

THE FADING MYTH OF EVOLUTION

Richard Dawkins says evolution is no longer a *theory*; it's a proven *fact*! So, what do you say?

How did the universe start?

- Evolutionists say matter and energy came from nothing – by natural processes.
- Creationists say matter and energy cannot come from natural processes. Their origin had to be supernatural.
- True scientists say the First Law of Thermodynamics states matter & energy can neither be created nor destroyed – **contradicting evolution, but supporting creation.**

How did the universe get to be as it is today?

- Evolutionists say the universe was originally a tiny clump, and it expanded – order coming from chaos over time.
- Creationists say the universe was orderly from the outset – the cosmos and solar system resulting from design; not chaotic chance over time.
- True scientists say the Second Law of Thermodynamics insists that all systems (left to themselves) proceed (over time) from order to chaos – **contradicting evolution, but supporting creation.**

How did life begin?

- Evolutionists say life began billions of years ago from non-life – through natural processes.
- Creationists say life cannot come from non-life by natural processes. Life comes only from life, being supernatural in origin.
- True scientists say the Law of Biogenesis dictates that life comes from life – Cell Theory stating that living cells can come only from living cells. This is a “law of science,” **contradicting evolution, but supporting creation.**

Did we come from Bacteria?

- Evolutionists say, yes! The first life was bacterial, and after billions of mutations (over billions of years) the result was people.
- Creationists say, absolutely not! Bacteria make bacteria; people make people – countering the evolutionary “Bacteria to People” ideology.
- True scientists say, DNA does what it does because of a written code (supported by biochemistry and genetics). If bacteria mutate, all you get is mutated bacteria, **contradicting evolution but supporting creation.**

Can incremental changes over time produce new creatures?

- Evolutionists say, yes! Accumulation of tiny changes over billions of years can produce whole new creatures.
- Creationists say: Offspring can vary, but only within limits. Traits may change, but dogs remain dogs and cats remain cats.
- True scientists say artificial breeding shows that there are *limits* to change in animals. You can breed dogs to get faster dogs, but they're still (and always will be) *dogs* – **contradicting evolution but supporting creation.**

Do fossils support evolution?

- Evolutionists know this isn't true. As evolutionary Mark Ridley admitted, “No real scientist uses the fossil record as evidence favoring the theory of evolution.”
- Creationists say the fossil record shows no evidence of missing links because they never existed.
- True scientists realize that the fossil record doesn't show transitions. If bacteria became human, there should be myriads missing links, but they don't exist – **contradicting evolution but supporting creation.**

If evolution happened, why don't we see it occurring today?

- Evolutionists say evolution occurs over lengthy ages, so you won't see it happening.
- Creationists say, “The reason we don't see it happening is because it doesn't happen.”
- True scientists say, “If it's happening, why are there no links in the fossil record?” **contradicting evolution but supporting creation.**

We have the gift of reasoning, but you don't need a Ph.D.! Not when you have the Word of God!

WHY NOT EVOLUTION?

Evolutionists generally portray creationists as obstructionists, resisting the advance of science. True science, however, should be self-correcting. Claiming that the physical world is its own reason for existence is a religious tenet, but many aren't buying it. Here are some arguments from *Reasons to Reject Evolution*, a CR Ministries pamphlet by Paul Humber:

- Reason # 1: Evolutionists have two explanations for the cosmos: Steady State and the Big Bang. The first is excluded due to the Law of Entropy. If the universe had no beginning, it would have dissipated long ago, due to "heat death," which is why the Steady State has (for the most part) been abandoned. However, the more popular Big Bang also needs to be abandoned. Even evolutionists admit the lack of evidence for the earliest (Pop. III) Stars – essential for the Cosmic Bang to have any credibility. Yet, despite an increasing desire within the scientific community for a serious review of the BB model, people still hold onto it -- since the only reasonable alternatives imply Special Creation (an abhorrent notion for many).
- Reason #2: Spontaneous generation has never been observed, though evolutionists have faith that it must have happened – at least once. In short, belief that life could generate from nonliving materials is a matter of faith – a religious tenet, not science.
- Reason #3: Evolutionists argue that billions of years are the basis for life arriving through natural processes. To evolutionists, the origin of life is like a lottery. Someone has to win, and since we're here, Planet Earth has won the lottery. The truth is that living organisms are so complex that it is impossible for life to have arrived naturally.
- Reason #4: Common-descent evolution is impossible for at least three reasons:
 - First: The probability of a functional protein evolving by chance is far too low to be realistic.
 - Second: Mutations usually damage the genome, and upward mobility can't happen by going downhill.
 - Third: The cost of stabilizing mutations in any population is a higher reproduction rate by those having the mutation – so much so that evolution cannot occur in the time-span envisioned by evolutionists.
- Reason #5: The Miller-Urey experiment (supposedly producing the building blocks life) was an utter failure.
- Reason #6: So-called simple cells are not simple at all. Former atheist Antony Flew became a theist because of fifty years of DNA research, providing powerful evidence for intelligent design.
- Reason #7: Natural selection cannot produce new information. Computer simulations simply hijack pre-existing information, invalidating the experiment.
- Reason #8: Ernst Haeckel's embryo drawings (linking lower life forms to higher ones) were fraudulent.
- Reason #9: Carl Sagan spoke of unique human qualities emerging within animal's wombs, but offered no proof.
- Reason #10: Darwin opposed smallpox vaccination; to strengthen humanity since only the weak would die.
- Reason #11: Over 100 so-called vestigial organs (vestigial of evolution) aren't vestigial at all, but functional.
- Reason #12: So-called "junk" DNA isn't necessarily junk, though DNA is increasingly degenerative.
- Reason #13: Changes in finch beaks (structures already existing) don't explain their origin.
- Reason #14: Peppered moths glued to tree trunks offer no proof for evolutionary progress.
- Reason #15: Piltdown Man was a deliberate fraud, like Nebraska Man and many other supposed pre-humans.
- Reason #16: Evolutionists are in denial about history. If human ancestry dates back 1-2 million years, why does human history go back less than 1% of that time? Evolutionists expect people to believe the unbelievable, but creationists aren't that gullible!
- Reason #17: Primitive languages throw no light on origins, since most are more grammatically complicated than languages spoken today – showing progressive simplification, not increasing complexity.
- Reason #18: Living fossils (supposedly absent from the fossils for millions of years) call into question the entire evolutionary paradigm.
- Reason #19: The latest dating technology (e.g., accelerator mass spectrometry) isn't used for fossils supposedly millions of years old. Why? Could it be for fear that newer carbon-14 dating techniques will call into question the ancient dates required by evolution?
- Reason #20: Rubbery dinosaur fossil tissue refutes lengthy ages of lithification, so why not submit it for analysis by newer dating methods?
- Reason #21: Helium and lead are by-products of the radio-decay of uranium, but the chronology of helium-diffusion clashes with that of lead-formation. Both can't be right, so why aren't evolutionary scientists trying to reconcile this discrepancy?
- Reason #22: Geologists are becoming Mega-flood catastrophists, so why hang on to outmoded hypotheses? Grand Canyon testifies to massive amounts of water once covering the American Southwest – to a height of 6,000 feet above current sea level. Contrary to evolutionary ideology, the major flow morphology of the Canyon proves that it was carved in a short time.

- **Reason #23:** In 1999, *National Geographic* displayed a fake fossil (Archaeoraptor), supposedly linking birds with dinosaurs. Three months later, *USA Today* debunked this story as “the missing link that wasn’t.” Finally, toward the end of its 2002 issue, *National Geographic* admitted its error. But, why did it take so long? And why was the retraction so much smaller than the original spread?
- **Reason #24:** *National Geographic*’s hominid sequence (from dark to light in color) was imaginary at best and racist at worst – falling flat as anything factual.
- **Reason #25:** Evolutionary hostility toward competing theories was obvious when Smithsonian officials demoted and harassed a scientist doubting Darwinian evolution. When this was uncovered by governmental officials, there was little effort to correct the damage that was done.
- **Reason #26:** Evolutionists are in denial regarding science, arguing that creationists aren’t true scientists. The Scientific Revolution, however, was driven by scientists committed to the God of Creation, holding that faith and science should be friends.
- **Reason #27:** The evolution of sexual reproduction has always been a mystery. Why do lower animals, birds, and mammals (including humans) not divide like amoebas? A lot of energy and risk seem to be wasted on courtship, gestation, birth, etc., so why wouldn’t fish to split into two, rather than waiting for a member of the opposite sex to evolve?

The bottom line is that facts are often skewed by bias. Christ’s words, however, fit beautifully with reality, for “He who made them from the beginning made them male and female.” (Matthew 19:4)

DEBUNKING EVOLUTIONARY THEORIES

Twelve areas of evolving scientific research debunking evolutionary myths are as follows:

1. The absolute beginning of the cosmos. (Aka the Big Bang):

Accepted for generations as “standard theory,” the Big Bang suggests “deep time” for the billions of years required for cosmic evolution. However, keeping it viable has required major modifications over the years, including Alan Guth’s 1980 warp-speed inflation theory. Later came cold dark matter, supplying additional mass for the assembly of massive heavenly bodies. And, later still (in the 1990s) came dark energy, explaining why the universe’s expansion seems to be accelerating. In the public media, these additions became *assumed fact*, though (in recent years) the entire bang theory has been fiercely challenged. – causing Eric Lerner (a research physicist) to write a passionately critical book, *The Big Bang Never Happened*. Along with challenges to Quasar and Redshift theories, in May, 2004, more than 200 scientists declared: “In no other field of physics would this continual recourse to new hypotheses be accepted.” Of course, the Big Bang is still the reigning theory, but it is unfolding before our very eyes – astro-physicist Robert Gentry insisting that it violates the sacrosanct laws of energy formation and conservation. **Why, then, the arrogant certainty of scientists searching for answers?**

2. The Anthropic Cosmological Principle:

This is the title of a book by John Barrow and Frank Tipler (Oxford University Press, 1986), pointing to the incredibly precise fine-tuning of the universe’s physical laws – essential for the entire physical world (including life) to exist. Secular scientists have been shaken by the implications of this in nature, since such razor-edged exactness cannot be explained as coming from random events. Excluding God from consideration, some theorists resort to speculative models – multiple universes and dimensions no one can observe or measure, causing a notorious atheistic mathematical physicist, Sir Frederick Hoyle, to conclude that the mathematical improbabilities *rule out a chance origin for life*.

3. The end of uniformitarianism and the rise of neo-catastrophism:

Recognizing that **major catastrophic events** are now accepted as the principal contributor to the formation of many of the earth’s surface features (including ocean fossils in rock strata high in the Himalayas), these events are now seen as **unique in history – best explained by upheavals connected with Noah’s Flood.**

4. Updated mechanisms for the Noahic Flood:

Dr. John Baumgardner, geophysicist from the Los Alamos National Laboratory (an authority on computer modeling of the earth’s crust) has produced a theory of *catastrophic plate tectonics* explaining continental motions and ocean plate formation accounting for many of the rapid, massive events of the Noahic Flood and continental division – occurring in a matter of weeks to months, rather than over millions of years. Nowhere in mainstream science is there any explanation matching Baumgardner’s model, fitting with the laws of physics – laying, also, the framework for a post-Flood history of Planet Earth and its people.

5. Recent discoveries of complexity and intricacy of living cells:

Mainstream science uses ill-defined words like “emergence” and “self-organization” to account for the extra-ordinary intricacies of life’s structures and processes, offering no convincing proofs for them – causing even British atheistic philosopher Antony Flew to change his mind in favor of a Designer.

6. The puzzle of species variation:

A giraffe doesn’t simply decide to grow a long neck! There must be multiple, coordinated, precise changes in its DNA blueprint. Macro-changes in the genotype are unspeakably more complex than ever imagined – ruling out any statistical probability that this could occur spontaneously. Obviously, the “accidental gene-mutation story” (the mainstay of evolutionary ascendancy) has collapsed. And, even the newer theory of “epigenomics” opens a whole new set of questions baffling scientists as to how species variation could have occurred.

7. Population genetics, genomic decay, and the false dream of incremental improvement:

Dr. John Sanford, Cornell University geneticist, has published a book, *Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Declining Genome*, showing how chance mutations are only rarely of any benefit – lost amongst the thousands of deleterious mutations occurring in any given population. Small (hurtful) mutations also *persist and accumulate* – a deteriorating genome, arguing powerfully against evolutionary ascendancy.

8. Dismissing natural selection:

Dr. Jerry Fodor, atheistic Rutgers University philosopher and professor of cognitive sciences, published (in 2007) in the *London Review of Books* an extraordinary paper: *Why Pigs Don’t Have Wings*. Demolishing natural selection as an evolutionary engine, it raised a storm among evolutionists. In February, 2010, Fodor co-authored another book, *What Darwin Got Wrong* – described by a reviewer as “attacking the theory of genetic ascendancy by natural selection by using ... surprise: science!” Sorry, Darwin! Your theory doesn’t do what you claimed!

9. Aesthetics of the natural world – the argument from beauty:

No cosmologist or evolutionist has ever accounted for the beauty and harmony of the universe, let alone the variety of colors, tastes, shapes etc. So, evolutionists simply leave it alone – providing a powerful argument for purposeful creation, not evolution.

10. Dissatisfaction with the inadequacies of neo-Darwinian synthesis:

In July, 2008, sixteen of the world’s top evolutionary scientists (the “Altenberg 16”) convened behind closed doors in a castle in Altenberg, Australia. Interviews by evolutionary journalist, Suzan Mazur, indicate a widely-shared *dissatisfaction* with inadequacies in the neo-Darwinian model that scientists had relied on for decades – mechanisms for new blueprints remaining a mystery. If natural selection is now rejected as a “weeding out” process, then Darwinian Theory is *dead!* And, what will replace it, no one knows!

11. Information theory – raising huge problems for the development of cognition and genetic coding:

To Christians intimidated by the arrogant certainty expressed in mainstream science, evolutionary information theory is a thing of the past – putting naturalists in increasing disarray! No natural explanation for the huge quantities of specific information within even a single cell (let alone whole organisms) has ever been found. Like digits in a computer, their arrangement must be perfect, or everything fails.

12. Darwin’s failed Tree of Life:

The fossil record reveals no clear evidence of macro-evolution. Instead, there is the *sudden appearance* of whole phyla out of nowhere – no change in basic body forms – just stasis – and no branching of Darwin’s failed tree of life!

So much for today’s evolutionary “science” (rejected by many of today’s finest scientists)! And, much more could be added! So, why be timid about recent creation? Even radiometric dating depends on human interpretation. Yes, we should still be respectful of science, but (rather than being defeated) this is a time for creationists to STAND TALL!