret fossil data. There is no 'absolute' theory of human evolution, as it depends on which data is being analysed, what the premises of the interpretation are, and the evolutionary framework with which the data is viewed. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 1991 p:20-23

(2) The theory that humans evolved in Africa more than 100,000 years ago, then migrated to Europe around 35,000 years ago is accepted by many evolutionary proponents as a fact. One part of the evidence for this theory is a small number of skeletal remains - their type and assessed age. Should older fossils be found elsewhere in the world, this theory will have to be terminated. *Nature* report in *Sydney Morning Herald*, 19/2/88

(3) The origin of humans in Africa is also based on the fact that tools which were found there have been dated as 2.0-2.5 million years old. These are the 'oldest' human tools ever found. The fact that these are the oldest, doesn't necessarily make them the first. *Science News*, March 8, 1986 p:149

(4) Another promulgated theory that modern humans evolved from an 'African Eve' 300,000 years ago is actually based on unsubstantiated assumptions. The date was reached by calculating how long it has been since all mitochondrial DNA was supposedly the same, based on the hypothesis that this form of DNA mutates at a rate of 2-4% every million years. Such foundational speculation cannot produce truth. *The Courier-mail* (Brisbane), May 9, 1986 p:5; *The Weekend Australian*, March 8-9, 1986

(5) 'Evidence' from DNA in cell organs called mitochondria, has been used to support the theory that humans descended from an 'African Eve'. It has now been admitted that the computer program used in the analysis was flawed, being based on circular reasoning. Depending on the starting assumptions, any one of a billion family trees could be made just as plausible, with any possible area of the world as the centre of human origin. *Science*, Vol. 255, February 7, 1992 p:686; *The Age* (Melbourne), February 24, 1992

(6) By studying mitochondria, Dr Rebecca Cann and Dr Mark Stoneking believe they have traced humans back to an origin in Africa 300,000 years ago. Douglas Wallace, studying mitochondria, has traced humans to Asia 100,000 years ago. The study of geological data has led Edmund Gill to trace human origins to Australia. *The Courier-mail* (Brisbane), May 9, 1986 p:5; *The Courier-Mail* (Brisbane), July 18, 1986; *The Weekend Australian*, March 3-4, 1986 p:17

(7) "[Statements about human origins have] very little to do with the real data and a great deal to do with unstated assumptions

Much of what is said in other areas, I think, is also highly speculative".

A statement by Dr David Pilbeam, an expert palaeoanthropologist at the Boston Natural History Museum. From an interview with Luther Sunderland, and recorded in his book "Darwin's Enigma", Master Books: El Cajon (California), 1988 p:88-90



Evolution Says

Evolution is the long term development of simple organisms into complex organisms over 1/2 billion years. The fossil record proves this.

The Facts Are

(1) Rather than regarding the single-celled bacteria as simple and primitive, many scientists today regard them as being complex and sophisticated. This becomes obvious, when it is considered that a one-celled animal may be made up of millions of molecular parts. *Scientific American*, Vol. 258, No. 6, June 1988 p:82

(2) "The simplest bacterium is so complicated from the point of view of a chemist that it is almost impossible to imagine how it happened". Expressed by the chairman of a 1990 National Academy of Science committee reviewing all origin-of-life research, and recorded in John Horgan's "Trends in Evolution: In the Beginning", *Scientific American*, February, 1991 p:100-109

(3) "But let us have no illusions. If today we look into the situations where the analogy with the life sciences is the most striking our research would still leave us quite unable to grasp the extreme complexity of the simplest of organisms." Written by Ilya Prigogine (Professor & Director of the Physics Department, Universite Libre de Bruxelles) in the article "Can Thermodynamics Explain Biological Order?", in *Impact of Science on Society*, Vol. 23, No. 3, 1973 p:178

(4) "I would rather believe in fairies than in such wild speculation. I have said for years that speculations about the origin of life lead to no useful purpose as even the simplest living system is far too complex to be understood in terms of the extremely primitive chemistry scientists have used in their attempts to explain the unexplainable." Thoughts expressed by Ernst B. Chain, Nobel Prize winning biochemist, and member of the penicillin development team. Quoted by Ronald W. Clark in his book "The Life of Ernst Chain: Penicillin and Beyond", Weidenfeld & Nicolson: London, 1985 p:147-148

(5) "However, the macromolecule-to-cell transition is a jump of fantastic dimensions, which lies beyond the range of testable hypothesis. In this area, all is conjecture. The available facts do not provide a basis for postulating that cells arose on this planet We simply wish to point out the fact that there is no scientific evidence." Written by the biochemists and evolutionists, David Green (University of Wisconsin, USA) and Robert Goldberger (National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland USA) in their book "Molecular Insights Into The Living Process", Academic Press: New York, 1967 p:406-407

(6) "The problem for biology is to reach a simple beginning the tendency is to imagine that there must have been a time when simple cells existed, but when complex cells did not this belief has turned out to be wrong Going back in time to the age of the oldest rocks fossil residues of ancient life-forms in the rocks do not reveal a simple beginning. Although we may care to think of fossil bacteria and fossil algae and microfungi as being simple compared to a dog or horse, the information standard remains enormously high. Most of the biochemical complexity of life was present already at the time the oldest surface rocks of the Earth were formed." A statement indicating that all cellular organisms discovered as fossils so far have been made of complex cells - no evolution from primordial soup to simple cell to complex cell has yet been discovered. Written by evolutionists Fred Hoyle, and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe, in "Evolution from Space", J.M. Dent & Sons: London, 1981 p:8 & 70

(7) If anything should give an indication that evolution results in simple life becoming more complex, it should be shown in the amount of genetic material a species cell contains. The more complex an animal, the greater the number of genes required for it to function. The converse should also be true. An examination, however, of the chromosome number of living things shows that this is not the case. For example, the number of chromosomes for some animals in order of their supposed evolutionary development are:- worm (2), crayfish (100), shrimp (254), goldfish (94), housefly (12), chicken (78), mouse (40), horse (66), & human (46). E. Sinnott, et al, "Principles of Genetics" (5th ed.), McGraw-Hill: New York, 1958 p:11



Evolution Says

All scientists believe that the fossil record provides the perfect, absolute proof of evolution.

The Facts Are

- (1) "Why in subsequent periods of great evolutionary activity when countless species, genera, and families arose, have there been no new animal body plans produced, no new phyla?" Roger Lewin lamenting the fact that macroevolution doesn't appear to have occurred after the Permian period when it was expected. *Science*, Vol. 241, 1988 p:20
- (2) "The only drawback that has kept the fossil record from answering most questions in systematics is its notorious incompleteness." Written by R. Schaeffer, and others, in their book "Evolutionary Biology", (T. Dobzhansky et. al. eds.), Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972 p:38
- (3) "Palaeontologists disagree about the speed and pattern of evolution it springs, I believe, from the false idea that the fossil record provides an important part of the evidence that evolution took place." Written by Mark Ridley (Zoologist, Oxford University) in his article "Who Doubts Evolution?" in *New Scientist*, Vol. 90, June 25, 1981 p:830
- (4) "Darwin's theory of natural selection has always been closely linked to evidence from fossils, and probably most people assume that fossils provide a very important part of the general argument that is made in favour of Darwinian interpretations of the history of life. Unfortunately, this is not strictly true." Written by Dr David M. Raup (Curator of Geology, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago) in his article "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology" in *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Vol. 50, No. 1, 1979 p:22
- (5) "In any case, no real evolutionist, whether gradualist or punctuationalist, uses the fossil record as evidence in favour of the theory of evolution" Written by Professor Mark Ridley (Professor of Zoology, Oxford University) in his article "Who Doubts Evolution?", in *New Scientist*, Vol. 90, No. 1259, June 1981 p:831
- (6) "..... anatomy and the fossil record cannot be relied upon for evolutionary lineages. Yet palaeontologists persist in doing just this." Written by J. Lowenstein & A. Zihlman in "The Invisible Ape", *New Scientist*, Vol. 120, No. 1641, 1988 p:57
- (7) "Contrary to what most scientists write, the fossil record does not support the Darwinian theory of evolution because it is this theory (there are several) which we use to interpret the fossil record. By doing so, we are guilty of circular reasoning if we then say the fossil record supports this theory" Written by Ronald R. West in "Palaeontology and Uniformitarianism", *Compass*, Vol. 45, May 1968 p:216
- (8) "Nine-tenths of the talk of evolutionists is sheer nonsense, not founded on observation and wholly unsupported by facts. This museum is full of [fossil] proofs of the utter falsity of their views. In all this great museum, there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species." A remark made by Dr Etheridge, world-famous palaeontologist of the British Museum. Recorded in Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (USA), 1983 p:119



Evolution Says

Palaeontologists accurately rebuild prehistoric animals from fossils. This shows us exactly what they looked like.

The Facts Are

- (1) The reconstruction of fossils by palaeontological experts gives an impression of absolute exactness of the end product. It is interesting to note then, that there is not a lot of agreement between these experts. The reconstructions they produce are often erroneous, and have to be changed. Only specimens found intact, such as in a bog or in ice, are capable of being accurate. [based on logic]
- (2) Taxidermist and dinosaur sculptor, Buddy Davis (USA), has confessed that while palaeontologists may have some idea about what the muscles and flesh were like, no one knows what the skin looked like (except from mummified fossils). He also confirmed that the skin texture placed on models could be way off, and that colours chosen were just guess-work. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1991 p:10-14
- (3) There is a difference in opinion over whether the tiny forelimbs of *Tyrannosaurus rex* were weak and useless. Some palaeontologists say they were powerful because they possibly had huge muscles attached to them. *The Peninsula Times Tribune*, July 2, 1990 p:A-4
- (4) Triceratops was originally depicted as ambling with its legs sprawled lizard-like. Later, palaeontologist Robert T. Bakker said that its legs came directly from under the body, allowing it to gallop like a rhino. Now, Rolf E. Johnson and John H. Ostrom say that it had sprawling lizard-like forelegs and could not gallop. *Science News*, October 20, 1990 p:255
- (5) According to several dinosaur specialists, *Ultrasaurus*, *Supersaurus* and *Seismosaurus* never existed. A close examination of bones in many museums has led to the conclusion that *Ultrasaurus* & *Supersaurus* are just large versions of the *Brachiosaurus*. *Seismosaurus*, who's description is based on the discovery of only a few bones, belonged to the group of diplodocid dinosaurs. *Science News*, August 16, 1986 p:103; *The Washington Post*, May 11, 1988
- (6) Dinosaur authority Gregory Paul has discovered while examining *Brachiosaurus* fossils in various museums, that they have not been reconstructed accurately. He believes that the animal had taller forelimbs and a shorter trunk than was commonly reconstructed. *The Washington Post*, May 11, 1988
- (7) *Stegosaurus* is now believed to have had only one row of plates sticking out of its back. A re-examination of all *Stegosaurus* fossils by palaeontologist Stephen Czerkas has led to this conclusion. *Scientific American*, October, 1986 p:70
- (8) The 19th century dinosaur experts, Gideon Mantell, mistook the spiky thumb bone of the iguanodon for a horn & placed it on top of the snout. A reconstruction from this drawing, last century, still stands in South London's Sydenham Park. *Sun Herald*, 8/11/92
- (9) Brontosaurus never existed. The head was found by the discoverer, Marsh, 6-8 km away from the body of the skeleton. Some dinosaur books and museums still exhibit the 'Brontosaurus' today. *Wichita Eagle Beacon*, April 3, 1983



Evolution Says

It is very easy for palaeontologists to accurately work out what an animal looked like from its fossilized bones.

The Facts Are

- (1) Examination of Snake Creek in 1927 showed that the tooth of an extinct genus of pig (*Catagonus wagneri*) had wrongly been interpreted as being the tooth of a 'human' ancestor. In 1972 a herd of these very animals (*Catagonus ameghino*) were discovered alive in Paraguay's Chaco. This new species is very similar to the extinct species. *Science*, Vol. 66, 1927 p:579; *Science*, Vol. 189, 1975 p:379
- (2) "No one knows for sure what they [ie. prehistoric animals] looked like, so the artist has the freedom to 'create' with colours and forms." Renowned medical illustrator Ronald J. Erwin stating in an interview with Robert Doolan, that an artist is free to make a painting of a prehistoric animal look which ever way they like. Quoted in "Filling in the Blanks" in *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1995 p:16-17
- (3) "I was told to make the illustrations either more or less human or modern - whatever the subject was. With this *Australopithecus* [viz. Lucy] I was told to re-create something that was a big "maybe", and then make it look believable. I was told to make her more ape-like, or more "transitional" in appearance I had been given a cast of a skull, and I was shown some drawings other artists had done of 'Lucy', and was asked to improve on these - to make her look more transitional." Renowned medical illustrator Ronald J. Erwin stating in an interview with Robert Doolan, that evolutionists try to make images of prehistoric animal look like they fit into the evolutionary model. Quoted in "Filling in the Blanks" in *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 17, No. 2, 1995 p:17
- (4) "The systematic status and biological affinity of a fossil organism is far more difficult to establish than in the case of a living form, and can never be established with any degree of certainty. To begin with, 99% of the biology of any organism resides in its soft anatomy, which is inaccessible in a fossil." Written by M. Denton in the article "The Fossil Record", in the publication "Evolution: A Theory in Crisis", Alder Publishers Inc: Bethesda (Maryland), 1985 p:177
- (5) "The problem with a lot of anthropologists is that they want so much to find a hominid [ape-man] that any scrap of bone becomes a hominid bone." Quoted as being stated by evolutionary anthropologist Dr Tim White (University of California), in Ian Anderson's article "Hominid Collarbone Exposed as Dolphin's Rib", in *New Scientist*, Vol. 98, No. 1355, April 1983 p:199
- (6) "As I have already implied, students of fossil primates have not been distinguished for caution when working within the logical constraints of their subject. The record is so astonishing that it is legitimate to ask whether much science is yet to be found in this field at all." Written by evolutionist (Lord) Sir Solly Zuckerman in his book "Beyond the Ivory Tower", Weidenfeld and Nicholson: London, 1970 p:64
- (7) "Palaeontologists (and evolutionary biologists in general) are famous for their facility in devising plausible stories: but they often forget that plausible stories need not be true." Written by Steven Jay Gould in *Paleobiology*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1977 p:34:1
- (8) "If you brought in a smart scientist from another discipline and showed him the meagre evidence we've got he'd surely say, 'forget it: there isn't enough to go on'." Written by palaeoanthropologist, David Pilbeam in Richard Leakey's "The Making of Mankind", Michael Joseph Press Ltd: London, 1981 p:43
- (9) "Everybody knows fossils are fickle; bones will sing any song you want to hear." J. Shreeve, "Argument Over a Woman", *Discover*, Vol.11, No. 8, 1990 p:58



Evolution Says

There are many animals alive today which are primitive reminders of life in the distant prehistoric past.

The Facts Are

(1) Mitochondrial DNA tests on the velvet worm by the CSIRO show that it is highly specialized, and should not be regarded as a primitive missing-link. *New Scientist*, November 21, 1992 p:14

(2) Experimental trials have shown that the common octopus, supposedly an 'early evolutionary' animal, can learn four times faster than common domestic animals trained by humans. These marine animals can learn even by watching a fellow octopus do an action first. This intellectual ability of learning by observation is considered to be very advanced, which some argue is almost on the verge of conceptual thought. This is an enigmatic quality for a primitive organism. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 25/4/92

(3) Behavioural scientist Dr Euan MacPhaill has been able to train pigeons to duplicate activities performed by chimpanzees. Chimps are able to stack boxes on top of one another to reach bananas hung up out of their reach. Not only has he trained pigeons to do this, but he trained them to associate food with lights and levers - a feat mastered by dolphins. These experiments lay to waste the evolutionary notion that intelligence developed during evolution, so that primates were at the pinnacle of intelligence. Dr MacPhaill believes that all vertebrates are equally adept at problem solving. *The Age* (Melbourne), September 10, 1986

(4) When discovered in the early 1990's, the Archaeobacteria were touted as rare, extremely primitive types, which somehow survived from the time when life first evolved. Their ability to survive in hot chemical springs led some scientists to propose a theory that chemical springs produced the first life, rather than the primordial soup. Since then, it has been discovered that these microbes are not rare, and that they appear to "provide up to 30 per cent of the single-celled marine biomass" in some Antarctic waters. Genetic studies have also shown that they are not primitive at all. *New Scientist*, Vol. 144, 1994 p:21



Evolution Says

The date is exactly known when any prehistoric animal became extinct, millions of years ago.

The Facts Are

- (1) Woolly mammoths are stated by evolutionists as having died out more than 10,000 years ago. But remains have been found on an island off Siberia, which give radiocarbon ages of less than 4,000 years. Siberian Evenk Indians, when first contacted by Russians at the turn of the century had well-preserved mammoth skins, and reported them as still being alive as late as 1922. They described exactly the appearance and behaviour of the mammoths, and gave details of the animal's diet and how they were hunted. *Nature* Vol. 362 No. 6418, 1993, p:288-289. *The Age (Melbourne)*, 29/3/93
- (2) Evolutionary theory dictates that the mastodon and the mammoth died out thousands and thousands of years ago. However, the bones of American mastodons unearthed in the early 1800's indicated that they had become extinct in the years prior to their excavation. Also, a report has shown that mastodons were in the recent memory of many North American Indian tribes. Another report in 1873 outlined an eyewitness account of a living herd of mammoths in Siberia. The discovery of mammoth paintings in the caves of Les Combarelles (France) also indicates that they were alive with modern humans. *The Scientific Monthly (Washington)*, Vol. 75, 1952 p:215-221; *Zoologist (London)*, series 2, Vol. 8, 1873 p:3731-3733
- (3) Coelacanth was long thought to be an extinct ancestor of land creatures, but it has been found living in the Indian Ocean. *New Scientist*, February 12, 1987 p:20
- (4) According to evolution, five-toed llamas became extinct 30 million years ago. Yet, archaeologists have found pottery with etchings of these creatures on it. Skeletons of the five-toed llama have even been found in diggings of the Tiahuanacan cultural. E. Colbert, "Evolution of the Vertebrates", Wiley: New York, 1955
- (5) In 1977 some Japanese fishermen hauled aboard in their nets the rotting body of a large sea creature. They took photos and threw it back. From the photos, Japanese scientists identified it as a Plesiosaur - a sea reptile that supposedly died out 70 million years ago. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 16 No. 3, 1994 p: 31
- (6) The *Illustrated London News* in February 1856 reported that workmen digging a railway tunnel in Culmomy (France), disturbed a huge winged creature. The creature was described as livid black, with a long neck and sharp teeth. It looked like a bat, and its skin was thick and oily. Its wing-span was measured at 3.22 m. It died soon after. A naturalist 'immediately recognised it as belonging to the genus *Pterodactylus anas*' - a pterodactyl known only as a fossil. *The Illustrated London News*, February 9, 1856 p:166
- (7) Belgian zoologist Bernard Heuvelmans, and Chicago University biologist Roy Mackal found evidence pointing to the existence of pterodactyls living in the jungles of Central Southern Africa. Out of fear of scorn from western scientists, their evidence was kept low-keyed as it contradicted evolutionary theory, and was a threat to evolutionary dating procedures. Bernard Heuvelmans, "On the Track of Unknown Animals", Hill & Wang: New York, 1959; Roy P. Mackal, "Searching for Hidden Animals", Doubleday: New York, 1980 p:54
- (8) A Brontosaurus-like creature was claimed to have been seen by a prospector in the Belgian Congo in 1919. Re-citing of the news report in "On This Day", *Newcastle Herald (Australia)*, December 29, 1993
- (9) Bones of a young duck-billed dinosaur found recently in Montana (USA) have been estimated to be 70 million years old. The finders commented that the bones appeared to be fresh despite their age and mineralization. An analysis of their mineral content showed them to have a calcium/phosphorous ratio very similar to fresh bones. *Science*, December 24, 1993 p:2020-2023



Evolution Says

The fossil record is full of innumerable links (inbetween forms), which show exactly how evolution took place.

The Facts Are

- (1) Many people believe that the fossil record provides the best evidence for evolution. A study by the world-renowned geneticist, Professor Richard Goldschmidt, in 1940 indicated that there were no transitional forms between the higher categories of living things. So 100 years after Charles Darwin said that there were no transitional forms, there were still none. *American Scientist*, Vol. 40, 1952 p:97
- (2) Recently discovered tiny, worm-like carnivorous creatures called peripatids, have been put forward by some evolutionists as the missing link between insects and worms. This seems ridiculous as these animals include species which have a placenta, like mammals. This reproductive feature, according to the evolutionary time-scale, is very advanced, far too advanced for such primitive creatures. The peripatids do not therefore represent a very primitive missing link. *The Advertiser (Adelaide)*, January 8, 1987 p:3
- (3) "... I fully agree with your comments [in your letter] on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book [entitled "Evolution"]. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them
- As a palaeontologist myself, I am much occupied with the philosophical problems of identifying ancestral forms in the fossil record. You say [in your letter] that I should at least 'show a photo of the fossil from which each type of organism was derived'. I will lay it on the line - there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument. The reason is that statements about ancestry and descent are not applicable in the fossil record". Contents of a letter written on April 10, 1979, by Dr Colin Patterson, a senior palaeoanthropologist at the British Museum of Natural History. Recorded in Luther Sunderland's "Darwin's Enigma", Master Books: El Cajon (California), 1988 p:88-90
- (4) "It may be firmly maintained that it is not even possible to make a caricature of an evolution out of paleo-biological facts. The fossil material is now so complete that it has been possible to construct new classes, and the lack of transitional series cannot be explained as being due to the scarcity of material. The deficiencies are real, they will never be filled." Written by the famed botanist and evolutionist Dr N. Heribert Nilsson (Professor, Lund University, Sweden) as a summary of the fossil record, in "Synthetische Artbildung", Verlag CWKE Geerup: Lund (Sweden), 1954. Quoted also in Arthur C. Custance's book "The Earth Before Man", Part II, Doorway Paper No. 20, Doorway Pub: Brockville (Canada), p:51
- (5) "It remains true, as every palaeontologist knows, that most new species, genera, and families, and that nearly all categories above the level of families, appear in the [geological] record suddenly and are not led up to by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences." Written by George Gaylord Simpson in "The Major Features of Evolution", Columbia University Press: New York, 1953 p:360
- (6) "Evolution requires intermediate forms between species and palaeontology does not provide them." Written by David B. Kitts in "Palaeontology and Evolutionary Theory", *Evolution*, Vol. 28, September 1974 p:467
- (7) "On the fundamental level it becomes a rigorously demonstratable fact that there are no transitional types, and that the so-called missing links are indeed non-existent." Written by physicist and research mathematician Dr Wolfgang Smith (Professor of Mathematics, Oregon State University) in his book "Teilhardism and the New Religion: A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin", Tan Books & Pub. Inc: Rockford (USA), 1988 p:8
- (8) "The curious thing is that there is a consistency about the fossil gaps; the fossils are missing in all the important places." Written by archaeologist Francis Hitching (Royal Institute of Archaeology) in "The Neck of the Giraffe or Where Darwin Went Wrong", Penguin Books: Bergenfield (USA), 1982 p:19
- (9) "The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of



palaeontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils." Written by evolutionist and palaeontologist Stephen Jay Gould (Professor of Geology and Palaeontology, Harvard University) in his article "Evolution's Erratic Pace", in *Natural History*, Vol. 86, No.5, May 1977 p:13-14

(10) "Since we have not the slightest evidence, either among living or the fossil animals, of any intergrading types following the major groups, it is a fair supposition that there never have been any such intergrading types." An admission by biologist Dr Austin Clark of the Smithsonian Institute as editor of the book "The New Evolution: Zoogenesis", Williams & Wilkins: Baltimore, 1930 p:189

(11) "Within continuously sampled lineages, one rarely finds the gradual morphological trends predicted by Darwinian evolution; rather, change occurs with the sudden appearance of new, well-differentiated species." Written by Robert E. Ricklefs (Department of Biology, University of Pennsylvania, USA) in his article "Paleontologists Confronting Macroevolution", in *Science*, Vol. 199 January 6, 1978 p:59

(12) "Instead of finding the gradual unfolding of life, what geologists of Darwin's time and geologists of the present day actually find is a highly uneven or jerky record; that is, species appear in the sequence very suddenly, show little or no change during their existence in the record, then abruptly go out of the record." Written by David Raup, curator of the Field Museum of Natural History, in Chicago (USA) in "Conflict Between Darwin and Palaeontology", *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1979. He rejects the idea that the rock record shows a gradual evolution of life.

(13) "The abrupt appearance of higher taxa [living things] in the fossil record has been a perennial puzzle. Not only do characteristic and distinctive remains of phyla appear suddenly, without known ancestors, but several classes of a phylum, orders of a class, and so on, commonly appear at approximately the same time without known intermediates." Written by James W. Valentine & Cathryn A. Campbell in "Genetic Regulation and the Fossil Record", *American Scientist*, Vol. 63, Nov/Dec 1975 p:673

(14) "As is well known, most fossil species appear instantaneously in the fossil record." Written by evolutionist Tom Kemp (Curator of the University Museum, Oxford University) in his article "A Fresh Look at the Fossil Record", in *New Scientist*, Vol. 108, No. 1485, December 1985 p:66

(15) "The record of evolution is still surprisingly jerky and, ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transitions than we had in Darwin's time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information" Written by Dr David M. Raup (Curator of Geology, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago) in his article "Conflicts Between Darwin and Paleontology", in *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, Vol. 50, No. 1, 1979 p:25

(16) "Since 1859 one of the most vexing properties of the fossil record has been its obvious imperfection. For the evolutionist this imperfection is most frustrating as it precludes any real possibility for mapping out the path of organic evolution owing to an infinity of 'missing links'." Written by Dr Arthur J. Boucot (Professor of Geology, Oregon State University, USA) in "Evolution and Extinction Rate Controls", Elsevier: Amsterdam, 1975 p:196

(17) "The main reason for inventing these macromutations [which produce evolutionary change] is that there are some features of plants and animals which can hardly be imagined as arising by gradual steps; the adaptive value of the perfected structure is easily seen, but intermediate steps seem to be useless, or even harmful." Dr Colin Patterson of the British Museum of Natural History expounding that evolutionary mutations are just an invented theory in his book "Evolution", British Museum of Natural History: London, 1978 p:142



Evolution Says

All living things show from the fossil record that they have evolved, changing from simple to more complex.

The Facts Are

(1) A factual summary of the reality of the fossil record is as follows:- (i) life-forms show little or no change during their fossil history; (ii) most fossil types are virtually identical to their living descendants; & (iii) fossil types appear in the fossil record without ancestral lineages. [summary]

(2) The best examples used to 'prove' Darwinian evolution - the nautiloids and oysters - are considered today to be just examples of quite trivial change. The fossil record shows that they have not changed in any appreciable way, except for a small fluctuation in morphology. Their fossils appear fully formed, with no evidence of having evolved. *Paleobiology*, Vol. 3, June/July 1977 p:115-151

(3) Steven Stanley (John Hopkins University, USA) has published some examples of the unchanging nature of living things. He cites the elephant family - regular elephants, mammoths and mastodons - as a prime example. Each was slightly different, but they all appeared suddenly in the fossil record fully formed, the latter two disappeared just as suddenly. This example of Stanley's was the same one that was once used to 'prove' evolution. *Science*, August 1981

(4) There are many examples of modern organisms which are identical to their fossil counterparts, showing that there has been no evolution over multiple millions of years. For example:-

(i) Termite [30 million years]. *Discover*, August, 1993 p:52

(ii) Coelacanth fish [60-80 million years]. *Nature*, December 22/29, 1988 p:727-732; *National Geographic*, January, 1989

(iii) Ant, *Nothomyrmecia macrops* [100 million years]. *Australasian Post*, July 15, 1989 p:48

(iv) Tuatara lizard [200 million years]. David Attenborough "The Living Planet", Guild Publishing: London, 1984 p:261

(v) Crayfish [220 million years]. *Discover*, January, 1995 p:84; *National Geographic*, Vol. 187, No. 6, 1995 (Geographica)

(vi) Ciliate protozoa, sheathed bacteria, algae, fungal spores and plant pollen [230 million years]. *Science*, Vol. 259, January 8, 1993 p:222-224

(vii) Tadpole shrimp, *Lepidurus apus* [250 million years]. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 16 No. 3, 1994 p: 51

(viii) Hagfish [300 million years]. *Nature*, Vol. 354, November 14, 1991 p:108

(ix) Cockroach [300 million years]. *The Billings Gazette*, June 8, 1991 p:9-A

(x) Ctenophore [400 million years]. *Science News*, Vol. 124, July 9, 1983

(xi) Onychophore [500 million years]. *Scientific American*, September, 1988 p:70

(xii) Chitons [550-600 million years]. *New Scientist*, December 21-28, 1991 p:10

(xiii) Bacteria [billions of years]. *Science News*, March 12, 1994 p:168-169

(5) Five hundred fossils, dated by evolutionary methods in the range of 15-50 million years old, have identical counterparts living today. They show no significant observable evolutionary change. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1993 p:14-19

(6) One thing the fossil record does show, is the gross imbalance between the many forms of life in the so-called Cambrian period (500 million years ago) and those following the great Permian extinction (200 million years ago). All existing types were present as fossils in Cambrian rock, and no new ones followed the Permian extinction. So, no new animal body plans evolved over that enormous period of 300 million year. *Science Frontiers*, November-December, 1988 p:2; *Science*, Vol. 241, 1988 p:20

(7) The conclusion of the 1980 Chicago conference was 'SPECIES STASIS'. That is, everything is staying the same. Evolution therefore defies the facts. *Science*, Vol. 210, No. 4472, November 21, 1980 p:883-887



Evolution Says

Evolution can be seen in action today. Some examples are:- the change in colour of the peppered moths in England; the resistance of insects to insecticides; the resistance of bacteria to antibiotics; the breeding of livestock; the formation of new plant species by radiation treatment; and the River Guppy experiment.

The Facts Are

(1) The scientific breeding of cattle is not an example of evolution. The genes for milk production and beef production are already in the species. Dairy cattle and beef cattle are just cattle. If they were all let go in a mob to indiscriminately breed for 10 years, they would all be scrub mongrels again. Cattle are only kept as high producers because humans selectively breed them in an artificial environment, and under artificial conditions. Natural selection and mutation plays no part in cattle breeding. [based on logic]

(2) Damaging plants by radiation and producing varieties with spots and blemishes on them is not an example of the formation of new species. The original species has neither improved, nor increased in complexity. [based on logic]

(3) Biologists from the University of Manchester have checked the colour of more than 1,800 peppered moths (*Biston betularia*). They found that the area once dominated by the black moths is steadily shrinking, and the light-coloured moths are becoming more abundant. The cleaner environmental conditions occurring since the enactment of clean-air laws is believed to have been responsible for this change. These findings confirm that these moths are not an example of evolution in action. The genes for the black race were always in the species, and did not occur as a mutation response to the carbon deposits on the trees. Nothing has evolved, only the numbers of different coloured moths has changed - the species has remained *Biston betularia* from the start to the finish. *Science*, Vol. 86, April, 1986 p:9

(4) "The experiments beautifully demonstrate natural selection - or survival of the fittest - in action, but they do not show evolution in progress, for however the populations may alter in their content of light, intermediate or dark forms, all the moths remain from beginning to end *Biston betularia*." Biologist L. Harrison Matthews, writing about the British Peppered Moth which changed to a black race during the industrial revolution. Recorded in the foreword of the 1971 edition of Charles Darwin's "The Origin of Species".

(5) The development of insecticide resistance in insects is often used as 'proof' of evolution in action. These are, however, just examples of screening processes, as the ability to exhibit resistance was already in the genetic code. The resistance did not show up until these chemicals were used, killing off those without the genetic resistance. These are no more examples of evolution than the selective breeding of new colours of parrots. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 200, No. 11, June 12, 1967 p:42

(6) The resistance of Golden Staph bacteria (*Staphylococcus aureus*) to penicillin is said by evolutionists to represent an example of evolution. The DNA information and the complex enzyme penicillinase which breaks down the antibiotic so that it can't harm the bacteria, had been discovered in the bacteria in 1940, before doctors started using penicillin. The resistance did not arise because of the presence of penicillin, or because of a mutation after its introduction, as it was already there in the genetic code. According to Dr Reiss-Levy (Director of Microbiology, St. George Hospital, Sydney), "We did not create the resistant strains. We have just given them a selective advantage by the widespread use of antibiotic therapy". "Bacterial Resistance - Problems and Solutions", The Medicine Group, June 26, 1987 p:2

(7) "Supergerms, in other words, are not an example of evolution, but have been artificially bred by man, just as surely as Hereford cattle and Pomeranian dogs have been artificially bred by man. It was



unintentional, but it was still artificial. The important varieties of supergerms, such as methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus*, have not come about through mutation, nor have any superbugs. Artificial selective breeding by humans is explanation enough - and even then we must remember that the germ still remains a germ. It has not evolved into something more complex." Written by Roger Kovaciny in "Supergerms - Do they Prove Evolution?", in *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1989 p:17

(8) "The introduction and widespread use of antibiotics is probably responsible for the spread of a formerly anonymous gene that has helped bacterial organisms survive for unknown centuries." Written by Dr Davis Smith (Harvard University) in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Vol. 200, No. 11, June 12, 1967 p:42

(9) Sickle cell anaemia is often given as 'proof' of mutation-driven evolution in action today. This mutation, although giving resistance to malaria, confers on the person a reduced oxygen carrying efficiency. These type of changes bring about an advantage for the individual in the special conditions, but they are of a disadvantage in the normal environment, proof again, that mutations are detrimental. Over the 300 years African negroes have been in the USA, the percentage of the sickle cell genes in their population has declined from 22% to 0.25%. This illustrates that away from special conditions which favour damaged genes, selection favours the normally functioning genes. Charlotte J. Avers, "Genetics", PWS Publishers: Boston (Massachusetts), 1984 p:559

(10) An 11 year experiment conducted by Californian researchers in Trinidad showed that if river guppies were moved to tributaries, their breeding habits changed. After 30-60 generations, the transferred population matured later, and had fewer, larger offspring. These changes were in response to the different type of predators in the tributaries. This experiment has been publicised as the first experiment to look at real evolutionary change under natural conditions. Unfortunately this experiment does not prove evolution. Like the selective breeding of livestock, the selection process acts in accordance with the genetic material already available in the population. No new genetic material, which is essential for evolution, has been proved to have been produced in the species. At the end of the experiment, the guppies were still guppies, only the environment had led to a modification in their behaviour. This experiment is actually scientifically inconclusive, as no attempt was made to return the adapted guppies to their original habitat. A switchback design of this type would have confirmed whether the changes were permanent or not. It is, however, very reasonable to expect that if returned, the guppies would have reverted to their original form. *San Francisco Chronicle*, July 26, 1990 p:A-7; *US News & World Report*, August 13, 1990 p:60; *Nature*, Vol. 346, July 26, 1992 p:313

(11) "Such studies [as the River Guppy experiment] merely show that genetic variability of the kind postulated in the models can be exploited by selection: they do not prove that the invoked selective agents are actually responsible for producing the observed differences." Written by Brian Charlesworth in his article "Life and Times of the Guppy" in *Nature*, Vol. 346, July 26, 1992 p:313

(12) The resistance of rats to the anti-coagulant Warfarin seems to be an example of mutation causing evolution. Resistance is conferred by a change in the enzyme which helps in the manufacture of Vitamin K (the body's blood coagulating agent) which Warfarin previously interfered with. This is not caused by a new gene, but by damage to the existing one. Rats with these damaged genes are so inefficient in producing Vitamin K, that they require 13 times more of it in their food each day. This is another example of mutations producing harmful genetic changes. L. Burnet, "Exercises in Applied Genetics", Cambridge University Press: Cambridge (UK), 1988

(13) Ten-year-old children of today are 4 cm taller and 2 Kg heavier than their average counterparts were in 1970. Also, today's 12-year-old girls are 10 cm taller and 10 Kg heavier than similar aged girls in 1911. These statistics are often used as 'proof' that humans are evolving, but they are basically the result of environmental factors. Better nutrition, fewer infectious diseases and better medical care are the most probable causes. *Sunday Telegraph*, October 9, 1994 p:130



Evolution Says

Computer simulations prove that evolution did occur. Computer simulations prove that the Big Bang did occur.

The Facts Are

- (1) Evolution simulations made for computers always 'prove' evolution because the parameters on which the program is based are evolutionary. In other words a program is written with evolutionary data inserted into it, and then used to prove evolution - a case of circular reasoning. [based on logic]
- (2) Many of the 'proofs' of evolution touted today are based on computer analysis of existing data. These computer programs analyse data using a formula, or compare it with a set of parameters or conditions. Unfortunately, as evolution is a historical theory, any formulae or parameters used are based on the scientist's assumptions about the past. If the assumptions are wrong, or based on circular reasoning, then the analysis is not valid. As there is no way of going back in time to scientifically monitor past conditions, all such computer programs are only tools of supposition, and can never be used to prove evolution. Based on the logic of computer simulations and historical analysis. c.f. *The Australian*, December 3, 1991
- (3) The computer programs which are used to analyse data from distant parts of the universe which we can't see or visit, are unsatisfactory analytical tools. These programs are also based on supposition and theory, no matter how factual scientist's believe their models are. Change the suppositions, alter the parameters, or adjust the formula, and a completely new analysis will result. Based on the logic of computer simulations and historical analysis. c.f. *The Australian*, December 3, 1991
- (4) Programmer John Schneider, in a letter to Science News, points out that T.S Ray's computer programs 'Tierra', contains mutations (random changes) which only produces a new combination of the same instructions. None of the 'evolved' organisms display any capability that did not already exist in the original 'organisms' program code. In other words, no Tierran 'organism' invented any new instructions, which is required for upward evolution. Schneider also points out that the rules incorporated in the program by Ray were contrived by him to keep Tierra's 'evolution' going. *Science News*, November 30, 1991
- (5) The jellyfish produced by the artistic abilities of one evolution simulator is an example of the contrived way in which computer programs 'prove' evolution. When the program produces a 2-dimensional image of a blob, which bears no resemblance to a jellyfish, the simulation will eventually draw a jellyfish. The artists admit that they intervene to push evolution in certain directions, and it is actually they who determine the degree of fitness required for survival. *New Scientist*, September 19, 1992 p:11
- (6) Richard Dawkins, has admitted that he has played the role of a 'creator' in a replicating and mutating program that he described in his book "The Blind Watchmaker". Science author Richard Milton describes the images produced by such evolution simulators as not corresponding in any way at all with living things, except the purely trivial way that someone sees resemblance in their shape. Dawkins admits that he played the role of a 'creator' as he chose which ones of the images were the most promising. He has also admitted that he bred each generation from whichever image looked like an insect, and that is the reason why they ended up looking so real. Richard Milton, "The Facts Of Life: Shattering the Myth of Darwinism", Fourth Estate: London. 1992 p:148



Evolution Says

Evolution is proved by scientific tests which show that many different sorts of animals are related to each other.

The Facts Are

(1) Analysis of the structure of the enzyme creatinine kinase in the brain tissue of various animals shows that the closest similarity exists between the enzyme of the elephant and the common housefly.

Information recorded on a videotaped lecture by Soviet biochemical scientist Dmitri Kouznetsov on October 30, 1990

(2) Evolutionary theory says that snakes are more closely related to crocodiles than they are to birds. Tests in 1982 on the alpha haemoglobin of these animals showed instead, that if they were related, reptiles are more related to the chicken, than they are to each other. Dr Colin Patterson in Lecture #5, at the American Museum of Natural History, New York, 1982

(3) It is obvious to everyone that apes and humans resemble each other. It must be understood, however, that there are also some substantial differences. Anatomy expert Artheu Keith lists 312 characteristics that are found only in humans. Bernhard Grzimek (ed.), "Grzimek's Animal Life Encyclopedia" Vol. 10 - Mammals I, 1975 p:488

(4) Evolutionary classification places all the herbivores in close relationship. However, this is only imaginative thinking. The famous biologist Albert S. Romer said that "strange as it may seem, a cow is, for example, probably as closely related to a lion as it is to a horse". Albert S. Romer, "Man and the Vertebrates", University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1941 p:139

(5) "One of the great advances of 20th century biology has been the demonstration that all living people are extremely closely related. Genetic research has provided what for some is the surprising result that our DNA variability is much less than the world wide anatomical variations of humanity might suggest". Alan Thorne & Milford Wolpoff stating that all humans are very closely related, in the article "Conflict Over Modern Human Origins", *Search*, Vol. 22, No. 5, 1991 p:175

(6) The 'molecular clock' theory seeks to show evolutionary relationships between creatures. Biochemistry researcher Mark Dwinell, says that this theory can't be used to show such relationships. "The seemingly plausible ['molecular clock'] theory, however, is fraught with difficulties for the evolutionists

Any attempt to promote this theory as reasonable and valid in light of so many discrepancies seems deceptive or duplicitous" Written by Mark Dwinell in his article "Molecular Evolution or Bust", in *Origins Research*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1985 p:1 & 11



Evolution Says

Vestigial organs are organs in our bodies that are no longer of any use. Evolutionary development has meant that they have degenerated from what they originally were in our ancestors. The existence of vestigial organs is proof that humans have evolved.

The Facts Are

- (1) German anatomist, Wiedershein, listed 180 supposed vestigial structures in the human body, indicating that they were left over from our evolution. Since that time, most have been shown to have a useful function, some being vital for the body's well being. Vestigial organs cannot therefore be used as 'proof' of evolution. Albert S. Romer, "The Vertebrate Body", W.B. Saunders Co, 1949 p:363; *Evolutionary Theory*, Vol. 5, May 1981 p:173
- (2) The appendix has long been categorized as a useless vestigial organ, but this is totally inaccurate. Since the 1960's it has been scientifically known that it has an important lymphatic and antibody production function, as part of the body's immune system. See Dr Jerry Bergman and Dr George Howe's review of the scientific literature in their book "Vestigial Organs are Fully Functional", CRS Monograph Series No. 4, 1993
- (3) "This [appendix] is frequently cited as a vestigial organ supposedly proving something or other about evolution. This is not the case." Written by Professor Albert S. Romer in his book "The Vertebrate Body", W.B. Saunders Co, 1949 p:363
- (4) "People sometimes speak of it [the appendix] as a vestigial organ, as though it were a useless remnant of a long cecum like that of a rabbit. It is not." Written by Matt Cartmill and others in the book "Human Structure", Harvard University Press (1987) p:136
- (5) An organ that is claimed to be an evolutionary vestigial structure is the thymus, situated near the heart. A series of experiments at the Chester Beatty Cancer Research Institute (London), demonstrated that the thymus imprints on a person the ability to distinguish between what is 'self' and what is not 'self'. This vital ability is essential for the body's defence system to operate effectively against foreign bodies such as disease organisms. *Lancet*, Vol. 2, 1961 p:748-749
- (6) Part of the body's immunity in the thymus is the presence of lymphocyte type T & B cells (one of the white blood cells). The tonsils and the appendix are also full of these cells, indicating their role in the body's immune system. They are not evolutionary vestigial organs at all. Jerry Bergman and George Howe (1993), "Vestigial Organs are Fully Functional", CRS Monograph Series No. 4, 1993 p:47-49
- (7) "The fatal flaw in the argument from vestigial organs is exposed by modern genetics. Basically, the concept of vestigial organs represents a return to Lamarckism where the development or loss of a structure is based upon need. It is now known, however, that organs can only be altered by a genetic alteration in the chromosomes, or DNA. The use or disuse of an organ has no effect whatsoever on subsequent generations. Even if the concept of vestigial organs were valid, it still would not lend support to evolution since it implies structures on the way out, not in. Nascent organs, those under construction into a functional unit, are completely non-existent. This fact serves as a powerful argument against organic evolution." Written by Scott M. Huse, in his book "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (USA), 1983 p:107
- (8) As far back as the early 1980's, it was known that vestigial organs do not prove evolution. "Vestigial organs provide no evidence for evolutionary theory." Written by S.R. Scadding in the article "Do Vestigial Organs Provide Evidence for Evolution?" in *Evolutionary Theory*, 1981, Vol. 5 p:176



Evolution Says

As human embryos develop they progress through stages that look like the many evolutionary ancestors of humans such as fish and reptiles. This development by the embryo is proof that humans evolved, and that they, and all modern land animals evolved from fish and reptiles.

The Facts Are

(1) The Biogenetic Law (also known as The Embryonic Recapitulation Theory), popularized by Ernst Haeckel, states that the human embryo goes through various stages of development which show the features of its supposed evolutionary ancestors. Even though Haeckel admitted that he fraudulently altered his diagrams to fake this theory, many still believe it. *American Scientist*, Vol. 76, May-June, 1988 p:273

(2) If humans evolved from apes, then the Biogenetic Law necessitates that there must be some ape-like characteristics displayed by the human embryo as it develops - eg. a hand-like grasping motion of the foot. A study of the development of the human embryo reveals that there is not the slightest hint of any climbing function displayed by the legs that would indicate that we descended from apes. At 6 weeks, the site of limb development can be seen. At 8 weeks the five folds that become toes can be seen. Early movements can be seen at 15 millimetres long, with the legs exhibiting actions of pushing and bracing. At 3 months, although the hand can make a fist and oppose the thumb, the feet are spread-eagled and never make any gripping motion. At three months the foot looks like that of a baby. At six months the hand can grip tightly, but the legs only kick. The only development that is observed is that consistent for an individual with upright posture and two-legged walking. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 1991 p:16-17

(3) "The biogenetic law has become so deeply rooted in biological thought that it cannot be weeded out, in spite of its having been demonstrated to be wrong by numerous subsequent scholars". Written by Walter J. Bock (Department of Biological Science, Columbia University) in *Science*, Vol. 164, May 1969 p:684

(4) Except for 'diehard' evolutionists, the Biogenetic Law is no longer used as proof of evolution. Professor G.G. Simpson has referred to it as "the overgeneralized and much abused aphorism of the nineteenth century". G.G. Simpson "The Meaning of Evolution", (revised), Yale University Press, 1967 p:218; *Science*, Vol. 164, May, 1969 p:684

(5) The idea of 'gill slits' in human embryos has been used for many years as 'proof' that we, and all other animals, evolved from fish. However, humans do not really have gill slits; their embryo have pharyngeal pouches. Fish have brachial apparatus which connects the inside of the pharynx to the outside, a feature missing in humans. The human embryonic pouches develop into important organs such as the thymus and parathyroid glands, showing that they are structures and not slits.. Jan Langman, "Medical Embryology", [4th ed.] Williams & Wilkins: Baltimore, 1981

(6) Stephen J. Gould, in his book "Ontogeny and Phylogeny" says that although he knows that human gill slits are now discredited as evolutionary remnants, it is a nice idea that has some substance to it. Stephen J. Gould, "Ontogeny and Phylogeny"



Evolution Says

Many living things have identical (or homologous) structures. This homology proves that they evolved from each other. It also proves that evolution occurred because the structure has been selected due to its advantage to the organism.

The Facts Are

(1) Comparative anatomy has been used as proof of evolution, however there is little value in the argument today. The discovery of parallelism (similar or identical characters in different species) must not be interpreted to mean that both species came from the same ancestor. Parallelism is no longer regarded as evidence for evolution by the world's most respected palaeontologists. *Scientific Monthly*, Vol. 16, No. 3, 1923 p:246; Albert S. Romer, "Genetics, Paleontology and Evolution", (Glen S. Jepson ed.), Princeton University Press, 1949 p:115

(2) The bill on a platypus and a duck are examples of homologous structures. In homology, the genes that produce the structure are said to have been passed on to successively evolving organisms. This theory breaks down, and the 'proof' for evolution disappears, when it is noted that many so-called homologous structures like these are produced by entirely different genes. Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:116-117

(3) The front appendages of reptiles, mammals, birds and humans are said to be homologous 'proving' that they come from a common ancestor. The facts are, however, that these appendages are not homologous structures because they are not produced by the same genes. If one organism evolved from another, and maintained a certain structure, then they must maintain the same genes that produced that structure. This is necessary because it is the genes which control all the characteristics of an organism. In the lizard, the foreleg develops from the 6th-9th embryo segment. For others, they develop from:- Salamander (2nd-5th), Frog (2nd-4th) and Swift (10th-14th). Likewise for the hind leg:- Lizard (25th-30th), Salamander (16th-18th), Frog (8th-10th) and Swift (20th-27th). Sir Gavin de Beer, "Homology, an Unsolved Problem", Oxford Biology Reader, 1971

(4) "..... what mechanism can it be that results in the production of homologous organs, the same 'patterns', in spite of their not being controlled by the same genes? I asked this question in 1938, and it has not been answered." Written by Sir Gavin de Beer, one of the great embryologists of this century in his monograph "Homology, An Unsolved Problem", Oxford Biology Reader, 1971

(5) "The known presence of parallelism in so many cases and its suspected presence in others suggests that it may have been an almost universal phenomenon." Albert S. Romer expressing the view that the existence of so many organisms with similar structures may not be due to evolution, but part of the characteristics of all living things. Written in Glen S. Jepson (ed.), "Genetics, Paleontology and Evolution", Princeton University Press, 1949 p:115

(6) "My last doubt concerns so-called parallel evolution Even something as complex as the eye has appeared several times; for example, in the squid, the vertebrates, and the arthropods. It's bad enough accounting for the origin of such things once, but the thought of producing them several times makes my head swim." Written by Frank B. Salisbury in his article "Doubts About the Modern Synthetic Theory of Evolution", in *American Biology Teacher*, September, 1971 p:336-338



Evolution Says

Major changes in evolution are caused by many small changes called mutations where the genetic code of an organism is accidentally altered. These mutations provide the individual with better characteristics than others in

The Facts Are

- (1) "It is entirely in line with the accidental nature of mutations that extensive tests have agreed in showing the vast majority of them detrimental to the organism in its job of surviving and reproducing good ones are so rare that we can consider them all bad." Written by radiation and mutation expert H. J. Muller in "How Radiation Changes the Genetic Constitution", in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, Vol. 11, No. 9, November 1955 p:331
- (2) "There is no single instance where it can be maintained that any of the mutants studied has a higher viability than the mother species." Written by N. Heribert Nilsson in "Synthetische Artbildung", Verlag CWK Gleerup: Sweden, 1953 p:1212
- (3) "A mutation doesn't produce major new raw material. You don't make a new species by mutating the species." Expressed by palaeontologist and evolutionist Stephen J. Gould in a lecture entitled "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?" at the Hobart and William Smith College, February 4, 1980
- (4) "To postulate that the development and survival of the fittest is entirely a consequence of chance mutations seems to me a hypothesis based on no evidence and irreconcilable with the facts. These classical evolutionary theories are a gross over-simplification of an immensely complex and intricate mass of facts, and it amazes me that they are swallowed so uncritically and readily, and for such a long time, by so many scientists without a murmur of protest." A recent statement by the 1945 Nobel Prize-winner, Sir Ernest Chain. Recorded in Scott M. Huse's book, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:119
- (5) "The opportune appearance of mutations permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding: a single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with an infinitesimal probability could not fail to occur There is no law against day dreaming, but science must not indulge in it." "No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution." Written by the distinguished evolutionist Pierre Paul Grassé (former President of the French Academie des Sciences, and holder of the Chair of Evolution at the Sorbonne in Paris for 20 years), in his book "Evolution of Living Organisms", Academic Press: New York, 1977 p:103, 88
- (6) "Micromutations do occur, but the theory that these alone can account for evolutionary change is either falsified, or else it is an unfalsifiable, hence metaphysical theory. I suppose that nobody will deny that it is a great misfortune if an entire branch of science becomes addicted to a false theory. But this is what has happened in biology." Written by evolutionist S. Lovtrup in "Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth", Croom Helm: London, 1987 p:422
- (7) "In the meantime, the educated public continues to believe that Darwin has provided all the relevant answers by the magic formula of random mutations plus natural selection - quite unaware of the fact that random mutations turned out to be irrelevant and natural selection a tautology." Written by Arthur Koestler in his book "Janus: A Summing Up", Vintage Books: New York, 1978 p:185



Evolution Says

Natural selection, where the environment chooses the newly mutated organism to survive while others die out, is the main instrument of evolution.

The Facts Are

- (1) "But how do you get from nothing to such an elaborate something if evolution must proceed through a long sequence of intermediate stages, each favoured by natural selection? You can't fly with 2% of a wing or gain much protection from an iota's similarity with a potentially concealing piece of vegetation. How, in other words, can natural selection explain these incipient stages of structure that can only be used (as we now observe them) in much more elaborated forms?" Written by evolutionist and palaeontologist Stephen J. Gould in "Not Necessarily a Wing", in *Natural History*, Vol. 94, No. 10, 1985 p:12
- (2) "But natural selection per se does not work to create new species." Written by the well-known naturalist and evolutionist, Niles Eldredge (a curator of the American Museum of Natural History in New York City), in "An Extravagance of Species (The Diversity of Fossil Trilobites Pose a Challenge to Traditional Evolutionary Theory)", in *Natural History*, Vol. 89, No. 7, July 1980 p:46
- (3) "The role assigned to natural selection in establishing adaptation, while speciously probable, is based on not one single sure datum [ie: a fact]." Written by the distinguished evolutionist Pierre Paul Grassé (former President of the French Academie des Sciences, and holder of the Chair of Evolution at the Sorbonne in Paris for 20 years), in his book "Evolution of Living Organisms", Academic Press: New York, 1977 p:170
- (4) "The hypothesis that natural selection has the degree of creative power required by Darwinist theory remains unsupported by empirical evidence." Written by Professor Phillip Johnson of the University of Californian in his book "Darwin on Trial", Intervarsity Press: Illinois, 1991 p:96
- (5) "In other words, natural selection over the long run does not seem to improve a species' chance of survival but simply enables it to 'track', or keep up with, the constantly changing environment." Written by Dr Richard Lewontin (Professor of Zoology, University of Chicago, and co-editor of the journal *American Naturalist*), in the article "Adaptation", in *Scientific American*, Vol. 239, No. 3, September 1978 p:215
- (6) "In the early part of the present century the prestige of the selection theory declined until many biologists regarded it not only as a relatively unimportant factor in evolution, but in addition as a subject not worthy of study by progressive, serious-minded biologists." Written by G.L. Stebbins in the book "Variation and Evolution in Plants", Columbia University Press: New York, 1950 p:101; *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1987 p:14
- (7) "No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever gotten near it" Spoken by evolutionist, Dr Colin Patterson, in an interview on the subject of Cladistics, BBC TV, March 4, 1982
- (8) "The central question of the [1980] Chicago Conference was whether the mechanisms of microevolution (mutations and natural selection) could be extrapolated to explain the phenomenon of macroevolution. At the risk of doing violence to the positions of some people at the meeting, the answer can be given as a clear 'NO!'" Written by science writer and evolutionist, Roger Lewin, in the article "Evolutionary Theory Under Fire", in *Science*, Vol. 210, No. 4472, November 1980 p:883-887
- (9) Darwin, in his original publication, rejected Lamarck's hypothesis of acquired traits in favour of natural selection. Later, subsequent research and debate caused him to return to Lamarck's theory. In the sixth edition of his book Darwin abandoned natural selection as the driving force behind evolution. This was due to the continuing lack of evidence and of theoretical problems. Charles Darwin, "The Origin of Species", (6th ed.) The Modern Library: New York, 1872 p:66



Evolution Says

Genetics has proved that evolution has occurred.

The Facts Are

(1) Research by the CSIRO has shown that the difference in ear length between rabbits in hot and cold climates are not genetic, and therefore not an example of evolution. Rabbits from both hot and cold climates were bred in captivity at 25°C and 15°C. In just one generation, the rabbit population bred at 25°C had ears longer than those bred at 15°C. The changes in ear length are regarded as a response to the environment only. *Australian Geographic*, Jan-Mar 1991

(2) Genetic migration and differential reproduction, influenced by reduced selection pressure, isolation and gene recombination in a population, have been put forward as proof of evolution. These population genetics mechanisms actually violate the Hardy-Weinberg Law which is based on the fact that gene frequencies in sexually breeding populations remain constant from generation to generation. These mechanisms for evolution are speculative, and lack statistical and factual evidence. G.H. Hardy in M.L. Gabriel & S. Fogel (eds), "Great Experiments in Biology", Prentice-Hall, 1955

(3) Polyploidy, or the presence of cells with more than the normal number of chromosomes, cannot be advanced as an example of speciation and evolution. The phenomenon is very rare in animals and is artificially induced by the chemical, colchicine, in plants. [based on logic]

(4) Chromosomal aberrations cause difficulties and are mostly harmful, limiting an organisms ability to survive. No new structures are produced by chromosomal aberration, and from the evidence, it also cannot be used as proof for evolution. *Scientific American*, Reprint #150, 1961

(5) The genetic evidence uncovered by scientists, regarding humans, favours a recent origin for racial groups. *Nature*, Vol. 293, September 17, 1981 p:190

(6) "The evolution of the genetic machinery is the step for which there are no laboratory models; hence one can speculate endlessly" Written by physical chemist Dr Richard E. Dickerson (Professor, Californian Institute of Technology) in his article "Chemical Evolution and the Origin of Life" in *Scientific American*, Vol. 239, No. 3, 1978 p:77

(7) "Genetics has no proofs for evolution. It has trouble explaining it. The closer one looks at the evidence for evolution the less one finds of substance. In fact the theory keeps on postulating evidence, and failing to find it, moves on to other postulates (fossil missing links, natural selection of improved forms, positive mutations, molecular phylogenetic sequences, etc.). This is not science." Written by Professor Maciej Giertych, Head of Genetics Department, Polish Academy of Science, Institute of Dendrology, Poland. Quoted in *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 13 No. 3, 1991 p:17



Evolution Says

Evolution has been proved, because it has been tested scientifically. It has successfully passed testing by the scientific method on innumerable occasions.

The Facts Are

- (1) "These evolutionary happenings are unique, unrepeatable, and irreversible
 - The applicability of the experimental method to the study of such unique historical processes is severely restricted before all else by the time intervals involved, which far exceed the lifetime of any human experimenter." Written by Theodosius Dobzhansky (former Emeritus Professor of Zoology and Biology, Rockefeller University, USA) in his article "On Methods of Evolutionary Biology and Anthropology - part 1, Biology" in *American Scientist*, Vol. 45, No. 5, 1957 p:388
- (2) "Evolution, at least in the sense that Darwin speaks of it, cannot be detected within the lifetime of a single observer." Dr David B. Kitts (School of Geology and Geophysics, University of Oklahoma, USA) in his article "Paleontology and Evolutionary Theory", in *Evolution*, Vol. 28, September, 1974 p:466
- (3) "It is easy enough to make up stories of how one form gave rise to another, and to find reasons why the stages should be favoured by natural selection. But such stories are not part of science, for there is no way of putting them to the test." Part of a personal letter by Dr Colin Patterson (Senior Palaeontologist, British Museum of Natural History, London) to Luther D. Sunderland. Quoted in his book "Darwin's Enigma", Master Books: San Diego (USA), 1984 p:89
- (4) "Our theory of evolution has become, as Popper described, one which cannot be refuted by any possible observations. Every conceivable observation can be fitted into it. It is thus 'outside of empirical science' but not necessarily false. No one can think of ways in which to test it. Ideas, either without basis or based on a few laboratory experiments carried out in extremely simplified systems, have attained currency far beyond their validity. They have become part of an evolutionary dogma accepted by most of us as part of our training." Written by Paul Ehrlich (Professor of Biology, Stanford University, USA) and L. Charles Birch (Professor of Biology, Sydney University, NSW) in their article "Evolutionary History and Population Biology" in *Nature*, Vol. 214, April 22, 1967 p:352
- (5) "Biologists are simply naive when they talk about experiments designed to test the theory of evolution. It is not testable. They may happen to stumble across facts which would seem to conflict with its predictions. These facts will invariably be ignored" Spoken by Professor Whitten (Professor of Genetics, University of Melbourne, Australia) at the 1980 Assembly Week address.
- (6) "We can only imagine what probably existed, and our imagination so far has not been very helpful." Written by physical chemist Dr Richard E. Dickerson (Professor, Californian Institute of Technology) in his article "Chemical Evolution and the Origin of Life" in *Scientific American*, Vol. 239, No. 3, 1978 p:78
- (7) "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." Written by Dr Loren Eiseley (Anthropologist) in the book "The Immense Journey", Random House: New York, 1957 p:199
- (8) "Scientists are having a hard time agreeing on when, where and - most important - how life first emerged on the earth." From John Horgan's article "Trends in Evolution: In the Beginning", in *Scientific American*, February 1991, p:100-109



Evolution Says

Evolution is logical and every thing about it has been proved by logic. It should be believed because it is logical.

The Facts Are

- (1) Genetically speaking, logic decrees that natural selection would tend to select for a greater number of offspring, and not the length of the animal's life. Evolution should not select for complexity, longevity or even quality of life, but the more simple survival habits of the length and fertility of reproductive periods. What is actually observed, is that animals which are supposed to be 'higher' (more complex) on the evolutionary scale are generally more vulnerable to extinction. These animals have a small number of offspring and a limited period of reproduction. *[based on logic]*
- (2) "Why will many predictably persist in their acceptance of some version of chemical evolution? Quite simply, because chemical evolution has not been falsified. One would be irrational to adhere to a falsified hypothesis. We have only presented a case that chemical evolution is highly implausible. By the nature of the case that is all one can do. In a strict, technical sense, chemical evolution cannot be falsified because it is not falsifiable. Chemical evolution is a speculative reconstruction of a unique past event, and cannot therefore be tested against recurring nature." Written by biochemists Charles B. Thaxton, Walter L. Bradley & Roger L. Olsen as a statement that biogenesis (chemical evolution) is an unprovable theory, and not a fact, in their book "The Mystery of Life's Origin: Reassessing Current Theories", Philosophical Library: New York, 1984 p:186
- (3) The basis of Darwinian evolution, according to biologist, Steven Jay Gould, is an "*a priori* assertion" - ie. something that is believed beforehand. Evolution originated, therefore, as an expression of the cultural and political biases of nineteenth century liberalism. This belief was not based on any evidence, but has been passed on as fact for over 100 years. *Paleobiology*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1977 p:115
- (4) "Consequently, the primary evidence for evolution is the assumption of evolution!" Written by Scott M. Huse in his book "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (Michigan), 1983 p:14
- (5) "The molecular evidence therefore fails to confirm either the reality of the common ancestors or the adequacy of the Darwinist mechanism. In fact, testing Darwinism by the molecular evidence has never even been attempted. As in other areas, the objective has been to find confirmation for a theory which was conclusively presumed to be true at the start of the investigation. The true scientific question - Does the molecular evidence as a whole tend to confirm Darwinism when evaluated without Darwinist bias? - has never been asked." Written by Professor Phillip Johnson of the University of California, in his book "Darwin on Trial", Intervarsity Press: Illinois, 1991 p:99
- (6) "We must ask first whether the theory of evolution by natural selection is scientific or pseudo-scientific (metaphysical)
- (7) Evolution is a uniformitarian belief - ie. the past can be totally understood by reference to present day events. In *New Scientist*, zoologist Mark Ridley describes uniformitarian as not being "an empirical principle: it is trusted because of its obvious logic



Evolution Says

Evolution defies the Second Law of Thermodynamics, by causing simple organisms to change, by chance, into complex organisms.

The Facts Are

- (1) "Another way of stating the Second Law then is, 'The universe is constantly getting more disorderly!' everything deteriorates, collapses, breaks down, wears out, all by itself - and that is what the second law is all about." An interpretation of the meaning of the Second Law, written by world-renowned evolutionist Isaac Asimov, in "In the Game of Energy and Thermodynamics You Can't Even Break Even", *Smithsonian Institution Journal*, June, 1970 p:6
- (2) The whole process of evolution is in total opposition to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which states that time leads to disorder, rather than to order. It is argued in defence of this anomaly by evolutionists that the second law only applies to closed systems, while they claim that our world is in an open system. They falsely contend that complexity is generated and maintained at the expense of the energy supplied to it from the Sun. A bull loose in a crockery shop expends energy and performs work, but it does not create or maintain order. What is required for maintenance and development is work that follows specification. This specification requires information on how to proceed. *American Scientist*, Vol. 56, 1968 p:100; *Chemical and Engineering News*, July 7, 1980 p:40; G.G. Simpson & W.S. Beck, "Life: An Introduction to Biology", (2nd ed.), Harcourt, Brace & World Inc, 1965 p:466
- (3) "An answer can readily be given to the question, 'Has the second law of thermodynamics been circumvented?' NOT YET". Written by expert Frank A. Greco in "On the Second Law of Thermodynamics", *American Laboratory*, Vol. 14, October, 1982 p:80-88
- (4) "There is no recorded experiment in the history of science that contradicts the second law or its corollaries ". Written to show that no experimental evidence has disproved the second law, by physicists G.N. Hatspoulous & E.P. Gyftopoulos in E.B. Stuart, et al (eds.) "Deductive Quantum Thermodynamics in a Critical Review of Thermodynamics", Mono Books Corp: Baltimore, 1970 p:78
- (5) "There are no known violations of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Ordinarily the second law is stated for isolated systems, but the second law applies equally well to open systems - there is somehow associated with the field of far-from-equilibrium phenomena the notion that the Second Law of Thermodynamics fails for such systems. It is important to make sure that this error does not perpetuate itself." Written by Professor John Ross (Harvard University) to indicate that if Earth is regarded as an open system, then the Second Law still applies to it (meaning that evolution could not occur). In *Chemical and Engineering News*, July 7, 1980 p:40
- (6) "..... if your theory is found to be against the second law of thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for it but to collapse in deepest humiliation." Written by British astronomer Arthur S. Eddington, indicating that the theory of evolution, according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, is virtually impossible. Recorded in his book "The Nature of the Physical World", Macmillan: New York, 1930 p:74
- (7) "No matter how carefully we examine the energetics of living systems we find no evidence of defeat of thermodynamic principles, but we do encounter a degree of complexity not witnessed in the non-living world." Written by evolutionary biochemist Dr Harold F. Blum in his book "Time's Arrow and Evolution", Princeton University Press: Princeton (USA), 1962 p:119
- (8) "Although it is true that mere chance processes can produce things, it is equally true that whatever chance creates, it almost instantaneously annihilates. Thus, we are not here by a mere chance process for if that were true, we would have vanished long ago by the same objective probability. As it turns out, much to the evolutionist's consternation, time is actually an enemy of organic evolution, not its salvation. The handiwork of time is disassociation and disintegration, not synthesis." Written by Scott M. Huse, in his book "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (USA), 1983 p:92



Evolution Says

Thomas Huxley's argument in 1860, that evolution must logically have occurred, proves that evolution is a fact. The Chaos Theory proves that evolution is not affected by the Second Law of Thermodynamics - ie: evolution can proceed, despite the universal progression of devolution.

The Facts Are

(1) Thomas Huxley argued that six 'eternal' monkeys typing endlessly on six 'eternal' typewriters, could produce the 23rd Psalm among their printed nonsense. This was 'logical proof' that evolution could occur by chance, given an eternity of time. [background information]

(2) Huxley's 'eternal' monkeys could not have typed the 23rd Psalm in 'eternity'. Just to type the name "William Shakespeare" on a typewriter would occupy a million, million monkeys for a million, million years. If the monkeys were replaced by a typing machine which would randomly type millions of characters a second, two lines of a Shakespearian sonnet could not be done in less than 10^{150} characters. The conclusion of this scientific study, is that the idea that randomness can produce a work of design is purely misleading. The belief in the efficiency of randomness is shown to be an absurdity. *New Scientist*, November 1, 1984 p:39

(3) The Second Law of Thermodynamics necessitates that all systems in isolation will run down irreversibly into disorder. Huxley's eternal monkeys and their eternal typewriters, however, would be subject to the same law, and would eventually breakdown. His logic analogy, that evolution should occur given enough time, is therefore not supported by the laws of the universe. [based on logic]

(4) There is a major flaw in the logic used by Thomas Huxley in his famous debate with Bishop Samuel Wilberforce in 1860. The flaw is that the biological processes of life are reversible, and reversible reactions cannot permanently lead to the synthesis of any compounds. Huxley's typewriters would therefore have to be reversible, which means that when each letter was typed, it would have to be erased immediately. The sum action of typing on such typewriters would be **ZERO**. [based on logic]

(5) The Chaos Theory has now been picked up by evolutionists as a driving force that could be responsible for producing evolution from non-living matter. The type of 'order' or patterns which can be explained mathematically by this theory include such things as eddies in flowing water, and ripple patterns on sand dunes. This is entirely different from the formation of information-bearing chemical sequences that characterize living things. Even if Chaos Theory could explain evolution, the Second Law of Thermodynamics always acts on complexity to break it down, despite the Chaos Theory. The Second Law of Thermodynamics is not deactivated by Chaos physics. [based on logic]

(6) Ilya Prigogine, received a Nobel Prize for his work on the Chaos Theory and the origin of life. He has however admitted that he cannot use his 'non-equilibrium dispartive structures' to explain the origin of even the simplest living thing. *Creation Ex Nihilo*, Vol. 12, No. 4, 1990 p:36

(7) "Scientists of the highest standing would today accept many of Wilberforce's criticism of Darwin" Spoken by Sir Edmund R. Leach in his address to the 1981 Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Recorded in the article "Men, Bishops and Apes" in *Nature*, Vol. 293, September 3, 1981 p:19

(8) "A scientific study of the universe has suggested a conclusion which may be summed up in the statement that the universe appears to have been designed by a pure mathematician." Written by Sir James Jeans in "The Mysterious Universe", Macmillan Co.: New York, 1932 p:140



Evolution Says

Darwin discovered exactly how evolution took place. His description of the process is fact.

The Facts Are

- (1) The theory of evolution is not a fixed theory as the general public are lead to believe. Evolution, especially biological evolution, "is currently beset by an almost bewildering array of diverse opinions". Its mechanisms are not well established, as no one has yet put forward a scientifically sound mechanism for how it was all supposed to have taken place. *New Scientist*, October 15, 1988 p:66
- (2) Because there were no real transitions or missing links in the fossil record, Richard Goldschmidt developed the 'hopeful monster theory' to explain the jumps between fossil types. The theory postulates, for example, that a bird hatched out of the egg of a dinosaur. *American Scientist*, Vol. 40, 1952 p:97
- (3) Another theory put forward in 1980 as a mechanism for evolution by Dr Stephen Jay Gould, is called 'punctuated equilibrium'. This theory suggests that species stayed the same for millions of years and then all of a sudden, there was a giant leap (saltation). Each saltation led to an entirely different form. According to this theory some super gene which is especially effective in early embryonic development produces the dramatic change. The new organism survives because it is supposedly better than its parents. *Paleobiology*, Vol. 6, No. 1, January, 1980 p:127; *Natural History*, Vol. 86. No. 6, p:22-30
- (4) When Steven Gould first proposed his theory of punctuated equilibrium, he did so without providing one single example as proof that it worked. Scientists see that there is no proof, but it is nevertheless gaining in popularity among them. *Natural History*, Vol. 86. No. 6, p:28; *New Scientist*, Vol. 101, February 9, 1984 p:34-35
- (5) "The punctuated equilibrium model has been widely accepted, not because it has a compelling theoretical basis but because it appears to resolve a dilemma. Apart from the obvious sampling problems inherent to the observations that stimulated the model, and apart from its intrinsic circularity (one could argue that speciation can occur only when phyletic change is rapid, not vice versa), the model is more ad hoc explanation than theory, and it rests on shaky ground." Written by Robert E. Ricklefs (Department of Biology, University of Pennsylvania, USA) in his article "Paleontologists Confronting Macroevolution" in *Science*, Vol. 199 January 6, 1978 p:59
- (6) Sir Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe have proposed a theory that life on earth came from viruses showered on the earth by passing comets. Mathematician Dr Mike Hendy (Massey University, New Zealand) has traced the 'evolutionary' trees of various strains of flu collected since 1933. He has calculated that the probability of them evolving on their own comet was one chance in 10^{58} . These calculations show that the theory of life from outer space could not reasonably account for even the recent history of the flu, let alone evolution itself. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, January 31, 1987 p:3
- (7) Francis Crick, Nobel-Prize winner and co-discoverer of the DNA double-helix, believes that there is virtually no chance that the first life could have risen spontaneously from Earth's chemistry as a 'primordial soup'. His theory is that the first living cells were brought here by a spaceship from outside our solar system. *Discover*, October, 1981 p:62-67 & 256; Francis Crick "Life Itself", Simon & Schuster: New York, 1981 p:117-141
- (8) A theory was proposed by Dr Graeme Cairns-Smith (University of Glasgow, Scotland) in the 1960's which suggests that clay was the site of the first life on earth. This hypothesis is based on the knowledge that clays can store and transfer energy, and act as catalysts. This hypothesis is not accepted these days as a valid theory. *The Age*, April 4, 1985 p:7; *Scientific American*, February, 1991 p:100-109; *Biosystems*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 1988 p:89;



Evolution Says

Darwin believed absolutely that evolution had occurred exactly the way he described it. He was very happy with his own description of the process.

The Facts Are

- (1) "You will be greatly disappointed [by the forthcoming book]; it will be grievously too hypothetical. It will very likely be of no other service than collocating some facts; though I myself think I see my way approximately on the origin of species. But, alas, how frequent, how almost universal it is in an author to persuade himself of the truth of his own dogmas." A quote of Charles Darwin from a letter to a colleague in 1858 regarding the concluding chapters of his book "Origin of Species". Quoted in John Lofton's Journal, *The Washington Times*, February 8, 1984
- (2) "For I [ie. Darwin] am well aware that scarcely a single point is discussed in this volume on which facts cannot be adduced, often apparently leading to conclusions directly opposite to those at which I have arrived. A fair result can be obtained only by fully stating and balancing the facts and arguments on both sides of each question; and this is here impossible." A confession that Darwin knew that there were other interpretations of his data. Written in the Introduction to "Origin of Species", 1859 p:2, and quoted in John Lofton's Journal, *The Washington Times*, February 8, 1984
- (3) "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." Written by Charles Darwin in his book "The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection", (6th ed. 1872), Senate: London, 1994 reprint, p:146
- (4) "Firstly, why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?" A confession of difficulties with his theory of evolution, by Charles Darwin in the first edition of his book "The Origin of Species", (1st. ed. reprint) Avenel Books: New York, 1979 p:205
- (5) "..... so must the numbers of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed on the earth, be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory [of evolution]. The explanation lies, as I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record." An admission by Charles Darwin of the imperfection of the geologic record, in his book "The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection", (6th ed. 1872), Senate: London, 1994 reprint, p:292
- (6) "Missing links in the sequence of fossil evidence were a worry to Darwin. He felt sure they would eventually turn up, but they are still missing and seem likely to remain so. What we are to make of that fact is still open to debate, but today it is the conventional neo-Darwinians who appear as the conservative bigots and the unorthodox neo-Sedgewickians who rate as enlightened rationalists prepared to contemplate the evidence that is plain for all to see." Spoken by Sir Edmund R. Leach (Professor) in his address to the 1981 Annual Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Recorded in the article "Men, Bishops and Apes" in *Nature*, Vol. 293, September 3, 1981 p:20
- (7) "Natural selection is incompetent to account for the incipient stages of useful structures" Charles Darwin abandoning natural selection in the sixth edition of his book "The Origin of Species", (6th ed.) The Modern Library: New York, 1872 p:66
- (8) "To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree." Written by Charles Darwin, in his book "The Origin of Species", (6th ed. 1872) Senate: London, 1994 reprint, p:143



(9) Darwin, in his original publication, rejected Lamarck's hypothesis of acquired traits in favour of natural selection. Later, subsequent research and debate caused him to return to Lamarck's theory. In the sixth edition of his book Darwin abandoned natural selection as the driving force behind evolution. This was due to the continuing lack of evidence and of theoretical problems. Charles Darwin, "The Origin of Species", (6th ed.) The Modern Library: New York, 1872 p:66

(10) "His theory had, in essence, preceded his knowledge - that is, he had hit upon a novel and evocative theory of evolution with limited knowledge at hand to satisfy either himself or others that the theory was true. He could neither accept it himself nor prove it to others. He simply did not know enough concerning the several natural history fields upon which his theory would have to be based." Dr Barry Gale (Science Historian, Darwin College, UK) in his book "Evolution Without Evidence". Quoted in John Lofton's Journal, *The Washington Times*, February 8, 1984

(11) "Darwin's book - *On the Origin of Species* - I find quite unsatisfactory: it says nothing about the origin of species; it is written very tentatively, with a special chapter on "Difficulties on Theory"; and it includes a great deal of discussion on why evidence for natural selection does not exist in the fossil record As a scientist, I am not happy with these ideas." Written by H. Lipson (Professor of Physics, University of Manchester, UK) in his letter to the editor "Origin of Species" in *New Scientist*, 14 May, 1981 p:452



Evolution Says

All scientists, including the world's top Biologists, Palaeontologists, Anthropologists, Cosmologists & Museum Curators believe that evolution occurred exactly the way Darwin described it.

The Facts Are

“Hundreds of scientists who once taught their university students that the bottom line on origins had finally been figured out and settled, are today confessing that they were completely wrong. They’ve discovered that their previous conclusions, once held so fervently, were based on very fragile evidences and suppositions which have since been refuted by new discoveries.” Luther D. Sunderland, “Darwin’s Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems” (4th ed.), Master Books: Santee (California), 1988 p:7-8

A collection of world famous evolutionists.

(1) A conference of scientists at the Field Museum of Natural History (Chicago) in October, 1980, was convened to thrash out the issues of Darwinian evolution. The meeting considered whether the mechanisms of micro-evolution (mutation and natural selection) gradually produced enough change to cause macro-evolution. Their final analysis was "NO!". *Science*, Vol. 210, No. 4472, November 21, 1980 p:883-887

Sir Fred Hoyle - *world-renown British mathematician, astronomer, cosmologist, and evolutionist; and Professor Chandra Wickramasinghe* - *his co-worker.*

(2) The theory of Darwinian gradualistic evolution is such an anathema to Sir Fred Hoyle that he has calculated many similes based on probability. One of his analogies is that the chance that higher life forms might have evolved is comparable with the chance that a "tornado sweeping through a junkyard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein". *Nature*, Vol. 294, November 12, 1981 p:105

(3) "Quite a few of my astronomical friends are considerable mathematicians, and once they become interested enough to calculate [the probabilities of the Big Bang] for themselves, instead of relying on hearsay argument, they can quickly see this point." Fred Hoyle's article "The Big Bang in Astronomy" in *New Scientist*, Vol. 92, No. 1280, November 19, 1981 p:527

(4) "True, the problem is not discussed openly in the main stream of biological literature, but one comes on small fragments published in obscure corners by writers who have evidently perceived the problem [that evolution is not logical or probable] and been acutely worried by it. Having made their protest against current [evolutionary] dogma, such writers seem always to have been prepared to let the matter drop, as no doubt they encountered the same kind of opposition that Chandra Wickramasinghe and I have run into." Sir Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe, in "Evolution from Space (The Omni Lecture): and Other Papers on the Origin of Life", Enslow Publishers: New Jersey, 1982 p:27-28

(5) "My impression is that most biologists really know in their hearts the issue [of improbability] is there, but are so appalled by its implications that they are prepared to swallow any line of thought to avoid it if one proceeds directly and straightforwardly in this matter, without being deflected by a fear of incurring the wrath of scientific opinion, one arrives at the conclusion that biomaterialists with their amazing measure of order must be the outcome of intelligent design [The] problems of order, such as the sequences of amino acids in the chains are precisely the problems that become easy once a directed intelligence enters the picture." Sir Fred Hoyle believes that life could not have originated on Earth and could not have originated elsewhere without some intelligence having directed it. Sir Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe, in "Evolution from Space (The Omni Lecture): and Other Papers on the Origin of Life", Enslow Publishers: New Jersey, 1982 p:27-28



(6) "Once we see, however, that the probability of life originating at random is so utterly minuscule as to make it absurd, it becomes sensible to think that the favourable properties of physics on which life depends are in every respect deliberate such a theory is so obvious that one wonders why it is not widely accepted as being self-evident. The reasons are psychological rather than scientific." Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe, in "Evolution from Space", J.M. Dent & Sons: London, 1981 p:141 & 130

(7) "The speculations of "The Origin of Species" turned out to be wrong the scientific facts throw Darwin out." Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe, in "Evolution from Space", J.M. Dent & Sons: London, 1981 p:6, 97

(8) "The evolutionary record leaks like a sieve There are so many flaws in Darwinism that one can wonder why it swept so completely through the scientific world, and why it is still endemic today." A statement by Sir Fred Hoyle & Professor Chandra Wickramasinghe concerning the fallacy of gradual evolution in their book "Evolution From Space", Granada Publishing: London, 1983 p:81

(9) "..... Life cannot have had a random beginning The trouble is that there are about two thousand enzymes, and the chance of obtaining them all in a random trial is only one part in $(10^{20})^{2,000} = 10^{40,000}$, an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup. If one is not prejudiced either by social beliefs or by a scientific training into the conviction that life originated on the earth, this simple calculation wipes the idea entirely out of court." Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe, in "Evolution from Space", J.M. Dent & Sons: London, 1981 p:148

Stephen Jay Gould - world famous biologist & evolutionist (Harvard University).

(10) Steven Jay Gould, is an eminent evolutionist who rejects the Darwinian theory that life gradually evolved on earth. He bases his belief on his interpretation of the fossil record. *Palaeobiology*, 1977

(11) Stephen Jay Gould believes that humans are not evolving - not even slowly. He has stated that there is no reason to think that we are going to get bigger brains, smaller toes, or anything else. He has gone on record as saying that "we are what we are". *The Washington Times*, February 8, 1984

Pierre-Paul Grassé - distinguished evolutionist, Chair of Evolution (The Sorbonne, Paris), and past-President (French Academie des Sciences).

(12) "To insist, even with Olympian assurance, that life appeared quite by chance and evolved in this fashion, is an unfounded supposition which I believe to be wrong and not in accordance with the facts." Written by Pierre-Paul Grassé in his book "Evolution of Living Organisms", Academic Press: New York, 1977 p:107

(13) "Facts must come first and theories must follow. The only verdict that matters is the one pronounced by the court as proved facts. Indeed, the best studies on evolution have been carried out by biologists who are not blinded by doctrines and who observe facts coldly without considering whether they agree or disagree with their theories. 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 of the interpretations and extrapolations that 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 the falsity of their beliefs." Written by Pierre-Paul Grassé in his book "Evolution of Living Organisms", Academic Press: New York, 1977 p:8



Dr David Pilbeam - *evolutionist, expert palaeoanthropologist, physical anthropologist (Yale University, USA) & (Boston Natural History Museum)* .

(14) David Pilbeam, has confessed that discoveries since 1976 have shaken his view of human origins and forced him to change his idea of man's ancestry. He does not believe that he would be likely to hit upon the true story of the origin of man. He believes that our theories clearly reflect current ideologies, instead of the actual data - reflecting only what was expected of them. *Human Nature*, June 1978

(15) "I know that, at least in Paleoanthropology, data are still so sparse that theory heavily influences interpretations. Theories have, in the past, clearly reflected our current ideologies instead of the actual data." David Pilbeam in his article "Rearranging Our Family Tree" in *Human Nature*, June, 1978 p:45

Søren Løvtrup - *evolutionist*.

(16) Søren Løvtrup does not adhere to the commonly promulgated Darwinian theory of evolution. He maintains that the logical consequence of any form of Darwinism "requires us to surrender our common sense". He claims that Darwinism is like the emperor's new clothes in the Hans Christian Anderson tale - "nakedly false". *New Scientist*, October 15, 1988 p:66

(17) "I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science. When this happens many people will pose the question: How did this ever happen?" S. Lovtrup in "Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth", Croom Helm: London, 1987 p:422; Quoted in *New Scientist*, October 15, 1988 p:66

Professor Waterhouse - *evolutionist*.

(18) "Well, what does this do to uniformitarianism? I think you have to bury it. The defenders of uniformitarianism are those in love with a word, not its original meaning. It is the end of the concept, unless you want to change the definition". Prof. Waterhouse dismissing the fact that you can prove evolution from the present on the assumption that things have remained uniform since the beginning. Spoken by the professor at the inaugural lecture at the University of Queensland (Brisbane) in 1980.

L. Harrison Matthews - *evolutionist*.

(19) "The fact of evolution is the backbone of biology, and biology is thus in the peculiar position of being a science founded on an unproved theory - is it then a science or a faith? Belief in the theory of evolution is thus exactly parallel to belief in special creation - both are concepts which believers know to be true but neither, up to the present, has been capable of proof". An admission of the non-scientific basis for the belief in evolution by L. Harrison Matthews in the foreword of the 1971 edition of Darwin's "The Origin of Species", J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd: London p:x

Dr Geoffrey Burbridge - *evolutionist and astronomer, former president of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*.

(20) "The fairest way to deal with the problem is not to fall back on authority (what eminent authorities believe, or don't believe) but to examine the evidence for oneself". Geoffrey Burbridge in "Quasars in the Balance", *Mercury*, Vol. 17, No. 5, 1988 p:140



Disillusioned Evolutionists

Norman MacBeth - *retired attorney and evolutionism researcher.*

(21) "Darwinism has failed in practice. The whole aim and purpose of Darwinism is to show how modern forms descended from ancient forms, that is, to construct reliable phylogenies (genealogies or family trees). In this it has utterly failed." Norman MacBeth in the article "A Third Position in the Textbook Controversy", *American Biology Teacher*, Vol. 38, No.8, November 1976 p:495

Jerome Lejeune - *Professor (Chair of Fundamental Genetics, University of Paris), internationally recognised geneticist, and evolution teacher.*

(22) "The neo-Darwinist is now reaching the point of dignity in the history of science that the Ptolemaic system in astronomy, the epicycle system, reached long ago. We know that it does not work." Quoted from the conference paper "The Beginning of Life", in October 1975, by Jerome Lejeune.

(23) "We have no acceptable theory of evolution at the present time. There is none; and I cannot accept the theory that I teach to my students each year. Let me explain. I teach the synthetic theory known as the neo-Darwinian one, for one reason only; not because it's good, we know it is bad, but because there isn't any other. Whilst waiting to find something better you are taught something which is known to be inexact" Comments made by Jerome Lejeune at a lecture in Paris on March 17, 1985. Notes are from a recording of the message.

Francisco Ayala - *evolutionist, and the world's leading spokesman on gradualistic evolution.*

(24) "The palaeontologists have convinced me small changes do not accumulate." Francisco Ayala, after the Field Museum of Natural History's Chicago conference in October, 1980. Quoted in *Science*, Vol. 210, No. 4472, November 21, 1980 p:883-887

Dr Gareth Nelson - *evolutionist, Chairman (Department of Herpetology and Ichthyology, American Museum of Natural History, New York).*

(25) "..... [the author] is basically correct that evidence, or proof, of origins - of the universe, of life, of all of the minor groups of life, of all of the major groups of life, indeed of all the species - is weak or nonexistent when measured on an absolute scale, as it always was and will always be." Gareth Nelson in the preface to W.R. Bird's book "The Origin of Species Revisited" (2 vols), Philosophical Library Inc: New York, 1987-89

Dr Colin Patterson - *Senior Palaeontologist (British Museum of Natural History, London), cladistics exponent.*

(26) "How the dinosaurs became extinct, how the mammals evolved, where man came from. These seem to me to be little more than story-telling. And this is the result of thinking about cladistics because as it turns out, as it seems to me, all one can learn about the history of life is learned from systematics, from groupings one finds in nature. The rest of it is story-telling of one sort or another." Spoken by Colin Patterson in an interview on BBC TV on March 4, 1982.



Dr Derek V. Ager - *evolutionist, geologist (Department of Geology, Oceanography, University College, Swansea, UK), and former President of the British Geological Association.*

(27) "We all know that many apparent evolutionary bursts are nothing more than brainstorming on the part of particular palaeontologists. One splitter in a library can do far more than millions of years of genetic mutation." Derek V. Ager in his article "The Nature of the Fossil Record" in *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association*, Vol. 87, No. 2, 1976 p:132



Evolutionists Say

"EVOLUTION IS A FACT". All scientists believe this is so.

The Facts Are

Arthur Koestler, *author*.

(1) "I have quoted some voices of dissent [against Darwinian evolution] coming from biologists in eminent academic positions. There have been many others, just as critical of the orthodox doctrine, though not always as outspoken - and their number is steadily growing." Arthur Koestler in his book "Janus: A Summing Up", Random House: New York, 1978 p:184

Dr Wolfgang Smith - *physicist, research mathematician, Professor of Mathematics (Oregon State University) and former aerodynamicist.*

(2) "It has often been claimed, moreover, that these new and momentous findings have at last unearthed the true mechanism of evolution, and that we are presently on the brink of discovering precisely how macroevolution has come about. However, the truth of the matter is very much the opposite: now that the actual physical structure of what might be termed the biochemical mainstays of life has come into view, scientists are finding - frequently to their dismay - that the evolutionist thesis has become more stringently unthinkable than ever before" Wolfgang Smith in his book "Teilhardism and the New Religion: A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin", Tan Books & Pub. Inc: Rockford (USA), 1988 p:8

(3) "The fact is that in recent times there has been increasing dissent on the issue within academic and professional ranks, and that a growing number of respectable scientists are defecting from the evolutionist camp. It is interesting, moreover, that for the most part these 'experts' have abandoned Darwinism, not on the basis of religious belief or biblical persuasion, but on strictly scientific grounds" Wolfgang Smith in his book "Teilhardism and the New Religion: A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin", Tan Books & Pub. Inc: Rockford (USA), 1988 p:1

(4) "The salient fact is this: if by evolution we mean macroevolution (as we henceforth shall), then it can be said with the utmost rigour that the doctrine is totally bereft of scientific sanction." Wolfgang Smith in his book "Teilhardism and the New Religion: A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin", Tan Books & Pub. Inc: Rockford (USA), 1988 p:5

(5) "Now, to be sure, given the multitude of extravagant claims about evolution promulgated by evolutionists with an air of scientific infallibility, this may indeed sound strange. And yet the fact remains that there exists to this day not a shred of bona fide scientific evidence in support of the thesis that macroevolutionary transformations have ever occurred." Wolfgang Smith in his book "Teilhardism and the New Religion: A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin", Tan Books & Pub. Inc: Rockford (USA), 1988 p:6

(6) "We are told dogmatically that evolution is an established fact; but we are never told who has established it, and by what means. We are told, often enough, that the doctrine is founded upon evidence, and that indeed this evidence 'is henceforward above all verification, as well as being immune from any subsequent contradiction by experience'; but we are left entirely in the dark on the crucial question wherein, precisely, this evidence consists." Wolfgang Smith in his book "Teilhardism and the New Religion: A Thorough Analysis of the Teachings of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin", Tan Books & Pub. Inc: Rockford (USA), 1988 p:2



Dr. Ernst Chain - Nobel Prize winning biochemist.

(7) Ernst Chain, who helped develop penicillin, in 1972, has called the theory of evolution, "a very feeble attempt to understand the development of life." He is also on record as saying "I would rather believe in fairies than in such wild speculation [as Darwinian evolution]". Ernst Chain. Quoted in Ronald W. Clark, "The Life of Ernst Chain: Penicillin and Beyond", Weidenfeld & Nicholson: London, 1985 p:147-148

Hubert P. Yockey - (Army Pulse Radiation Facility, Maryland, USA).

(8) "One must conclude that, contrary to the established and current wisdom, a scenario describing the genesis of life on Earth by chance and natural causes which can be accepted on the basis of fact and not faith has not yet been written." Hubert P. Yockey in his article "A Calculation of the Probability of Spontaneous Biogenesis by Information Theory" in *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 67, 1977 p:398

Peter T. Saunders - mathematician, (University of London), and Mae-Wan Ho - biologist, (Open University).

(9) "From the claims that are made for neo-Darwinism one could easily get the impression that it has made great progress towards explaining evolution, mostly leaving the details to be cleared up. In fact, quite the reverse is true. Neo-Darwinism can account for some of the details, but the major problems remain unsolved. Samuel Butler's (1911) complaint that Darwin had given us 'an origin of the species with the origin cut out' is true today as when he wrote it." Peter T. Saunders and Mae-Wan Ho in "Is Neo-Darwinism Falsifiable? And Does It Matter?", in *Nature and Systems*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 1982 p:191

Ludwig von Bertalanffy - biologist.

(10) "The fact that a theory so vague, so insufficiently verifiable, and so far from the criteria otherwise applied in 'hard' science has become a dogma can only be explained on sociological grounds." Ludwig von Bertalanffy, as quoted by Huston Smith in his book "Beyond the Post-Modern Mind", Crossroads: New York, 1982 p:173

George Kocan - science writer and biologist.

(11) "Unfortunately, many scientists and non-scientists have made Evolution into a religion, something to be defended against infidels. In my experience, many students of biology - professors and textbook writers included - have been so carried away with the arguments for Evolution that they neglect to question it. They preach it College students, having gone through such a closed system of education, themselves become teachers, entering high schools to continue the process, using textbooks written by former classmates or professors. High standards of scholarship and teaching break down. Propaganda and the pursuit of power replace the pursuit of knowledge. Education becomes a fraud." George Kocan in his article "Evolution Isn't Faith But Theory", in the *Chicago Tribune*, Monday, April 21, 1980



Dr T.N. Tahmisian - *physiologist (The Atomic Energy Commission, USA).*

(12) "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."

T.N. Tahmisian. Quoted by N.J. Mitchell in the book "Evolution and the Emperor's New Clothes", Roydon Pub: UK, 1983 [title page]

Karl Popper.

(14) "I have come to the conclusion that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory, but a metaphysical research programme" Karl Popper in his autobiography "Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography", Fontana Books, 1976

Dr. Robert Jastrow - *Director (Institute for Space Studies, USA).*

(15) "Now and then a scientist stumbles across a fact that seems to solve one of the great mysteries of science over-night. Such unexpected discoveries are rare. When they occur, the scientific community gets very excited. But excitement is not the best barometer of scientific validity. Science, said Adam Smith, should be "the great antidote to the poison of enthusiasm". The case of the disappearing dinosaurs is a fascinating demonstration that science is not based on facts alone. The interpretation of the facts is even more important." Robert Jastrow in his article "The Dinosaur Massacre" in *Omega Science Digest*, March/April, 1984 p:23

Dr Albert Fleischmann - *(University of Erlangen, Germany).*

(16) "I reject evolution because I deem it obsolete; because the knowledge, hard won since 1830, of anatomy, histology, cytology, and embryology, cannot be made to accord with its basic idea. The foundationless, fantastic edifice of the evolution doctrine would long ago have met with its long-deserved fate were it not that the love of fairy tales is so deep-rooted in the hearts of man." Dr Albert Fleischmann. Recorded in Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (USA), 1983 p:120

Dr George Wald - *winner of the 1967 Nobel Peace Prize for Science.*

(17) "When it comes to the origin of life on this earth, there are only two possibilities: creation or spontaneous generation (evolution). There is no third way. Spontaneous generation was disproved 100 years ago, but that leads us only to one other conclusion: that of supernatural creation. We cannot accept that on philosophical grounds (personal reasons); therefore we choose to believe the impossible: that life arose spontaneously by chance." Dr George Wald. Quoted in Scott M. Huse, "The Collapse of Evolution", Baker Book House: Grand Rapids (USA), 1983 p:3



Professor J. Keosian.

(13) "All present approaches to a solution of the problem of the origin of life are either irrelevant or lead into a blind alley. Therein lies the crisis." J. Keosian summarizing the then current evidence for chemical evolution, in his article "The Origin of Life" in the *Proceedings of the 2nd ISSOL Meeting, 5th ICOL Meeting*, (H. Noda ed.), Japan Scientific Society Press: Japan, 1978 p:569-574

Malcolm Muggeridge - famous philosopher and journalist.

(18) "I, myself, am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially to the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has." Statement made by the famous philosopher and journalist Malcolm Muggeridge at the Pascal Lectures, University of Waterloo: Ontario (Canada)

Professor Louis Bounoure - former president of the Biological Society of Strasbourg, Director (Strasbourg Zoological Museum), Director of Research (French National Centre of Scientific Research).

(19) "Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless." Louis Bounoure, quoted in *The Advocate*, Thursday March 8, 1984 p:17



Evolutionists Say

"EVOLUTION IS A FACT". This page contains all the incontrovertible facts of evolution.

The Facts Are

A D D E N D U M

Since the printing of this book, the following items have come to light:-

1/ Geologic Column #20 (item 4.4) - The 'whale on its tail' cited there has since been shown to be lying in rock layers tilted to around 90°. The diatomaceous rock in which the fossil was found did not have distinct layers, so its angle of rest was mistaken. It wasn't until a layer of rock underneath the whale was found, that the angle of tilt was shown to be vertical. Despite this error, the fossil is an anomaly because evolutionary uniformitarianism decrees that this diatomite formed at the estimated rate of 5 mm per year. Now, this 26.6 m long whale had a head around 2.3 m thick, which means that it would have taken around 4600 years for it to have been totally buried. Over this period of time scavengers would have well and truly destroyed all the remains above the sediment. *Creation ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1995 p:244-258.

2/ The Moon #7 (item 2) - The rate of meteorite dust entering the earth was calculated by Hans Pettersson in 1960 to be 14 mil t/yr (*Scientific American*, Vol. 202, 1960 p:132). His estimate for Earth was of 182 ft (60 m) in 5 billion years. It is believed that a similar rate would apply to the moon. Apollo astronauts reported about 1/8" (3 mm) of dust on the moon's surface. This estimated rate of cosmic dust has been recalculated following the re-evaluation of the background parameters, but its alteration will not reduce the build-up from 60 m to 3 mm.

3/ Solar System - The Sun #4 (item 2) - The theoretical and experimental knowledge which supports the concept of nuclear fusion as the source of the Sun's energy, rather than by gravitational collapse, does not negate the evidence to the contrary. Independent of which ever theory is found to be acceptable, they are still only theories, not facts.

4/ Earth's Magnetic Field # 11 - The evolutionary concept of long cycles in the earth's magnetic field reversals, is a different concept to the known existence of rapid reversals which are occurring in rocks forming at the present time. Long cycles are an open ended concept which allows for field reversals to fit into any evolutionary time frame involving enormously long spans of time. *Creation ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1995 p:13-15

5/ Plate Tectonics #14 & Continental Drift #15 - Despite continental drift being accepted by many creationists because it fits their Catastrophic Plate Tectonics theory, there are still problems involving the theory. It still has not been incontrovertibly proved, nor are the multiple millions of years of time attributed to it by evolution a definite fact. Again, there is still the problem of contradictory data which must be included in the overall analysis. And also, Australia still has to rotate to fit into one of the schemes. Rather than being a proven fact, the theory of continental drift contains notions that make it acceptable to both creationists and evolutionists alike because it fits in with both their preconceived ideas. All up, continental drift still sits in the hypothesis basket. *Creation ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1995 p:12-20

6/ The Speed of Light (removed) - There are some who believe that Barry Setterfield's Decay Of Light Speed theory is not sound, and that it does not stand up to statistical analysis. This does not alter it from being considered as an alternative hypothesis, like red-shift, which needs further analysis for it to be confirmed. Then again there is 'statistical analysis' and there is 'statistical analysis'. *Creation ex Nihilo Technical Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1995 p:102-105; Russell Humphry's book "Starlight and Time".

7/ Archaeopteryx Fake (removed) - There are some who believe that the examination of archaeopteryx fossils which showed evidence that it was a fraud is not substantiated. Nevertheless, the statements of these noted scientists still stands, and the possibility that it is a fake still remains.

L. D. Smart
(February 1996)