

## Evolution: Fact or Philosophy?

In the past 100 years or so the concept of evolution has so totally gripped our society that anyone who now chooses to assert his belief in God is considered by most to have committed intellectual suicide. "After all, this is an enlightened and sophisticated culture, freed of superstitions," we are told. "Man evolved," is what we are taught in school, and this theme is reinforced in our magazines, movies, television programs, etc. Nevertheless, we believe that this universe, the earth, and all the life that is herein contained, including man, were created ex nihilo by an Almighty Eternal God, and we have prepared this essay to expose some of the assumptions on which evolutionary doctrine is based, and to show that a person can believe in a Divine Creation with the evidences in nature supporting this belief.

Science is the marriage of logic and reason to controlled experimentation and direct observation. Facts are correlated, arranged, classified, and mathematically manipulated until a hypothesis, which relates the facts and attempts to explain them, can be formed. If further experimentation confirms the hypothesis, and if it allows for possible predictions, and if it is fruitful in stimulating further research, then it may be termed a theory.<sup>1</sup> A theory is never a fact, nor can a theory ever become a fact. Inasmuch as evolution can not be tested by experimentation, it must remain a hypothesis. But to admit of one hypothesis is not to exclude all other possible explanations for the data available. Scientists must make certain assumptions such as uniformity of natural laws and processes throughout time as he observes them in experimental conditions, in order to accomplish anything. But to make this assumption must not be to deny the possibility that supernatural processes operated in the past. The scientist puts faith in the correctness of his basic assumptions, faith in the integrity of other scientists and faith in the accuracy of their observations. Moreover, scientists, like all other men, exhibit objectivity in their endeavors only to the point their egos permit; they form emotional attachments to hypotheses, have intense pride of authorship, etc. It might also be pointed out here that the number of people who believe in any particular philosophy is no guarantee or measure of the truth of that philosophy. As Wm. H. George said, "Facts remain but theories crumble."

In this essay evolution is taken as the hypothesis that life emerged through the chance collision of organic compounds in a primeval sea, and that through a long, long process of mutation and natural selection, the great diversity of life as we see it, including man, has emerged; evolution denies the existence of God.

There is biographical evidence that Charles Darwin did not embark on the Beagle voyage with scientific objectivity, but rather with the philosophy of his grand-father, Erasmus Darwin, an ardent evolutionist.

"Eat or be eaten," was he claimed the first law of nature, and it was one that he often mentioned at the dinner table.

In his Temple of Nature he sought to show how this law would lead to an "improving excellence" in every part of creation.<sup>2</sup>

But also Darwin was taught at Cambridge theology school that God created every single species immutable and placed them in their particular niches exactly as they were to be found in 1831.<sup>3</sup> Darwin saw, however, that this was not so, for he observed migration with variation, and what Darwin basically disagreed with was the inaccurate interpretation of Scripture by the Cambridge theologians. Genesis 1 does not teach fixity of the individual; it teaches fixity of the created basic kinds (for example, countless varieties of peas, corn, dozens of breeds of dogs, cows, etc.), as well as variation in adjusting to environments, but we insist that there is no evidence that any new kind has

ever arisen from a preexisting kind. We recognize the processes of mutation, variation, and natural selection, as these are readily observed, but to apply these on a cosmological scale to account for all of life is, in our belief, unwarranted and erroneous.

## I Origins of Life

The spontaneous formation of life is critical to the hypothesis of evolution (evolutionists are adamant on this point), for if God must be invoked at this point, He then might just as well be given credit for the entire creation. It is of interest that spontaneous generation of life was accepted at the time of Darwin's "Origin of Species;" it was not disproved until almost 30 years later by the work of Pasteur. Nevertheless, it is asserted that conditions were different billions of years ago and that life did, at that time, spontaneously form (scientists here deny uniformity of natural processes as it suits them.) Scientists such as Urey and Miller<sup>4</sup> assumed reducing conditions prevailed in the earth's early atmosphere (it is agreed that life could not have spontaneously formed in an oxidizing atmosphere) and they were the first to demonstrate how the necessary organic compounds could have formed: Methane, ammonia and water were exposed to a continuous electrical discharge, and it was found that numerous simple organic compounds, such as the simple amino acid, glycine, were formed. Others then jumped on the bandwagon, and various techniques such as electron beams into CO<sub>2</sub>, ultraviolet irradiation of other ammonia mixtures, etc., have produced an impressive list of simple organic substances which, it is stated, could have, through chance collision polymerized and combined in other various ways to form the first simple life forms. The primeval seas were converted into "soups" of organic compounds in which life not only "could" have formed, but that it was "inevitable."

However, Urey and Miller forced their reaction to the side of product formation by removal of the products from the reaction mixture. Thus equilibrium did not prevail. When equilibrium thermodynamics apply, it may be calculated that the aqueous concentration of glycine formed was  $10^{-27}$  moles/liter, with lesser concentrations for the more complex compounds which were formed.<sup>5</sup> But solar radiation, especially the wavelength 2250-2950Å, is exceedingly effective in destroying these postulated simple building blocks of life as well as any early life which formed. Because of this destructive effect of the sun's energy up to 97% of the glycine formed would be decarboxylated by the time it fell to the seas. At the very most, glycine concentrations of up to  $10^{-12}$  molar might have prevailed in these primeval seas. Hardly a "soup!" Even in the seas, any of these complex molecules or even early life which supposedly had formed would have been effectively oxidized and destroyed, for water absorbs UV radiation in the wavelength of less than 2900Å to form H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and free radicals such as OH and OH<sub>2</sub>. (Of course, this UV light would have been effectively blocked by the ozone of an oxidizing atmosphere - but in this case spontaneous formation of life would have been impossible!) There is additional evidence, moreover, that these experiments of forming organic compounds from CH<sub>4</sub>, NH<sub>3</sub>, and H<sub>2</sub>O are based on a false assumption, for there are now good reasons to believe that NH<sub>3</sub> was not present in the earth's early atmosphere.<sup>6,7</sup> Oparin<sup>8</sup> feels his coacervate droplet models lend great credence to the possibility of spontaneous formation of life, in fact, in his zeal he terms these models the "protobionts" of primitive life. It need scarcely be pointed out that any laboratory model is just that and no more; it is fallacious to assert that because a model is successful that it is (or was) reality. That a protovirus was the first form of life has often been stated, but there is not a shred of evidence today to support this statement. The recently acquired understanding of the genetic code implies that if the atoms of the individual subassemblies (the base triplets) were left to chance they would go together in any of  $10^{87}$  different ways, each one of which would have to be tested for survival value until the ones which are fittest would be found.<sup>9</sup> Noble laureate

H.C. Urey has pointed out that there is not enough matter in the universe to make the many kinds of subassemblies that would form at random - if any do. Moreover, it is now known that the enzyme DNA polymerase is essential for the incorporation of nucleotides into the DNA molecule. To be sure, the doubt has recently been expressed<sup>10</sup> that even one new enzyme could form in a living cell, let alone a cell packed full of enzymes, let alone an enzyme with any specific activity, such as DNA polymerase, by a random collision of amino acids in solution. Spontaneous generation of life must remain wishful thinking.

RNA and DNA chains, identical to and with the infectivity of bacteriophages have, of course, been recently synthesized in the laboratory.<sup>11</sup> However, the basic compounds used are obtained from commercial suppliers and the template followed is one provided already by nature. By no means can these experiments be construed to mean a synthesis of life. If, in the distant future, and it is even then highly unlikely, an understanding of molecular biology permits the in vitro assembly from inorganic components of a cell which is capable of separating itself from its environment by means of a cell membrane, capable of engulfing food matter (pinocytosis), and ejecting wastes (emlocytosis), capable of maintaining an internal environment, capable of metabolizing substrate so that it can be free-living, and capable of replicating its cytoplasmic structure and its genetic material, man will not have demonstrated that this occurred by chance collision in the primeval seas, but rather that life is the result of an intense, intelligent effort. To believe that a cell could have spontaneously formed is like believing a fantastically huge and complex organ could assemble itself from its parts and then start playing the most perfectly harmonious and original music, all by its self.

## II Taxonomy

It is stated that the fact that living things can be naturally fitted into a hierarchial scheme of categories indicates evolutionary relationship. These relationships are based on similarities, which are evidence of descent from a common ancestor. But those similarities which support the view of evolution are selected as the basis of relationship (those similarities which don't fit are considered examples of parallel mutation with convergence), Kerkut<sup>12</sup> has pointed out the inability of taxonomy to provide evidence for evolution in a recent detailed and critical analysis of evolution.

At the lowest level of the taxa, there is no agreement as to what gave rise to what. The resemblances between bacteria and protozoa are superficial and tenuous, and can possibly be explained on the basis of convergence. Which bacteria could have given rise to the protozoa is only conjecture and many opinions are available without supporting factual evidence. Bacteria and protozoa could conceivably have had independent origins, bacteria could have derived from protozoa by simplification, or bacteria could be a polyphyletic grade. There is no evidence to choose from among these.

Of the Protozoa, Ciliophora and Sporozoa can be dismissed as being the most primitive or ancestral stock (because of their very complex structures or complicated life cycles), but there is argument as to whether Rhizopoda or Flagellata is more primitive. That they are a polyphyletic grade of organization, having been derived from Fungi, Algae, and Metazoa, but grouped together today because of certain convergent morphologic characteristics, has substantiating evidence and supporters. Some evidence is available that Metazoa could have arisen from colonial Protozoa, though some investigators object and feel that there is evidence that Metazoa arose from syncytia, and others who claim origin from Metaphyta. Data is not available to make any scientific conclusion on this relationship. Schemes that the Metaphyta gave rise to the Metazoa and the Protozoa are

interesting and can not be disproven on the basis of available information.

Similarly, it is necessary to state the most primitive of the Metazoa to establish a phylogenetic series. From a comparison of similarities and dissimilarities it can be seen that such a statement must be only an opinion, for sufficient information is not available to come to any conclusion; there is no consensus. In fact, these groups appear to be completely isolated from each other and the relationship between these Phyla is very tenuous. The derivation of Porifera - indeed most of the invertebrate and vertebrate line - from Gastrula is based more on authoritative presentation and attractiveness than factual information.

Also among the invertebrate phyla the relationships are quite tenuous. Protostomia and Deuterostomia concepts are in actuality not clear distinctions. Marked variations in even the most recent classifications of the invertebrates reflect inability to perceive clear-cut differences among the phyla. Many of these phyla appear to be isolated, and even among apparently similar phyla there exist very significant dissimilarities. The important relationship to the Metazoa is unknown. Paleontological data is no help because all of these phyla are already discrete and fully established in the earliest of the fossil-bearing strata, the Cambrian.

The vertebrates have been derived from the annelids, arthropods, nemerteans, hemichordates, and the urochordates by various investigators. Of the origin of the vertebrates one biologist has said, "in a sense this account is science fiction." Plant taxonomy is also frustrated by not knowing which characters are primitive and which are advanced. At least a couple of dozen different classifications of the plant kingdom are available;<sup>3</sup> this testifies to the inability to discern relationships on the basis of evolutionary concepts.

Because of the less than satisfactory attempts to build taxa on a morphologic basis, a great deal of enthusiasm has been directed at finding biochemical similarities. The distribution of the phosphagens, arginine phosphate and creatine phosphate, does not permit any conclusions regarding the relationships of the invertebrates. Among vertebrates, such diversity abounds that relationships can be "found" wherever sought. For example, the isoenzyme mobilities of hepatic galactose dehydrogenase of humans are identical with dogs, but not with other primates.<sup>13</sup> Peptide sequences of fibrinogen for sheep and goats are identical, but these are closer to those of the reindeer than of the ox, opposite to the usual taxonomic classification.<sup>14</sup> The amino acid sequence of insulin of sperm whales is identical to that of pigs but very different from that of seiwhales.<sup>15</sup> The hemoglobin of man closely resembles the hemoglobin of the New World monkeys yet these Ceboidea are not thought to be closely related to man.<sup>16</sup> Daphnia, alone, of all the crustacea, has hemoglobin, whereas the others all have hemocyanin. Also, the root nodules of leguminous plants have been found to contain hemoglobin.<sup>12</sup> It is obvious that relationships can not be established here on the basis of these biochemical similarities.

Thus, the ability to discern relationships, morphologically or biochemically, is not so exact. It appears that most, if not all, of the phyla and lesser divisions are separate and clearly defined groups which, indeed, may not have any relationship to each other after all. Life today is characterized by diversity but also by discontinuity, that is, intermediate gradations between kinds are not present, each kind is distinct, separate, and clear-cut. The species alive today have been likened to the terminal twigs of a tree of which the trunk and main branches have disappeared. It would seem that these distinct groups could be more likely on the basis of a Creation of distinct "kinds," which have since reproduced after their "kind," albeit with some variations within the kind (as the coyote, wolf, and numerous varieties of dogs derive from a dog "kind"). But

evolutionists deny the possibility of a Creator, so they search in the rocks for fossil evidence of these main branches and trunk.

### III Paleontology

The most important evidence for Evolution is that obtained from paleontology.<sup>17</sup> The fossil record of life in the past is the only non-circumstantial evidence supporting evolution. Most of the earth's surface is covered by sedimentary or metamorphic rock evidencing the fact that most, or all, of the earth was at one time, or times, submerged by water.<sup>17</sup> But modern geologists are unwilling to accept the Noahic Flood because of the supernatural overtones, so the principle of uniformitarianism has dominated geology. This principle states that "the present is the key to the past," and that exceedingly slow processes of weathering, river flow, delta deposition, land subsidence and emergence, etc., have operated over eons of years, all over the world, leading to the strata as we have them today, several miles in thickness in some areas. The most important evidence for uniformitarianism is the fossil record of evolution progressing through geologic ages. Yet the most important evidence for evolution is paleontologic. Here is circular reasoning; each assumption depends on the other for verification. Moreover, uniformitarianism is assumed, not proved, and Flood geology is denied, it has never been refuted. Radioisotope dating of various rock strata has not been satisfactory to establish geologic age because numerous dates provided contradict the previously determined geologic age and so have been discarded.<sup>18</sup>

However, denials notwithstanding, there are numerous geologic evidences<sup>17,19</sup> of aqueous catastrophe, such as fossil graveyards (very rapid burial of countless plants and animals in water-laid sediments); polystrate fossils (large intact fossils of animals and especially tree trunks extending twenty or more feet vertically through numerous geologic strata); phenomenon of stratification (contemporary observation as well as laboratory experimentation indicates most sedimentary deposits are the result of brief, intense periods of flood run-off, rather than slow uniform silting. This is in itself prima facie evidence that powerful waters once covered the earth); alluvial valleys (most rivers today course through valleys which once contained far more water than they now do, with great amounts of alluvial deposits in the valley floors, indicating that the rivers of the world have once carried tremendous volumes of water and sediment); incised meanders (intricate patterns of meandering alluvial streams cut deep into uplifting relatively soft and erodible sedimentary beds); etc. Indeed, the orogeny of the great chains of mountains of the world can be well understood by considering it a compensatory mechanism secondary to the deepening of the sea basins to accommodate the great amounts of water which had covered the earth.<sup>20,21</sup> Geology seems to point to a great cataclysm, far greater than anything ever observed in the modern world. Uniformitarian geology is unable to satisfactorily account for these phenomena.

The classification and dating of the various rock strata is accomplished by means of simple marine organisms, the "index fossils," which are supposed to be specific for certain strata. (But these could be in an order of complexity in the geologic column not on the basis of evolution but rather due to differential rates of settling following the Flood, on the basis of hydrodynamic principles, i.e. more complex shapes exert greater "drag" than simpler ones.) Nowhere in the world is this geologic column complete - the periods of geologic history are actually a composite of strata from many sites.

The lower-most sedimentary strata are the pre-Cambrian which contain rare and widely scattered fossils. The earliest of the fossil-bearing strata is the Cambrian, and here are found the fossils of all the invertebrate phyla, discrete and fully established at this stage in history! There are no transitions or inter-

grading of these phyla; if development were random, then the fossils should be an enormous hodge-podge at the earliest levels. Even at the lowest levels of development the majority of species and genera are all real entities, even after a supposed billion years of exposure to mutagens and having their genetic pool so modified as to have yielded more complex forms. In other words, these phyla have appeared suddenly and have persevered through supposedly long ages to be with us today (except of course, for those which became extinct.) Series or grades of observed variations in patterns of shells may not at all be due to evolution but rather merely a reflection of changes in temperature or pH of the water, an explanation for which there is now adequate evidence.<sup>22</sup>

In the vertebrate line, paleontology gives evidence of evolution in that there seems to be an order of appearance of fish, then amphibia, then reptiles, then mammals and birds. However, if graphs of the time of origin, not the time of supposed dominance, are examined, it will be seen that Agnatha, Placoderms, Osteichthes, elasmobranchs, Amphibia, and Reptilia all seem to have "arisen" in strata which are very close to each other, and not far removed from the Cambrian period, i.e. Silurian to the Carboniferous periods.<sup>12</sup> This has been termed "explosive evolution." Mammals and birds appear higher in the geologic column. (Could not this finding be explained on the basis of the remarkable ability of fleet-footed mammals and winged birds to escape the rising Flood waters by fleeing to the hills, thus, they might be expected to be found, more or less, in the uppermost sediments. In other words, couldn't the order of the vertebrates in the strata be on the basis of mobility in escaping the Flood, rather than on the basis of evolution?)<sup>23</sup>

As far as the plant kingdom is concerned, it has been stated<sup>3,22,24</sup> there is no fossil evidence to support the evolution of any plant group. H. Nilsson, Swedish botanist, and author of a monumental treatise, asserts that plants did not evolve but "flared up" in a non-evolutionary manner. Nothing is known of the evolution of flowering plant groups. Evolution is deemphasized or ignored in most botany courses. As a matter of fact, the new field of palynology (study of microfossils of pollen grains and spores in rocks) has recently demonstrated the presence of fossil spores of vascular plants in Cambrian strata,<sup>25</sup> prima facie evidence that these plants existed in their advanced stage of development at least this early. But conifer seed plants (pine and spruce) must have been in existence even "earlier," for pollen characteristic of these plants has been found embedded in pre-Cambrian strata at the floor of the Grand Canyon.<sup>26</sup> Moreover, valid wood specimens have been found in pre-Cambrian strata in Canada.<sup>27</sup> Plants don't seem to have heard about theories such as evolution which they destroy by their very existence.

While on the subject of "mis-placed" fossils, human footprints have been found in 250 million year old Carboniferous strata,<sup>28</sup> and several years ago a whole trail of distinct human footprints was found going along the Paluxy River bed, in Texas, with the footprints of a dinosaur, a gigantic sauropod walking alongside in the same stratum of rock.<sup>29</sup> (Dinosaurs are thought to have been extinct for 70 million years before man evolved.) Similarly, at Antelope Springs, Utah, the footprints of humans wearing sandals, and of bare-foot children have been found in Cambrian strata.<sup>30</sup>

In many areas of the world fossils are in the "wrong" order, but this has been explained as being due to overthrusting. By this we are expected to believe that miles and miles of solid rock have been horizontally transported to another site without leaving behind any trace of movement. Recent scrutiny of the famous Empire Mountain (Arizona) overthrust<sup>31</sup> and of the Lewis Overthrust (Montana to Canada)<sup>32</sup> by geologists have shown there are none of the tell-tale evidences of

overthrusting at these sites. Moreover, it is now considered by some geologists that overthrusting is just not possible.<sup>33</sup>

Just as life today is characterized by diversity and discontinuity, so is the fossil record of life in previous days. Let some quotes illustrate:

"In spite of these examples, it remains true, as every paleontologist knows, that most new species, genera, and families, appear in the record suddenly and are not led up to by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences" (G.G. Simpson, Harvard paleontologist).

"The facts are that many species and genera, indeed the majority, do appear suddenly in the record, differing sharply and in many ways from any earlier group, and that this appearance of discontinuity becomes more common the higher the level, until it is virtually universal as regards orders and all higher steps in the taxonomic hierarchy. The face of the record thus does really suggest normal discontinuity at all levels. . . This essentially paleontological problem is also of crucial interest for all other biologists, and, since there is such conflict of opinion, non-paleontologists may choose either to believe the authority who agrees with their prejudices or to discard the evidence as worthless." (G.G. Simpson).

"From time to time discoveries are made of connecting links that provide clues to the relationships, as between fishes and amphibians, amphibians and reptiles, and reptiles and mammals. These isolated discoveries, of course, stimulate hope that more complete records will be found and other gaps closed. These finds are, however, rare, and experience shows that the gaps which separate the highest categories may never be bridged in the fossil record. Many of the discontinuities tend to be more and more emphasized with increased collection." (N.D. Newell, paleontologist of the American Museum of Natural History).

"There is no need to apologize any longer for the poverty of the fossil record. In some ways it has become almost unmanageably rich, and discovery is out-pacing integration. . . The fossil record nevertheless continues to be composed mainly of gaps." (T.N. George, Prof. of Geology at the University of Glasgow).

"It has long been hoped that extinct plants will ultimately reveal some of the stages through which existing groups have passed during the course of their development, but it must be freely admitted that this aspiration has been fulfilled to a very slight extent, even though paleobotanical research has been in progress for more than one hundred years. As yet, we have not been able to trace the phylogenetic history of a single group of modern plants from its beginning to the present" (C.A. Arnold, paleobotanist, Univ. of Michigan).

"But the facts of paleontology conform equally well with other interpretations that have been discredited (sic) by neobiological work, e.g., divine creation, etc., and paleontology by itself can neither prove nor refute such ideas" (D. Davis, Curator of Vertebrate Anatomy, Chicago Museum of Natural History).

To say that certain connecting links have been discovered is to overstate the situation for, indeed, it is not certain crucial missing links for which paleontologists search, but rather countless populations of transitional forms which are needed to grade between the distinct kinds which are found. That

isolated fossils share features of different kinds hardly establishes a bridge between these kinds. Archeopteryx (two fossils available), the supposed missing link between reptiles and birds, shares an elongated tail and teeth with reptiles and wings and feathers with birds. This long-tailed, toothed bird appears to be an extinct kind of bird, to state that it fits half-way between kinds is philosophy. One can, for example, state with equally logical philosophy, that man is, on the basis of his fore-limb morphology, the link in the evolution of the whale to the bat.

Looking squarely, then, at the paleontologic data as well as at present day living forms, without the misleading step of logic -which is imperfect in man, the observed law of nature seems to be variety with discontinuity. The observed record, then, accords fully with the God-given command of Genesis 1 whereby the created kinds should reproduce after their kinds. To mingle philosophy with observations is to change science into a religion. Indeed, to assume that, given enough time, basic kinds can give rise through natural processes to new kinds is speculation, or philosophy, for it is not only not supported by observations but can not be experimentally demonstrated, and faith is required to believe it. To illustrate the extent to which faith operates, let these quotes suffice:

"One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are -as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation" (G. Wald, Prof. of Biology at Harvard.)

"I readily admit that no species has ever been known to engender another, and that there is no absolutely definite evidence that such a thing has ever taken place. Nonetheless, I believe evolution to be just as certain as if it had been objectively proved" (Yves Delage, late Prof. of Zoology at the Sorbonne.)

"In short what science asks of us here is an act of faith, and it is in fact under the guise of a sort of revealed truth that the idea of evolution is generally put forward. . . Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups" (L. Bournoure, Prof. of Biology, Director of Research, National Center of Scientific Research of France.)

#### IV Mutations

Darwinian evolution is thought to have proceeded by means of random point mutational changes in the genotype of individuals, giving rise to variants which, by continuous breeding, alter the population toward the expression of the newly acquired character. The environment, then acts upon that individual, or his population, so that the newly acquired character leads to enhanced survival of this variation or to its elimination. Neo-Darwinian evolution tries to side-step the harshness of the natural selective process in order to make evolution more "peaceful." According to neo-Darwinism selection is on the basis of survival of those who leave the most offspring ("differential reproduction"). It looks at population changes only in respect to leaving behind offspring and in respect to nothing else, such as organisms' specific ways of life, etc. It doesn't overcome any of the difficulties of natural selection and is termed "vacuous" by some evolutionists.<sup>34</sup> How could giraffes with longer necks leave behind more offspring unless they were "fitter" in some way? Evolution still needs "survival of the fittest" to channel the small continuous variants into the path of progress. As sufficient variants accumulate, interbreeding becomes impossible and a new species is said to have formed.



However, mutations occur only very rarely, mutation rates being estimated by different authorities as perhaps in the range of  $10^{-5}$  or  $10^{-6}$  visible mutations per gamete, depending on the species, the gene, etc., (though these numbers may have to be revised to as much as 10 times more frequently if the high incidence of neutral or biochemical mutations that has been postulated becomes accepted). But the frequency of the occurrence of those mutations which offer increased survivability is exceedingly low, on the order, perhaps, of  $10^{-5}$ , or 0.001% (5-10% of all mutations being neutral, up to 10% being lethal, and the rest sub-lethal).<sup>35</sup> The probability then, of a point mutation occurring during gametogenesis which would offer enhanced survivability is in the order of magnitude of  $10^{-10}$ . If indeed such vanishingly rare favorable mutations did enter the genetic pool of any population, it would more than likely be diluted out by the far more commonly occurring deleterious mutations. Furthermore, Patau,<sup>36</sup> a German population geneticist, has shown that there is but a slim chance that a mutation could get fully established in a typical large population, for if a mutation with even as much as 1% selective advantage (geneticists usually refer to favorable mutations having .05% to .5% selective advantage) occurred, it would require 900,230 generations for that mutation to be incorporated in from .01% to .1% of that population. The curve then rises sharply so that after another 100,500 generations the mutation would be 100% incorporated in the population. Thus, if the human generation time is 20 years, 18 million years would be required to incorporate even one supposedly beneficial mutation in .1% of the human population. But also, to effect progressive changes in an organ or tissue, a series of mutations in the same gene would be required, but the probability of this occurring is slim, considering the great number of genes present in the gametes of most organisms. (It has been estimated that there are 40,000 genes, and much superfluous DNA in mammals,<sup>35</sup> for example, though others estimate the number of genes in mammals to be in the millions.) Mutations, being random, are unlikely to effect repeated changes in the same gene; indeed, if any gene were affected at a later point in time by a mutagenic stimulus it is far more likely that the result would be harmful.

There is some evidence that even small mutations may be dead-ends, even though they be favorable. When eye rings were painted on either a males or females of a colony of Larus sea-gulls, simulating mutations; it was observed that the "mutated" mate was not permitted to mount, so that no offspring could have resulted to preserve the "mutation."<sup>37</sup> The implications of this study are obvious.

Among plants, mutations yield useful and interesting variants, but all are weaker, i.e., not vigorous under varying garden conditions, or have decreased percentage of good pollen or decreased number of seeds per plant, effectively reducing fertility.<sup>38</sup> To hope that mutations in the genetic code could result in an improvement of the species is like expecting a tiny explosion occurring at some random site in a television set would result in an improved picture.

Unable to account for the great differences between classes and phyla on the basis of the gradual accumulation of these many small minor variations, R. Goldschmidt<sup>39</sup> postulated large sudden mutations affecting many vital traits simultaneously, allowing one organism to jump into a totally new taxonomic category. He hoped that, although most of these macromutations would be lethal, by freak chance some rare survivors could have accounted for the existing taxonomic variety. However, few, if any, biologists today accept this postulate because of the certain calculable lethality of macromutations and the certainty that any such surviving monsters would be unable to mate. Again, because of the difficulty of achieving jumps in evolution through point mutation or macro-mutation, some have suggested polyploidy as the source of these jumps. However, almost all examples of polyploidy occur in the plant kingdom (it is a rare and insignificant phenomenon in the animal kingdom), many examples must be induced with the drug,

colchicine, and many plants have to be carried through several generations of artificial vegetative cultivation before natural reproduction is possible. But chiefly, almost all polyploidic forms exhibit moderate to marked reduction in fertility and the increased number of chromosomes hampers genetic variation so that far from providing a means for progressive evolution, polyploidy seems to be a dead-end. Similarly, chromosomal translocations and inversions are thought to offer little evolutionary advantage because the number of surviving rearrangements are limited, they offer but little fitness at the expense of flexibility, and they are thought to have little likelihood of becoming established.<sup>40</sup>

An implication of the idea that the great variety and complexity of life came to us through random mutations is that the fossil record should be rich in the numerous transitions and subtle gradations which link all life forms. As we previously observed, such is not the case, despite almost 100 years of intensive fossil-hunting to prove Darwin to be correct. The missing-links, the countless hundreds of thousands, or more, of transitional populations are not found. "Faith is the substance of fossils hoped for, the evidence of links unseen." (A. Lunn, The Flight From Reason).

There are biochemical missing links, also. It is currently fashionable to establish biochemical evidences of evolution, yet amino acid analysis of bovine carboxypeptidase A has only resulted in a major problem for the evolutionist. This enzyme occurs in two approximately equally distributed alleles, the Val and Leu forms, which differ in three separate but linked amino acids along the chain, that is, all three of the Val set or all three of the Leu set occur in any individual. But if point mutation had given rise to these alleles, as it is supposed to have done, where are at least two other expected intermediate alleles? In almost five years of search, these biochemical transitions have not been found.<sup>41</sup>

Why can't we see evolution progressing before our eyes? Is it because the process is too slow? In the past 100 years of careful observation of field specimens by biologists, if even as few as 100,000 organisms have been studied per year, then almost ten million animal-years of observation are available to us today. Has any character which would aid in changing one order into a higher order, e.g. a feather or a mammary gland on a reptile, been observed in this time? The Tuatara, a beakheaded lizard is found in fossil form in Cretaceous strata, yet he is alive today and identical to his fossil forebears of 135 million years ago.<sup>42</sup> It would appear that the animal kinds obey God's direct order to reproduce after their own kind.

## V Natural Selection

Selection is employed in husbandry and agriculture, but it is limited or restricted in that after a few generations a given strain has genes which are alike for a given character and the progeny will always be the same. Field observations have shown that natural selection operates to maintain a certain standard, or lower limit, in the kinds of plants or animals and can sort out types for new habitats. But to state that it can improve the kinds, leading to better organization than the predecessor's is based on deduction rather than on observation or experiment. The statement, "Various organisms try various things; they keep what works and discard the rest," can not be verified, let alone scientifically proved, and so must be taken on abject faith.

The concept of natural selection acting on mutation-induced variants is, of course, logical, and not difficult to comprehend (which may account in part for its wide acceptance), but credulity is stretched beyond limits when one expects that such a mechanism could result in the remarkable degree of complexity found in

living organisms. For example, birds are far more than reptiles with wings and feathers. In particular, birds in flight develop hyperthermia (up to 113°F), and since their thermodynamic efficiency is limited, much heat must be dissipated by a very precise and carefully controlled - and largely yet unknown - means of air-cooling through the feathers.<sup>43</sup> But reptiles are cold-blooded animals, so how could birds have evolved to have achieved flight but also this very efficient and complex means of cooling, (which had to be almost, if not completely, perfect before it would be of use at all)? But mammals also need a way of cooling, which is perspiring, yet the earliest mammals to have evolved which hadn't yet perfected heat regulation would have died off the first hot spell that came along. Heat regulation, in other words, must be perfect or else it would be useless for survival. (Yet didn't the mammals survive over the reptiles because they were better adapted for the colder climates? Are we to believe that heat dissipation methods evolved while mammals were trying to keep warm?)

Similarly, the eye can hardly be of significant survival value for any organism unless that eye were perfect in its exceedingly complex form at its first appearance. Some evolutionists have suggested schemes for the evolution of the eye, but these are less than satisfying, especially inasmuch as the mosaic eye of insects and crabs is not intermediate between the light-sensitive, bowl-shaped structures of flatworms and the camera-like, complex, sensitive eye of the vertebrates. Moreover, two germ-layers participate in the embryonic development of the eye, and so progressive mutations in separate genes must have occurred simultaneously to somehow allow the eye to form. (Credulity is also taxed by the frequent biologic phenomenon of symbiosis resulting from simultaneous mutations affecting both partners.) It seems far easier to accept the fact that eyes were made for seeing and that ears were made for hearing, and that God gave each kind visual or auditory acuity according to that organisms' particular need.

Moreover, there is evidence that the role of competition and natural selection has been overemphasized, and that a more complicated and delicate situation actually exists. For example, wolves on the Hebrides Islands never kill off more than one-sixth of the deer population, that beavers in Scotland cut down only one out of a thousand trees, allowing a twenty year cycle for growth of new trees, and a text<sup>44</sup> is now available pointing out the many ways laboratory and wild populations of animals can and do limit the size of their population apart from losses due to predation, disease, starvation, or climate changes.

A French mathematician has programmed a computer to see what effect one space (natural selection) has on another (a genotype) as random changes are introduced in the latter. The chance of seeing the modified program is 10<sup>-1000</sup>, i.e. no chance. He concluded, "We believe that there is a considerable gap in the neo-Darwinian theory of evolution, and we believe this gap to be of such nature that it cannot be bridged within the current conception of biology."<sup>34</sup> Evolutionists participating at this Wistar Institute Symposium politely suggested that mathematicians leave evolution alone (pp 16, 31, 42, 75, 76, 105), they being aware, perhaps, that their "science" is not rigorous enough to be upheld by mathematical analysis. Indeed, evolution is not only not rigorous, it is so flexible that it can never be disproven, because anything can be "explained" by manipulating the threads of the argument to suit the occasion. In the above Symposium (pp 47, 63, 67, 71), illustrations are offered to show that the evolutionary process is so nebulously and vaguely defined in terms of mechanisms that any observation can be explained by merely suitably rearranging the variables. "If a theory is so flexible that the same explanation can be used to account for two entirely contrary tendencies, then the theory is meaningless" (Medawar).

## VI Homologies, Vestigial Organs, and Embryology

Homologous structures are those anatomic similarities which have similar embryonic development, regardless of their function. These structures are real and demonstrable; we differ from the evolutionist, however, in his conclusion that these structures represent descent from a common ancestor. We feel this conclusion must remain pure speculation, for they can just as well be explained by the ingenuity of our Creator in adapting the same basic anatomic pattern to different uses. That Volkswagens and Cadillacs have four wheels, carburetors, steering wheels, etc., does not indicate geneologic descent but rather commonness in design to achieve a desired purpose. Similarities, whether homologies or convergences, derive from the out-working of a common Designer, but One who also takes great delight in diversity. Of this explanation, Darwin said, in The Origin, "On the ordinary view of the independent creation of each being, we can only say that so it is; that it has pleased the Creator to construct all the animals and plants in each great class on a uniform plan, but this is not a scientific explanation." So! Regardless of the adequacy -or truth- of this explanation, it is rejected by evolutionists because it isn't scientific. It almost appears evolutionists are worshipping the god, Science. (One can't help but wonder if some scientists love system more than truth.) At any rate, there seems to be no data to resolve the issue. The evidence is completely subjective: similarities bespeak either common general design or common ancestry, as the individual wants to believe.

Vestigial organs are supposedly a "remembrance" of an ancestral trait. A list of almost 100 "vestigial" organs was once published<sup>22</sup> to show the truth of evolution, but these included such organs as the parathyroids, the thymus, the pineal, the coccyx, etc, for which we now recognize useful if not essential functions. For example, looking at the human skeleton one could naïvely conclude the coccyx to be the vestige of a tail, but this structure actually serves to provide for the exit of the sacral nerves and for the attachment of the levator ani and sphincter ani externus muscles, necessary for rectal function. The semilunar fold at the corner of the eye is not a vestige of the nictitating membrane but rather serves to collect foreign material where it can be easily removed. Though the embryologic tooth buds found in whale fetuses were once thought to be vestiges, they are now known to be necessary for proper formation of the whale's jaw bones. Moreover if one can talk about vestiges, what about nascent organs -where are the incompletely formed organs which will evolve in the future into useful structures?

Many evolutionists point to the morphologic similarity of many of the vertebrate early embryos as an evidence of evolution. Haeckel's Biogenetic Law, "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" was once thus popular (perhaps because of its succinctness), but now too many exceptions have been recognized to retain it. This law does not apply to almost the entire plant kingdom. The most recent editions of the more popular embryology texts now state, "this doctrine goes beyond the facts" (Arey); there are "innumerable exceptions to the general law of recapitulation" (Rugh); "It is now firmly established that ontogeny does not repeat phylogeny. Ontogeny repeats ontogeny, with variations" (Simpson and Beck). It is not unexpected that everything unspecialized and undeveloped should be more or less alike. But it is now recognized that Haeckel deceitfully manufactured evidence to show that the "more or less" became "identical".<sup>45</sup>

That human embryos have pharyngeal pouches and arches is absolutely essential for the development of the ear, the Eustachian tube, the thyroid, parathyroids, thymus, etc, and never does one see human, avian, or reptilian embryos go through a stage of gill slits (as in fish), nor do these pouches in the embryo even communicate with the outside. Clearly, these can be explained by the use by God of a basic plan of development whereby the genetic code of each kind allows for development and differentiation of basic similar embryologic structures.

## VII Thermodynamics

According to the first Law of Thermodynamics, energy and matter are neither created nor destroyed; according to the second Law, energy enters any system from higher levels to revert to lower levels as work is accomplished. The energy thus unavailable to perform work is termed entropy, which also means disorder. These laws are empirical, they have been observed in nature and by experimentation. The second Law applies to any spontaneously occurring natural process or system, whether imaginary boundaries are placed around the system ("isolated" or "closed") or whether the system is seen in the context of the universe. The Law implies that the direction of all natural processes, when left to themselves, is one of degeneration toward states of disorder. Yet evolution purports to be a natural process which left to itself advances to higher degrees of organization. Sir Julian Huxley says, "Evolution in the extended sense can be defined as a directional and essentially irreversible process occurring in time, which in its course gives rise to an increase of variety and an increasingly high level of organization in its products. Our present knowledge indeed forces us to the view that the whole of reality is evolution -a single process of self-transformation." Evolution, then, as a natural process, violates the second Law of Thermodynamics.<sup>46,47</sup> Most biologists have ignored this problem, though some have blithely stated the Law to be wrong.

## VIII Origin of Man

The evolution of man is a confused topic. Much of the confusion has been caused by several problems, such as the finding of tools or other artefacts associated with a "find" (was "he" a maker of tools, or only a user of tools, or was "he" a victim killed by the tools?); labels of "primitive" or "advanced" without adequate documentation by means of radioisotope dating or authentication of the geologic stratum of the find; assumptions of degrees of intelligence on basis of cranial vault capacity (now known to be a poor correlation<sup>48</sup>); habit of paleontologists of naming each new find as a new species, if not genus, cluttering up the nomenclature, attaching a degree of precision which is totally unwarranted, giving the appearance of filling in the "gaps", and lending great prestige to the finder;<sup>49</sup> failure of paleontologists to take into account the relatively high physical and dental variability in given species of men or apes;<sup>50</sup> tendency to prepare artists' reconstructions whereby hair, lips, ears, nose, skin, etc, is imagined as having been on the particular skull or skull fragment, and is thus presented to the public as if it were the way "he" really looked (artists' renderings have made the skull of Australopithecus look like a black and hairy gorilla or look like a soulful modern day man); the shape of the skull gives no indication of the emotions, reflective ability, intellect, ability to communicate, self consciousness or moral knowledge of that "man"; each authority claims the "missing-link" for his find ("Man's recent history is shot thru with uncertainties...there is not merely one missing link" but a "whole series of grades of missing links in hominid history")<sup>51</sup> and receives considerable publicity; each authority claims he is merely reading the evidence, but the considerable disagreement among authorities means the "evidence" can be read according to each authority's imaginations, presuppositions, etc.

That the "evidence" can be what you make it is exemplified by the Piltdown man story; the skull was found in a gravel bed in England in 1912 and was called Pleistocene. A fluoride test showed the same content of fluoride in both jaw and cranium, and X-ray of the jaw showed the teeth to have short roots like a man's, so the skull was placed in the British museum and hailed as a "missing-link". When it was re-examined in 1953 the teeth were noted to have been filed down, so repeat X-ray films were now interpreted as showing long and crooked roots like the teeth of apes, and the fluoride test now revealed no fluoride in the jaw, showing it to be recent. Forty-one years later scientists "reread" the evidence and recognized it to be a fraud.

At one time, years ago, the evolution of man seemed quite simple, Australopithecus

evolved from some unknown, unspecialized anthropoid precursor; he then progressively evolved to Java man, to Peking man, to Neanderthal man, to Cro-Magnon man, and finally to modern man. This concept is no longer tenable.<sup>52</sup>

The "men" who have been found so far include the following: 1) Australopithecus who has a sloping small ape-like forehead, prominent sagittal crest and small cranial content. He has been found in East Africa, South Africa, India, etc. These skulls are not human, though they have human teeth, not at all ape-like, and not at all half-way in between;<sup>53</sup> they may be, in all probability, a mutant form of man. 2) Homo habilis has modern human teeth, modern forehead, no sagittal crest, a medium sized cranial vault, modern human hands, but he has been found in deeper strata than Australopithecus.<sup>54,55</sup> 3) Neanderthal man has been found in Europe, Africa, Palestine, etc. He has a modern skull, though with prominent orbital arches and a receding forehead, normal-sized cranial vault and short legs. A full skeleton found in Italy showed he stood erect with his head square on his neck as we carry our heads, thus negating most previous artists' conceptions. His tools are well-shaped, and he built houses. 4) Cro-Magnon man is essentially as modern as we are. 5) Swanscombe man was found in 25 feet of gravel near the Thames River in England, along with some tools. He has a fully modern skull, yet the flouride content of his skull and the bones of extinct mammals found with him have shown him to be more ancient than the above men.<sup>56</sup> 6) Fontchevade man was found in a cave in Southern France, deeper than deposits of Neanderthal man, yet he has a modern skull configuration. The flouride content of his skull is the same as those of some extinct mammals found at the same level, yet greater than the flouride of the overlying Neanderthal men. <sup>56,57,58</sup>

The skulls of modern men have been found along with the skulls of Neanderthal man at Mt. Carmel, Tabun, Skuhl (Palestine), Choukoutien (China), and in Kenya. Also, two skulls of modern man were found at the same site in Java as the so-called Pithecanthropus, though these two skulls were kept secret for twenty years because they didn't fit into the scheme of evolution held by the finder. Modern men, it will be seen, have been living simultaneously and previous to the men who are popularly supposed to be modern man's ancestors.

A better explanation for all of the above than the idea that man has evolved from some primitive primate is that modern man has existed from the beginning, but that mutants formed, headed for extinction,<sup>59</sup> due possibly to heightened exposure to radiation immediately after the Flood. The rapid expression of these odd mutations may have been aided by inbreeding in small, close, isolated and migrating populations. This forced dispersion (see Genesis 11) from the cultured center resulted in loss of culture as they migrated or extended out to the frontiers of the post-Flood world. These migrating waves then may have been dominated, absorbed or overwhelmed subsequently by other waves. All the while, at the center, civilization may have been blossoming with great cultural diversity. All this must have taken place well within the past 10,000 years as shown by radiocarbon dating which is corrected for non-equilibrium kinetics (see below).

## IX Timeclocks

A. Radiocarbon Dating. When atoms of the upper atmosphere are struck by radiations from space, high energy neutrons are formed. These are captured by nitrogen which releases a proton to yield  $^{14}\text{C}$ , which is unstable with a half-life of about 5700 years, reverting to nitrogen.  $^{14}\text{C}$  enters the carbon cycle as  $^{14}\text{CO}_2$  and is thus metabolized by living forms along with the more abundant  $^{12}\text{CO}_2$ , so that when that organism dies and its metabolic exchange with the  $\text{CO}_2$  pool ceases, the  $^{14}\text{C}$  content (spectrometric analysis) gives the date of death. It is assumed that the proportion of  $^{14}\text{C}$  in the total  $\text{CO}_2$  pool has in the past been exactly the same as pre-industrial revolution 1850 A.D. It is also assumed that the rate of formation

of  $^{14}\text{C}$  is in equilibrium with the rate of decay. The latter assumption, however, has in recent years been repeatedly shown not to be the case,<sup>27,60,61</sup> but rather that the  $^{14}\text{C}$  is decaying 0.72 times that being formed, and that  $^{14}\text{C}$  is thus slowly building up in the carbon cycle. That this imbalance has not yet been corrected means that 30,000 years have not yet elapsed since zero time. In fact, employing differential equations, the radio-carbon time curve has been extrapolated backward to indicate a Creation about 7000 B.C.<sup>62</sup> This, however, assumes that radiation from space has been essentially the same for the past 30,000 years or so. Could there have been some mechanism, which ceased functioning about 7000 years B.C. which could have prevented entry of  $^{14}\text{C}$  into the atmosphere?

The Bible gives an answer which is uncontestable. Genesis 1:6,7 states without hesitation that there was water, probably in the form of vapor, above the firmament (literally "expanse") of the troposphere. This great vapor canopy would have successfully blocked entry of radiation or radiation-induced neutrons. Incidentally, this canopy would have absorbed and uniformly distributed solar radiant energy over the whole earth, resulting in a "greenhouse" effect, markedly enhancing vegetative growth. (There is considerable fossil evidence of a tropical climate having once prevailed at the earth's poles. Vast coal, oil, and gas reserves, limestone beds, shales, and enormous amounts of organic material scattered in gravel beds are additional evidence of a greenhouse effect.) This shield from radiation would also have prevented somatic mutations and thus could account for the long survival time of early men. Then Genesis 7:11 clearly suggests this huge vapor canopy condensed and fell to earth as rain ("the windows of heaven were opened"): water from this source, as well as the vast amounts of juvenile water which came belching up from the "fountains of the great deep" caused the world-wide catastrophe described in Genesis 6 to 9. Obviously, there is now no way of proving this vapor canopy, except to take the Bible on faith, which as seen from the foregoing, is not something unknown to scientists. But also, this canopy explains the factual information available, whereas scientists are left groping if they do not accept it. Moreover, it has been observed that there is more helium-3 in the atmosphere than can be accounted for on the basis of geologic time of several billion years.  $^3\text{He}$  is formed by beta decay from tritium which would be formed in substantial amounts by bombardment of the water vapor canopy by cosmic ray neutrons. Additional evidence of the need for applying a non-equilibrium correction is the repeated finding of ancient tablets of archaeologically known dates but which are too "old" by present equilibrium radiocarbon calculations.<sup>63</sup> It should be added that almost every buried log, fossil, bone, peat, and even much coal and petroleum can be dated by the radiocarbon technique,<sup>64</sup> and can be shown to be less than 10,000 years old if correction for non-equilibrium is applied.

B. The Age of the Earth. The earth has been stated to be from 3.6 to 4.5 billion years old,<sup>65</sup> so that much time is available for the processes of evolution and uniformitarian geology to have occurred. But evolution and uniformitarianism were assumed to be true long before the age of the earth was ever measured, and one can't help but wonder to what extent previous bias affected these measurements.

Whether the age is calculated on the basis of the rate of conversion of  $^{238}\text{U}$  to  $^{206}\text{Pb}$ ,  $^{235}\text{U}$  to  $^{207}\text{Pb}$ , or the ratio of  $^{206}\text{Pb}$  to  $^{207}\text{Pb}$ , several assumptions are made. One is that  $^{204}\text{Pb}$  is the only non-radiogenic lead, and that any  $^{206}\text{Pb}$  or  $^{207}\text{Pb}$  found in the rocks must have gotten there by radioactive decay from uranium. Some metallurgists take issue with this assumption.<sup>66,67</sup> Among other possibilities is the one that radiogenic lead was formed in the earth at the time of Creation. Another assumption is that there had never occurred leaching of uranium from the rock, for uranium is highly soluble in weakly acid solutions. Yet another assumption is that uranium has always decayed to lead at the same rate in the past as it does at the present. It is conceivable that during the brief period following the precipitation of the vapor canopy, the exceedingly intense radiation from space

( $10^9$ - $10^{18}$ BeV) passed through to great depths below the earth's surface, overcoming the nuclear potential barrier energy of unstable nuclides resulting in a brief period of accelerated decay to their daughter nuclides. In fact, observations of polished mineral sections show explosive, random, expansion cracks in halos of radioactive zircon inclusions resulting from sudden rapid volume increase due to isotropization from radioactive decay.<sup>62</sup> This finding indicates that rates of decay were once greater than those observed today. But also, when the quantities of  $^{207}\text{Pb}$  and  $^{206}\text{Pb}$  are corrected to account for the formation of  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  by (n, gamma) reactions, these  $^{206}\text{Pb}/^{207}\text{Pb}$  ratios do not indicate great age at all but rather show these rocks to be quite "modern."<sup>62</sup> Corrections for observed  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  concentrations (stemming from the  $^{207}\text{Pb}$  (n, gamma)  $^{208}\text{Pb}$  reaction) effectively wipe out all of geologic time.

Although currently popular, the  $^{40}\text{K}$  to  $^{40}\text{A}$  technique has been criticized for a number of reasons: the amount of  $^{40}\text{A}$  initially present in the rocks is unknown; the half-life of  $\text{K}^{40}$  is uncertain, thought to be 1.31 billion years; the percentage of  $\text{K}^{40}$  which goes to  $\text{A}^{40}$  is uncertain (from 88-92% of  $\text{K}^{40}$  goes to  $\text{Ca}^{40}$  by gamma emission);  $\text{A}^{40}$  is abundantly found in the earth's atmosphere (1% by volume, of which at the present, 0.337% is  $\text{A}^{36}$ ), thus the extremely minute amount ( $10^{-12}\text{cc}$ ) of  $\text{A}^{40}$  found in the rocks is multiplied by the large  $\text{A}^{36}$  correction factor of 295.6 to subtract the relatively huge amount of atmospheric contamination by  $\text{A}^{40}$ ; that the ratio of  $\text{A}^{36}$  to  $\text{A}^{40}$  has always been the same as it is presently is an assumption which is probably unwarranted, for  $\text{A}^{36}$  can be shown to be a product of atmospheric bombardment by cosmic radiation, and is probably accumulating in the atmosphere making the value of 295.6 meaningless for the distant past.<sup>62,68</sup> It might also be added that the decay rate of  $\text{K}^{40}$  to  $\text{A}^{40}$  may not have been the same in the past as it is today, as discussed above. Some submarine pillow basalt from Kilauea volcano, Hawaii, known to be, at most, a few thousand years old, was found by  $\text{K}^{40}$  to  $\text{A}^{40}$  technique to range from 100,000 to 40,000,000 years old, indicating that age may be simulated by hydrostatic pressure among other factors.<sup>69</sup>

## X Conclusion

In the standard scientific journals there are now appearing occasional articles expressing doubts about evolution by men who are not scientific obscurantists but rather are sufficiently bold that they will not be cowed by derision.

"There exists, as well, a generally silent group of students engaged in biological pursuits who tend to disagree with much of the current thought but say and write little because they are not particularly interested, do not see that controversy over evolution is of any particular importance, or are so strongly in disagreement that it seems futile to undertake the monumental task of controverting the immense body of information and theory that exists in the formulation of modern thinking. It is, of course, difficult to judge the size and composition of this silent segment, but there is no doubt that the numbers are not inconsiderable." (E.C. Olson, Professor of Geology at University of Chicago, speaking at the Darwinian Centennial Celebration.)

"As we know, there is a great divergence of opinion among biologists, not only about the causes of evolution but even about the actual process. This divergence exists because the evidence is unsatisfactory and does not permit any certain conclusion. It is therefore right and proper to draw the attention of the non-scientific public to the disagreements about evolution. But some recent remarks of evolutionists show that they think this unreasonable. This situation, where men rally to the defense of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigor, attempting to maintain its credit with the public by the suppression of



criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science." (W.R. Thompson, Director of the Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control at Ottawa, Canada, and renowned entomologist. This quote is from the Introduction to the Everyman's Library Series, 1956 edition of Darwin's Origin of Species. The entire Introduction is a devastating indictment and refutation of evolution. It can also be found reprinted in J. Amer. Scient. Affiliation 12:2; 1960.)

Scientists in France are considerably more open in their criticism of evolution. See the review article in Science Digest 51:61, 1961.

One can't help but wonder to what extent the non-scientific public has accepted evolution because they have been cowed into accepting it out of fear of being called ignorant or reactionary, and have rejected the plain teaching of a special Creation by God for fear of being called superstitious. Just as certain members of the scientific community are now expressing doubts about evolution, yet others, such as the several hundred geologists, geneticists, biologists, physicists, etc, of the Creation Research Society, fully accept the record of Creation in the Bible. Since 1964 these accomplished men of science have been publishing many original articles and regular features in their Quarterly Journal of the Creation Research Society in an attempt to reevaluate science from a theistic point of view. As a matter of fact, it is acknowledged that most of the ideas and information in this essay have already been more fully presented in the references cited from this Journal.

It has been seen in this essay that there are many serious problems that an evolutionist must ignore or somehow rationalize if he insists on adhering to evolution. The Bible account of Creation, followed by a world-wide Flood, followed by repopulation of the earth, as outlined above, seems to be a very attractive alternate explanation for the huge body of evidence which is available to us today. It is clear, however, that no matter how attractive this alternative explanation may be, it will continue to be repugnant to the man who absolutely will not admit to the presence of an Eternal God. Evolution will probably not soon be displaced from the minds of proud intelligent and sophisticated men who refuse to humble themselves before anyone, even though that One be his Creator. Evolution will always attract men, because evolution implies improvement, progress and development which strongly appeal to man's pride and ambition.

Some men recognize the problems with evolution and evoke the assistance of Some Being to account for spontaneous generation, directing natural selection, etc, but nevertheless they insist on keeping this Being limited so that they needn't be held responsible. But whether man wants to be held responsible or not, he is, according to the word and tenor of the entire Bible, which claims to be nothing less than the Word of God to man. It would seem to be the most logical thing for any man to recognize God as his Creator and return His love according to His commandments and terms, having the full body of scientific evidence and history<sup>70</sup> to support or substantiate this faith.

## REFERENCES

1. Science 145:1414, 1964
2. Clark, Darwin, Before and After  
Moody Press, Chicago, 1966, p.46.
3. Quart. J. Creation Res. Soc 6:13, 1969
4. Science 130: 245, 1959
5. Nature 186:693, 1960
6. Science 148: 1455, 1965
7. Ann N.Y. Acad Sci 69:255, 1957
8. Oparin, The Chemical Origin of Life  
C. Thomas, Springfield, 1964.
9. Quart J Creation Res Soc 5:34, 1968
10. Science 144:1031, 1964
11. Proc Nat'l Acad Sci of USA 58:1723,  
2321, 1967
12. Kerkut, Implications of Evolution  
Pergamon Press, 1960.
13. Science 154:533, 1966
14. Nature 202:147, 1964
15. Science 146:1318, 1964
16. Science 147:841, 1965
17. Whitcomb and Morris, The Genesis Flood  
Presbyterian & Reformed Publ. Co.,  
Phila., 1966, p134.
18. Albritton Jr., ed., The Fabric of  
Geology, 1963, p108
19. Quart J Creation Res Soc 4:89, 1967
20. Whitcomb and Morris, op cit, pp 140,  
268, 286.
21. Nature 216:779, 1967
22. Rusch, in Essays from the Creationist  
Viewpoint, Concordia Lutheran College  
1966, p17
23. Whitcomb and Morris, op cit, p275
24. Quart J Creation Res Soc 6:85, 1969
25. Evolution 10:109, 1956
26. Quart J Creation Res Soc 3:38, 1966
27. Cook, Prehistory and Earth Models,  
M.Parrish & Co., London, 1966, pp332,3
28. Scientific American 162:14, 1940
29. Burdick, in The Naturalist, vol 16,  
Spring, 1957
30. Quart J Creation Res Soc 5:97, 1968
31. " 6:49, 1969
32. " 6:96, 1969
33. Bulletin of Geological Society of Amer-  
ica, June 1969, pp927-52
34. Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-  
Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution  
Wistar Institute Press, 1967
35. Science 164:788, 1969
36. Zeitschr für Ind Abstam und Verer-  
bungslehre 76:220
37. Scientific American 217:94, Oct. 1967
38. Quart J Creation Res Soc 4:35, 1967
39. Goldschmidt, Understanding Heredity  
J. Wiley, N.Y., 1952
40. Quart J Creation Res Soc 6:45, 1969
41. Biochem. 8:2762, 1969
42. Scientific Monthly 76:165, 1953
43. Quart J Creation Res Soc 6:136, 1969
44. Wynne-Edwards, Animal Dispersion in  
Relation to Social Behavior,  
Hafner Publ. N.Y., 1962
45. Quart J Creation Res Soc 6:27, 1969
46. Nature 189:693, 1960
47. Quart J Creation Res Soc 5:138, 1969
48. ColdSpring Harbor Symp 24:215, 1959
49. Dobzhanski, Mankind Evolving, Yale  
Univ. Press, 1962, p171.
50. Science 141:880, 1963
51. Mayr, Animal Species and Evolution,  
Belknap Press, Cambridge, 1963, p637
52. Quart J Creation Res Soc 5:5, 23, 42  
1968
53. Howells, Mankind in the Making  
Doubleday, N.Y., 1959, p118.
54. Nature 202:9, 1964
55. Nature 209:1280, 1966.
56. Lasker, The Evolution of Man  
Rinehart & Winston, N.Y., 1961,  
pp117-8
57. Clark, The Fossil Evidence for Human  
Evolution, 2nd ed., U. of Chicago  
Press 1964, p70.
58. Howells, op cit, p 220.
59. J.J.D. de Wit, 'Reflections on the  
Architecture of the Organic World  
and the Origin of Man -A Critical  
Evaluation of the Transformist  
Principle,' Philosophia Reformata '64
60. Review Geology 1:35, 1963
61. J Geophys Research 70:5937, 1965
62. Quart J Creation Res Soc 5:65, 69, 78  
83, 1968
63. Scientific American 218:30, May 1968
64. Radiocarbon vols 1-10
65. Scientific American 196:86, 1957
66. Economic Geology 54:133, 606, 1959
67. Science 121:74, 1955
68. Quart J Creation Res Soc 6:71, 1969
69. Science 161:1132, 1968
70. See especially J.N.D. Anderson's  
Christianity, The Witness of History  
among many others on this subject.