

A Brief Study Showing that Biological Evolution Is Not Truly Scientific

By Raymond C. Faircloth

Does the Fossil Record Give Evidence of Evolution?

The fossil record is stated to extend back 3.5 billion years for what were probably small, **primitive sea creatures**. The fact that sea shells have been discovered in many very high locations indicates that the seas were full of, at least a few species of simple life. These were then thrown up as the dry land appeared. Nevertheless the geologic sediments have been laid down uniformly over millions of years.

DARWIN'S DILEMMA REGARDING FOSSILS

For the theory of evolution to be true, the fossil record should show a fine gradation between the different animal species and have millions of intermediate links. Darwin recognized that this was not the case:

The distinctiveness of specific forms, and their not being blended together by innumerable transitional links, is *a very obvious difficulty... 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 serious objection to my theory.* *The Origin of Species*, 1859, p. 287, (Mentor edition).

So Darwin predicted that these fossil links would eventually be discovered. Is this the case? Paleontologist and evolutionist David Raup admits:

“Well, we are now about 120 years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species but *the situation hasn't changed much.* “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... So *Darwin's problem has not been alleviated* in the last 120 years and we still have a record which does show change *but one that can hardly be looked upon as the most reasonable consequence of natural selection*” *Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin*, 1979, p. 25.

So the fossil record does not demonstrate a gradual evolution of mutated species from one kind to another and renowned paleontologist Niles Eldredge comments:

No wonder paleontologists shied away from evolution for so long. It seems never to happen. Assiduous collecting up cliff faces yields zigzags, minor oscillations, and the very occasional slight accumulation of change over millions of years, **at a rate too slow to really account for all the prodigious change that has occurred in evolutionary history.** “When we do see the introduction of evolutionary novelty, it usually shows up with a bang, and often with no firm evidence that the organisms did not evolve elsewhere! Evolution cannot forever be going on someplace else. Yet that's how the fossil record has struck many a forlorn paleontologist looking to learn something about evolution” (emphasis ours).

Reinventing Darwin: The Great Evolutionary Debate, 1995, p. 95.

Also the possibly leading paleontologist of the 20th century Otto Schindewolf wrote that the fossils ‘“directly contradict' Darwin.”’

THE PRE-CAMBRIAN EXPLOSION- THE BIG BANG OF BIOLOGY

The facts are that the fossil record shows an explosion of fully developed complex life without predecessors occurring during **the Cambrian era** (543 million years ago). This explosion included 32 of the 33 phyla that we see today and turns Darwin's ‘*Tree of life*’ on its head. The Cambrian era is interspersed with the extinction of many species including types of sea mammals (whales etc) and horses different from those which exist today with new species occurring suddenly. This proves biological evolution did not happen and indicates that during His Days of Creation God repeatedly replaced extinct species with new ones as He gradually changed earth's geology, bio-deposits etc step by step in preparation for human life. Such an explosion of complex life does not fit the evolutionary model of simple-to-complex life.

DOES 'PUNCTUATED EQUILIBRIUM' SOLVE THE PROBLEM?

In Lee Strobel's book *The Case for a Creator*, he quotes biologist Stephen Meyer who explains that:

The fossils of the Cambrian explosion absolutely cannot be explained by Darwinian theory **or even by the concept called "punctuated equilibrium,"** which was specifically formulated in an effort to explain away the embarrassing fossil record," ... "When you look at the issue from the perspective of biological information, the best explanation is that an intelligence was responsible for this otherwise inexplicable phenomenon . . . "So when you encounter the Cambrian explosion, with its huge and sudden appearance of radically new body plans, you realize you need lots of new biological information. Some of it would be encoded for in DNA—although how that occurs is still an insurmountable problem for Darwinists. But on top of that, where does the new information come from that's not attributable to DNA? How does the hierarchical arrangement of cells, tissues, organs, and body plans develop? Darwinists don't have an answer. It's not even on their radar"" pp. 238-239.

There has not yet been proposed any evolutionary mechanism that satisfactorily explains this explosion of complex life forms in the Cambrian era.

Does Homology Prove Macro-Evolution?

SIMILARITY OF STRUCTURE IN CREATURES

Darwin proposed that because different types of creatures shared some common features that this was evidence for a common ancestry and therefore evolution. However, the fossil record shows no gradual changes of these features. A much more logical implication from the facts is that these similar features show common design for practical purposes and because of those creatures live in the same environment whether on land, in the sea or in the air. So good design features mean that:

- There are no three-legged terrestrial creatures.
- Five digits in hands, wings and flippers act for optimal functioning.
- Two eyes, two ears and four limbs act for optimal functioning.

Similarity of certain structures is found in creatures that are completely unrelated e.g.

- The brain structure of the parrot is virtually identical to that of a chimpanzee.
- The chameleon's eyes are virtually identical to those of a fish called the sandlance.

It seems that there is no evidence in the fossil record of any 'failed models'! Yet amazingly the chance of the same complex features evolving many thousands of times for the many species is virtually nil.

TRANSITIONAL FORMS

The fossil record can be interpreted in different ways. It does not have to be interpreted as demonstrating that there are any transitional forms through a process of evolution; but rather it can be interpreted as demonstrating God's progressive creation of species so there is **extinction and then replacement** by more advanced species until the end of the 6th Day of creation and from which time only extinction has occurred. So this speciation/extinction/new speciation process started with simple life forms and progressed to more advanced forms.

Key Question: *Why are so-called transitional life-forms most abundant among species with the lowest probability to survive mutational and environmental changes and least abundant among species with the highest probabilities to survive such changes?*

ARE THERE ANY VESTIGIAL ORGANS?

Wisdom teeth, valves in the veins, the pineal gland, the thymus, lachrymal glands, certain female organs, the thyroid, the tonsils, the appendix, the pituitary gland, and many others have all been classified in earlier times as vestigial organs – i.e. once needed in our earlier so-called evolutionary period but no longer needed. Yet, not one evolutionist has been willing to have all these organs removed. In fact, in recent times, the list has grown much shorter as the useful functioning of these organs has been discovered. In time, as the creation model predicts, there would be the discovery of useful functions for the remaining so-called vestigial organs. For example it is now known that:

- The tonsils help protect against infection.
- The appendix helps protect against gastrointestinal problems and to fight infection.

Can Life Begin Unintelligently from Raw Materials?

THERE WAS NO PRIMORDIAL SOUP

Darwin proposed to a friend that life may have arisen from “some warm little pond.” However, Carbon-13 to carbon-12 ratio analysis, plus nitrogen-15 to nitrogen-14 ratio analysis, on ancient carbonaceous material establishes that a primordial soup or mineral substrate of pre-biotic molecules never existed.

In the Miller-Urey experiment, a mixture of gases was run through heat and electricity, and produced a tar-like substance which formed some amino acids. However, Miller and Urey excluded oxygen from the experiment, which scientists now deem was essential when life first appeared. If the oxygen had been included then no amino acids would have formed, and so stopping any further development of the complex proteins required as the building blocks of life. Concerning an early oxidizing atmosphere on earth Erich Dimroth and Michael Kimberley, having examined mineralogical evidence, concluded:

In general we find no evidence in the sedimentary distribution of carbon, sulfur, uranium, or iron that an oxygen-free atmosphere has existed at any time during the span of geological history recorded in well-preserved sedimentary rock. 1970, *Can. J. Earth Sci.*, 13, 1161.

The late British astronomer Sir Fred Hoyle concluded that in the Miller-Urey experiment:

The...building blocks of proteins can therefore be produced by natural means. But *this is far from proving that life could have evolved in this way*. No one has shown that the correct arrangements of amino acids, like the orderings in enzymes, can be produced by this method...” A junkyard contains all the bits and pieces of a Boeing 747, dismembered and in disarray. A whirlwind happens to blow through the yard. *What is the chance* that after its passage *a fully assembled 747*, ready to fly, will be found standing there? *So small as to be negligible*, even if a tornado were to blow through enough junkyards to fill the whole Universe.

The Intelligent Universe, 1983, pp. 18-19.

Scientifically, life can only arise from life (the law of biogenesis). So there was no primordial soup to produce life.

CAN CHEMICALS EVOLVE INTO LIFE'S BUILDING BLOCKS?

In the foreword to *The Mystery of Life's Origin—Reassessing Current Theories*, Dr. Dean Kenyon, Professor of Biology at San Francisco State University reasons:

I have been increasingly struck by a peculiar feature of many of the published experiments in the field. I am not referring to those studies conducted more or less along the lines of Miller's original work, although there are firm grounds for criticizing those studies as well. I am referring to those experiments designed to elucidate possible pathways of prebiotic synthesis of certain organic substances of biologic interest, such as purines and pyrimidines, or polypeptides. In most cases the experimental conditions in such studies have been so artificially simplified as to have virtually no bearing on any actual processes that might have taken place on the primitive earth. For example, if one wishes to find a possible prebiotic mechanism of condensation of free amino acids to polypeptides, it is not likely that sugars or aldehydes would be added to the reaction mixture. And yet, **how likely is it that amino acids (or any other presumed precursor substance) occurred anywhere on the primitive earth free from contamination substances**, either in solution or the solid state? The difficulty is that if sugars or aldehydes were also present polypeptides would not form. Instead an interfering cross-reaction would occur between amino acids and sugars to give complex, insoluble polymeric material of very dubious relevance to chemical evolution. This problem of potentially interfering cross-reactions has been largely neglected in much of the published work on the chemical origins of life. The possible implications of such an omission merit careful study. Other aspects of origin-of-life research have contributed to my growing uneasiness about the theory of chemical evolution. One of these is the enormous gap between the most complex “protocell” model systems produced in the laboratory and the simplest living cells. Anyone familiar with the ultrastructural and biochemical complexity of the genus *Mycoplasma*, for example, should have serious doubts about the relevance of any of the various laboratory “protocells” to the actual historical origin of cells, in my view, the possibility of closing this gap by laboratory simulation of chemical events likely to have occurred on the primitive earth is extremely remote.

Another intractable problem concerns the spontaneous origin of the optical isomer preferences found universally in living matter (e.g., L- rather than D-amino acids in proteins, D- rather than L- sugars in nucleic acids). After all the prodigious effort that has gone into attempts to solve this great question over the years, we are really no nearer to a solution today than we were thirty years ago.

Finally, in this brief summary of the reasons for my growing doubts that life on earth could have begun spontaneously by purely chemical and physical means, there is the problem of the origin of genetic, i.e., biologically relevant, information in biopolymers. No experimental system yet devised has provided the slightest clue as to how biologically meaningful sequences of subunits might have originated in prebiotic polynucleotides or polypeptides. Evidence for some degree of spontaneous sequence ordering has been published, but there is no indication whatsoever that the non-randomness is biologically significant. Until such evidence is forthcoming one certainly cannot claim that the possibility of a naturalistic origin of life has been demonstrated.

THE HOMOCHIRALITY PROBLEM

Scientist Hugh Ross in his book *Creation as Science* explains that:

Naturalistic models for life's origin also require a site where amino acids and pentose sugars of a specific orientation can be selected from the normal random mix of left- and right-handed configurations. Amino acids can link together to form protein chains only if the group is entirely one-handed (homochiral)—Either all right or all left. Likewise, nucleotides can link together to form DNA or RNA only if all the pentose sugars are either all left handed or all right handed.

No known natural mechanism exists (present or past) on Earth for generating this homochirality...Homochiral amino acids are difficult to produce even under highly complex and carefully controlled laboratory conditions. The only promising result has arisen from experiments exploiting 100 percent circularly polarised ultraviolet light. In one case, careful control of the intensity and wavelength of such light yielded as much as a 20 percent excess of left-handed amino acids. The cost, however, of producing this excess was the destruction of nearly all of the original amino acids. In fact, for every 2 percent excess generated, half or more of the amino acids in the original mixture were destroyed.

The only known natural source of circularly polarised ultraviolet (UV) light lies far from Earth—in the synchrotron radiation emitted by some neutron stars and also in the vicinity of some black holes...

The lack of any discernible natural mechanism for generating homochiral amino acids and pentose sugars remains devastating for naturalistic models of life's origin, pp. 118, 9.

The evolution theory relies on the need for protein chains to arise without intelligent guidance. As shown above, this cannot happen.

Does Natural Selection Produce New Species?

In his book *The Origin of Species* published in 1859 Charles Darwin proposed the concept of natural selection as the mechanism for the evolution of life. Certainly almost every species possesses a mechanism that allows it to adapt to changing environmental conditions so that it does not easily become extinct. This mechanism is known as natural selection (mistakenly called 'survival of the fittest') and is primarily a mechanism of conservation. It is not the "mechanism" of change that is generally claimed for it. But how shall the evolutionist who denies a creator explain the origination of this process of natural selection? Clearly even the process requires an intelligent mind behind it! Natural selection, in fact, only makes changes within a species, but this never moves across the species barrier to create a different form of life; yet many evolutionists have abandoned this process as a mechanism for evolutionary change on the basis that natural selection has never given evidence of being able to change one species into another. Furthermore, the contradiction is in the name because evolution appeals to random changes which can hardly be any form of 'selection.'

THE LAW OF HEREDITY

Certainly, over time, there is change within species. This is sometimes called **micro-evolution** of which the following are examples:

- Microbial antibiotic resistance.
- Modifications in the fruit fly's eyes and wings.
- Varying beak sizes of finches.

However, molecular biology has demonstrated that variations within species can operate only within a certain range specified by the DNA. So the above noted microbes are still microbes, the fruit flies are still fruit flies and the finches are still finches—they do not become eagles etc. Whenever there has been crossbreeding of two

species i.e. horse/donkey the resulting mule is usually sterile. In the rare cases when the female mule does produce it reverts back toward either the horse or the donkey species. All of this works against the concept of **macro-evolution**. In his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, biochemist Michael Denton stated:

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

Can Random Mutations Be a Mechanism for Evolution?

After most evolutionists decided that natural selection by itself could not bring about evolutionary change they moved to the concept of the occurrence of random mutations as the answer. This phase is known as neo-Darwinianism.

DNA IS A LANGUAGE OF CODED INSTRUCTIONS

Whenever scientists have conducted experiments to randomly cause mutations in the cells of various creatures, they have always failed to produce improvements in creatures and have mostly produced defects. So the appeal to replication or copying errors (mutations) as a proposed mechanism of evolution is contrary to all observation and experimental investigation. The effect is the same as when constructed sentences in normal language are subjected on numerous occasions to undirected random changes—the result is always gobbledygook. This is because language and instructions do not develop incrementally i.e. one or two letters or words at a time, but rather as an expression of **ideas**. Even translation from one language to another is not best done one letter or even one word at a time, but **idea for idea**. This is the same for the language of DNA in biological development. It is impossible for random changes to bring any lasting benefit to a creature and, in fact, each entity has genetic systems in place to correct most mutations. So in discussing attempts to simulate the process of evolution on computers Michael Denton concluded that:

If complex computer programs cannot be changed by random mechanisms, then surely the same must apply to the genetic programs of living organisms. **The fact that systems in every way analogous to living organisms cannot undergo evolution by pure trial and error** [i.e., by mutation and selection] and that their functional distribution invariably conforms to an improbable discontinuum comes, in my opinion, **very close to a formal disproof of the whole Darwinian paradigm of nature**. By what strange capacity do living organisms defy the laws of chance which are apparently obeyed by all analogous complex systems? (Emphasis ours). *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, in the chapter "Beyond the Reach of Chance,"

WHY MUTATIONS CANNOT BRING ABOUT EVOLUTION

1. **Mathematical Limitations.**

The ratio of harmful to beneficial mutations is estimated as ranging from 10,000:1 to 10,000,000:1 or 10^7 . However, evolution requires **a series of related mutations**, and the probability of getting just two mutations comes to $10^7 \times 10^7 = 10^{14}$ i.e. a hundred trillion! The probability of getting three mutations in a row is 10^{21} i.e. one in a billion trillion. Yet it would require dozens more of such mutations to bring about a new creature. So mathematically mutations, as a mechanism for evolution is totally impractical.

As far back as 1967, a group of leading biologists and **mathematicians** met to consider: *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution*. The question was: could mutations along with natural selection be a mechanism for evolutionary change? The mathematicians' answer was—**no**. This led the chairman of the meeting, C. H. Waddington to reclassify himself as a "post-neo-Darwinist," i.e. a believer in evolution but that mutations combined with natural selection cannot explain how it happens. So now the search is on for a different mechanism to explain evolution.

2. **Mutations are mainly harmful**

Most genetic mutations are small and of no consequence. However, large mutations are overwhelmingly harmful to an organism's survival. This is because mutations are caused by radiation or replication/copying errors in the genes. They generally cause birth defects, tumours, cancer, death and in some cases extinction. The

only life forms with the possibility for mutational advance are those with very high populations (about a quadrillion or more) and short generation times (less than 3 months) e.g. viruses/bacteria.

Mutations tend to **break down** genetic order i.e. to corrupt it by blocking the normal function of certain genes and produce abnormalities into the human population e.g. haemophilia because of a mutation of a clotting-factor gene in certain families. Strangely no evolutionist believes that by standing in front of an X-ray for its mutational benefits he might evolve some advantageous feature.

The main claim to a beneficial mutation concerns **sickle-cell anaemia**—a disease of the red blood cells. The benefit is to those who suffer malaria in Africa because the one-celled organism that causes malaria reacts badly to sickle-cell haemoglobin. However, 25% of the children of carriers can die of sickle-cell anaemia, and another 25% are subject to malaria, so it is hardly a beneficial mutation in overall terms.

3. Mutations are only changes in genes that already exist.

So mutations presuppose creation—they point back to it. So the result of mutation is just a varied form of an already-existing gene. This makes mutations irrelevant as regards the beginning of life on earth and means that the existing genetic material is never added to although some may be lost because of the mutation. Therefore, they can produce only variation **within their kind**, not change from one kind to another. So because mutations cannot compose genetic scripts they cannot bring about evolutionary change.

Is there Enough Time for Evolution to Occur?

On the basis of the mathematical improbabilities mentioned above natural processes would not have enough time to produce the abundance of life that occurred 3.8 billion years ago within the **50 million years** span after the major asteroid bombardment (no life possible at that time) which occurred 3.85 billion years ago. The universe just isn't old enough or big enough for the probability of 1 in $10^{3,000,000}$ as the odds against the evolution of the horse according to the estimate of the famous evolutionist Julian Huxley.

The Cell Could Not Have Evolved

Darwin had no concept of the enormous complexity of the cell. To create this masterpiece of engineering requires the performance of the following processes one after the other:

- Assembly of boundary membranes.
- Formation of energy capturing capabilities by the boundary membrane.
- Encapsulation of macromolecules (like proteins, RNA, and DNA).
- The introduction of pores into the boundary membrane that can funnel raw materials into the interior space.
- Production of systems that allow the macromolecules to grow.
- Generation of catalysts that speed up the growth of the encapsulated macromolecules.
- Provision for the macromolecules to replicate.
- Introduction of information into one set of macromolecules that directs the production of macromolecules.
- Development of mechanisms to cause the boundary membrane to subdivide into two smaller systems that can grow.
- Production of the means to pass information-containing macromolecules to the daughter products of the subdivision process.

The individual biochemical systems for the cell are irreducibly complex and cannot emerge through an undirected stepwise process so that the probability of the essential gene set coming into existence simultaneously through natural processes is astronomically improbable. Recent research on the cell reveals that it operates with many systems that resemble **highly complex machines or motors**. Clearly there is intelligent design and pattern for the cell. Mathematician William Dembski and molecular biologist Jonathan Wells note that:

“It’s true that eukaryotic cells are the most complicated cells we know. But the simplest life forms we know, the prokaryotic cells (such as bacteria, which lack a nucleus), are themselves *immensely complex*. Moreover, they are every bit as high-tech as the eukaryotic cells—if eukaryotes are like state-of-the-art laptop computers, then prokaryotes are like state-of-the-art cell phones... There is no evidence whatsoever of earlier, more primitive life forms from which prokaryotes might have evolved” *How to Be an Intellectually Fulfilled Atheist (or Not)*, 2008, p. 4.

These authors then detail what is common to these two types of cells in terms of complexity:

- Information processing, storage and retrieval
- Artificial languages and their decoding systems
- Error detection, correction and proofreading devices for quality control
- Digital data-embedding technology
- Transportation and distribution systems
- Automated parcel addressing (similar to post codes and delivery labels)
- Assembly processes employing pre-fabrication and modular construction
- Self-reproducing robotic manufacturing plants.

This complexity is staggering and had Darwin known of it he likely would never have produced his theory of evolution because it would have had no starting point.

CELL INFORMATION REQUIRES INTELLIGENCE

This is available in the form of a code of instructions (genes) within the cell’s nucleus. These instructions are not made of matter i.e. they have no mass, length or width—but can be transferred by matter. A single human DNA molecule contains about *three billion* genetic letters—with an error rate, i.e. a *copying mistake* of one *for every 10 billion letters* (after all the molecular editing machines have been in operation). Indeed the DNA programs each *species* to remain within the limits of its own general kind.

Former atheist Sir Antony Flew commented:

What I think the DNA material has done, is that it has shown, *by the almost unbelievable complexity* of the arrangements which are needed to produce [life], that *intelligence must have been involved in getting these extraordinarily diverse elements to work together*. "It's the enormous complexity of the number of elements and the enormous subtlety of the ways they work together. The meeting of these two parts *at the right time by chance is simply minute*. It is all a matter of the enormous complexity by which the results were achieved, which looked to *me* like the work of intelligence. *There Is a God*, 2007, p. 75.

Do Humans and Other Creatures Have the Same Common Ancestor?

ARE CHIMPANZEES 99% GENETICALLY SIMILAR TO HUMANS?

Darwin proposed that human beings evolved from some kind of ape closely related to chimpanzees; and until recently it was thought that humans were 99 percent genetically similar to chimps. However, *The International Consortium for the Sequencing of Chimpanzee Chromosome 22* made a genome to genome comparison between humans and chimpanzees. When reported in 2002, it revealed that about 15,000 of the 65,000 chimp DNA fragments did not align with any sequence in the Human Genome Database. In fact the *Max Plank Institute* discovered that only two-thirds of the sequences from the chimp genome aligned with sequences in the human genome. In spite of the fact that, in those that did align, there was a 98.76% genetic similarity, the mitochondrial DNA match is only 91.1%. These results show that genetically there is only an **86.7% similarity** between chimps and humans. The difference in the genetic makeup of the two species makes a massive difference in their biochemistry, so that the mental capacity of humans is of an altogether different order to that of chimps. This is especially so in the area of language ability. So to demonstrate the absurdity of anyone positing the idea that humans and chimps have a common ancestor a gene to gene comparison of humans and **mice** reveals an **80%** similarity. However, only 300 of the 30,000 genes are held in common between these two species. By way of further comparison humans are genetically **35% daffodil**. So the 86.7% genetic similarity between humans and chimps really provides no basis for imagining a common ancestor of both species. Clearly, any similarity between chimpanzees and humans is due to common design rather than a common ancestor.

LUCY - AUSTRALOPITHECUS AFARENSIS

A 40% complete skeleton of this species was discovered in 1974 in Ethiopia by the team of Donald Johnson. It was claimed that this creature immediately preceded *Homo habilis*, the first member of the genus homo, and so leading to modern humans. However, in 2002 an *Australopithecus afarensis* jawbone was discovered which, after investigation, revealed that *Australopithecus afarensis*, and therefore Lucy, was exclusively part of the branch leading to *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus* and so not leading to *Homo habilis* or anything concerned with humans.

NEANDERTHALS

These bipedal, primitive tool using, large-brained creatures that existed from **500,000+** years ago to 30,000 years ago have been seen by evolutionists as a transitional form leading to modern man. However, analysis by scientists of mitochondrial DNA shows that these **animals**, not genetically connected with the great apes, also have made no contribution to the human gene pool. The physical significant differences to humans are:

- Smaller brain size to body mass and a smaller parietal lobe than in humans
- An extraordinarily long face with sloped forehead and receding chin.
- The spinal hole at the base of the skull that is oval rather than round as in humans.
- Large round eye sockets
- An extremely long nose
- The lower jawbone is squarish not triangular.
- A unique bony protrusion near the rear of the lower jaw
- Very large front teeth
- A barrel shaped chest
- Considerably shorter limbs than humans

Scientists now make the claim that Neanderthals have no evolutionary connection to humanity. They are just one of a series of bipedal primates, unconnected to the great apes, each one more skilled at hunting than the one before. The tool using ability seems to be limited to the making of stone flakes as cutting implements or, if they were still in existence after the creation of man, they may simply have stumbled on tools that had been made by humans.

CRO-MAGNON MAN

Fossils of this so-called transitional form were first discovered in 1868 and are dated to 35,000 years ago. Variations from healthy modern humans are now known to be evidence of early onset disease e.g. arthritis. Therefore, scientists no longer view these as any kind of transitional form. They are **fully human** and with a brain size slightly larger than that of 21st century humans.

Creatures that Defy Evolutionary Theory

SYMBIOTIC RELATIONSHIPS

These are relationships whereby one creature could not exist without its working relationship with another but very different kind of creature. So it is imperative that both creatures come into existence simultaneously. In evolutionary terms such a probability is so high as to be impossible for all practical purpose even if ages of time were allowed.

WHEN A FEMALE BEE ISN'T EVEN A BEE

“Blister beetles of California’s Mojave Desert depend on solitary bees for their life cycle. However, the beetles have nothing of interest to offer the bees. Blister beetle larvae are so tiny that dozens of them can infest the solitary bee’s body. Riding on the female bee, they transfer into the solitary bee’s nursery when the female lays her eggs. There the beetle larvae eat the pollen that the mother has packed for her hatchlings. Once they pupate into wingless adults, they then need a male bee to carry them to a female so the next cycle of life can begin. To attract a male bee, large numbers of the beetles pile together into a clump that looks like a female bee. They will hold this shape for up to two weeks, waiting for a male bee to show interest. Researchers have also concluded that, while in this position, the beetles also generate the scent of a female bee ready to mate! Once a male bee gets close enough, the tiny beetles jump on his body. When he mates with a female, the beetles transfer to her body and wait for her to lay eggs. Scientists are amazed that the beetles, which are not social insects, are smart enough to work together to fool the male bees. Obviously, the beetles did not design this clever strategy by

themselves. The cooperation they show for their survival was designed and programmed into them by their wise Creator, perhaps to show us how important working together is for survival.”

CreationMoments.net, July 10, 2010.

THE BOMBARDIER BEETLE

This creature fires 1,000 sequential bullets similar to the firing of a machine gun. It was created with its asbestos firing chamber. It could not have evolved this defence mechanism without blowing itself up. All the parts need to exist together. Evolutionary change could not bring about all these factors simultaneously.

THE GIRAFFE

To get enough blood up to its head the giraffe has many extra valves. It also has a sponge section under its brain to absorb the impact of the blood hitting the brain when the giraffe bends to drink. All of this enables it to lift its head quickly in case of emergency. Again all the parts had to exist immediately and simultaneously, otherwise it would have died.

THE WOODPECKER

Without immediately having an industrial strength beak and a skull which is the thickest of all creatures and cartilage to act as a shock absorber as all in evidence at the same time the woodpecker would not have survived. Furthermore, it instinctively closes its eyes at the occurrence of each smash against the tree. If it didn't it would lose its eyeballs. To get at the insects inside the tree the woodpecker's tongue is specially barbed. To aid in snatching the insect glue is secreted onto the tongue. This glue is then dissolved before the woodpecker swallows the insect.

THE EUROPEAN GREEN PECKER

To enable this pecker to reach the deeply buried insects it has an extremely long tongue which could not remain in its mouth. To accommodate this tongue, starting from the back of its throat, the tongue goes up over the inside of the skull, through its nostrils and into its beak.

How would it have survived whilst the evolutionary steps were taking place? The tongue and its abilities were needed in complete form from its beginning.

THE INCUBATOR BIRD

The female of this Australian bird builds a nest that is buried deep in the ground and rises to a height of 50 ft. It has a diameter of 20 ft. The bird then lays one egg each day for 7 months. All the time the male works to keep the nest at a constant 91 degrees F and 99.5% humidity. Yet it is never shown how to build such a gigantic nest or that it must maintain these constants for the full 7 months. These abilities must work simultaneously.

THE PLATYPUS

This creature detects electrical impulses from its prey so that it may find its food. How could it survive whilst developing this mechanism?

THE BLACK AND YELLOW GARDEN SPIDER

This creature uses different kinds and colours of webbing for different purposes in its catching and storing of its prey. The webbing is also formed around the new born spiders in such a way that when the wind catches them it carries them up into the air to a height of 1,500 ft and takes them south for a distance of up to 1,500 miles.

A CHICK'S EGGSHELL

The eggshell forms with 10,000 holes over its surface so that the chick may breathe and rid itself of waste. Inside it has a membrane and an extra air-sack. The chick's egg-tooth is on the outside of the beak so that it can break its way out of the shell at the right time. This time is always from the 19th to the 21st day at which time the chick is born. How could any evolution process have catered for the chick's breathing arrangement and informed the chick of what to do and when to do it?

Evolutionary Teachings that Have Been proven to Be Wrong – Yet still Appear in Modern Text Books

- Darwin's 'Tree of Life.'
- Darwin's finches.
- The Miller-Urey Experiment.
- Homology in vertebrate limbs.

- Haeckel's embryos.
- Peppered moths.
- Four-winged fruit flies.
- Fossil horses.
- Transitional links from ape to man.

DARWIN'S 'TREE OF LIFE'

Darwin's diagram is of an imagined transformation of a common ancestor into the different species of today. This was based on extremely limited evidence about adaptations within species and then extrapolated to form the idea that a species or genus can transform into a completely different one. However, the reality is an inversion of Darwin's tree, whereby the branches of life were very diverse and numerous at the beginning and through extinction are fewer now because there are fewer kinds of life-forms today than in the past.

According to Dr. Jonathan Wells:

Darwin knew—and scientists have recently confirmed—that the early fossil record turns the evolutionary tree of life *upside down*. Ten years ago it was hoped that molecular evidence might save the tree, but recent discoveries have dashed that hope. Although you would not learn it from reading biology textbooks.

Darwin's Tree of Life has been Uprooted p. 51.

Conclusion

Current scientific knowledge shows that it is impossible that there was a primordial soup. It further shows that chemicals cannot evolve into amino acids as the building blocks of life. Without these processes the mechanisms of natural selection and mutations could not even begin to work. However, supposing that there had been a primordial soup and that chemicals could evolve into amino acids, we still find that the primary proposed mechanisms could not take the process any further. There is clearly far more evidence for an intelligent mind to be behind all of earth's creation whereby much of complex life became evident suddenly in the Cambrian era.

www.biblicaltruthseekers.co.uk

SUGGESTED READING

The Cell's Design – How Chemistry Reveals the Creator's Artistry. By Fazala Rana.

For two opposing views by Christian authors who are biologists the following books are suggested:

1. *Who Was Adam—A Creation Approach to the Origin of Man.* By Fazala Rana.

This is available from Reasons to Believe and treats the Genesis 1 and 2 account in a literal (but not literalistic) way

2. *Creation or Evolution—Do We Have to Choose?* By Denis Alexander.

This treats the Genesis 1 and 2 account in an allegorical/figurative way.

Also the following DVDs are recommended:

Incredible creatures that Defy Evolution. #1, #2, and #3 (#1 is hard to obtain).

Life's Story. Parts 1 and 2.