

Notes5

EVIDENCE #1

There are no transitional links and intermediate forms in either the fossil record or the modern world. Therefore, there is no actual evidence that evolution has occurred either in the past or the present.

Absolutely no transitional forms either in the fossil record or in modern animal and plant life have been found. All appear fully formed and complete. The fossil record amply supplies us with representation of almost all species of animals and plants but none of the supposed links of plant to animal, fish to amphibian, amphibian to reptile, or reptile to birds and mammals are represented nor any transitional forms at all. There are essentially the same gaps between all the basic kinds in the fossil record as exists in plant and animal life today. There are literally a host of missing links in the fossil record and the modern world.

1. "There is no evidence in the fossil record of one kind of creature becoming another kind. No transitional links or intermediate forms between various kinds of creatures have ever been found." For example, "the evolutionist claims that it took perhaps fifty million years for a fish to evolve into an amphibian. But, again, there are no transitional forms. For example, not a single fossil with part fins...part feet has been found. And this is true between every major plant and animal kind." ([22], p.19)
2. "Nowhere do we see animals with partially evolved legs, eyes, brains, or various other tissues, organs, and biological structures." ([22], p.19-20)
3. "If continuous evolution is a universal law of nature, as the evolutionist claims, then there should be an abundance of evidences of continuity and transition between all the kinds of organisms involved in the process, both in the present world and in the fossil record. Instead we find great gaps between all the basic kinds, and essentially the same gaps in the fossil record that exist in the modern world." ([18], p.34)
4. There are no links of plant to animal, fish to amphibian, amphibian to reptile, reptile to birds and mammals. There are no links whatsoever.
5. "All of the present orders, classes, and phyla appear quite suddenly in the fossil record, without indications of the evolving lines from which they developed. The same is largely true even for most families and genera. There are literally an innumerable host of 'missing links' in the record." ([18], p.33)
6. "There is simply no evidence of partially evolved animals or plants in the fossil record to indicate that evolution has occurred in the past, and certainly no evidence of partially evolved animals and plants existing today to indicate that evolution is occurring at the present." ([22], p.20)
7. "...the outstanding characteristics of the fossil record is the absence of evidence for evolution." ([11], p.50)

8. If there were links then they would have been found since the fossil record is "...quite ample to represent the true state of the ancient world. Most individual species of fossil plants and animals have been collected in considerable numbers, but the hypothetical intermediate species have never been represented at all!" ([18], p.33)
9. Darwin stated, "Why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?" ([11], p.46)
10. Darwin admitted that the number of transitional links "must have been conceivably great." The fact that there are none prompted him to conclude that this fact is "the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory."
11. "The occasional suggested examples of missing links (such as the famous archaeopteryx - supposedly linking the birds and reptiles) can usually be recognized on closer study to represent merely another type of one of the basic kinds it supposedly links (the archaeopteryx was a true bird, by any reasonable definition, with feathers and warm blood)." ([18], p.33-34)
12. "Even if a creature shared characteristics belonging to two separate groups, however, this would not necessarily make it a transitional link as long as each of the characteristics themselves is complete and not in the process of transition from one type of structure or function into another type of structure or function." ([22], p.25)
13. "Because of the lack of evidence for gradual evolution in the fossil record, more and more evolutionists are adopting a new theory of evolution known as macroevolution. The theory of macroevolution teaches that animals and plants changed suddenly from one kind to another without going through any gradual or transitional process."
14. Other evolutionists claim that the links are missing only because the changes are so small that they are not noticed. The problem here is that they are assuming that at every point in the evolution process the being would appear as complete or whole. Actually, they would appear as in transition as when a house is being built.
15. "The point to remember...is that the fossil problem for Darwinism is getting worse all the time." ([11], p.57)

EVIDENCE #2

Natural selection (the evolution mechanism, along with mutations) is incapable of advancing an organism to a "higher-order".

It can be noted that natural selection as a driving mechanism for evolution is totally inadequate. Natural selection (along with mutation) is said to have caused organisms to evolve from one basic kind (animals which can reproduce with one another) into another basic kind. This is prohibited genetically since all of the information for the development of an organism has already been encoded in the DNA of its parent. Variation to organisms must remain within its basic kind. For example, genetically, a wide variety of

dogs can come to exist, but a dog can never become anything other than a dog. It remains in its kind. It does not have the genetic ability to become anything more. Admitting this, evolutionists have tried to explain that natural selection happened in conjunction with mutations to the genetic code. This could not produce evolution, however, since mutations do not create new genetic potential, they just alter what is already there. Furthermore, mutations are small, random, and harmful alterations to the genetic code. This also makes evolution from mutations impossible. For example, a working wristwatch does not improve but is harmed when its inside parts are randomly altered. Natural selection also contradicts the second law of thermodynamics which states that, left to themselves, all things tend to deteriorate rather than develop, while evolution wants to go in the opposite direction. "Survival of the fittest" demonstrates only how an organism has survived, not how it has evolved.

1. "All the 'information' for the development of each particular organism was already 'encoded' in the DNA of its parent. They must reproduce 'after their kinds'." ([18], p.25)
2. "There are great numbers of 'genes' (or DNA molecules) in each germ cell, and these can be arranged in various ways to permit a wide range of variation in the individual members of a basic 'kind' of plant or animal, but the possible range of variation is nevertheless limited to the basic genetic framework of that particular 'kind'." ([18], p.25)
3. "The genetic system permits a wide variety of specific features (eye color, height, shape of skull, etc.) within the limits of a particular kind. These characteristics vary in accordance with the Mendelian laws of heredity. Depending on factors such as possible isolation and inbreeding, some of these characteristics become fixed and a definite 'race' established."
4. "Although the number of varieties or races that may be established from an original kind is undoubtedly quite large, it is clear that there are definite limits to this or even speciation has no true evolutionary significance. New varieties are established, but not new kinds." ([18], p.26)
5. "For example, all the different races of dogs are simply variations and changes within the genetic boundaries of the dog kind. Although there is ample evidence of changes within kinds such as the various races of dogs, cats, horses, cows, etc., there has never been observed any changes across kinds, such as, for example, a dog becoming a cat or a horse becoming a cow; such changes are not possible since a dog does not have the information in its genes to become a cat...It is the various distribution and recombination of genes which ultimately produce the variations and physiological differences that we find within a family unit, race, or natural species." ([22], p.7)
6. In light of these facts, evolutionists have turned to mutations (small, random and almost always harmful changes in the genetic code) in the gene pool to explain their theory, "The general picture of how evolution works is now clear. The basic raw material is the mutant gene. Among these mutations most will be deleterious, but a minority will be beneficial. These few will be retained...". James F. Crow, a modern leader for evolution. ([19], p.47) Two problems with claiming mutations to be the source of positive change are as follows: "an accumulation of literally

- millions of such micro mutations would be necessary to change one basic 'kind' of plant or animal into another" and "an even more serious difficulty is the fact that practically all observed mutations are harmful, and usually even fatal, to the creature experiencing them. Truly beneficial mutations are so rarely observed, and even these are so questionable, as to leave their very existence still in doubt. Even evolutionary geneticists readily acknowledge that 99.9% of all observed mutations are harmful." ([18], p.27-28)
7. Mutation are small, random, and harmful or at best neutral to the organism, and rare. All four of these characteristics make mutations impossible to bringing evolutionary change. Any change that is random, because it is done to a highly ordered organism, will be harmful or neutral. A random change done to a wristwatch will not improve the watch. It will harm it or at very best, be neutral to it. An earthquake does not develop a city, it brings destruction to it. ([22], p.7 and [18], p.27)
 8. "Living creatures are extremely intricate assemblies of interrelated parts, and the parts themselves are also complex. It is impossible to imagine how the parts could change in unison as a result of chance mutation." ([11], p.32)
 9. "But, let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that a beneficial mutation might occur; still the fact remains that for every beneficial mutation there will be hundreds of harmful ones so that the net effect, or result, over time will be that the harmful mutations always win and will ultimately cause the organism, or even species, to degenerate or die." ([22], p.8)
 10. "...mutations are incapable of producing evolution because they can only alter and effect the existing structure of genes: they cannot create new genetic material or new genetic potential."
 11. "...only mutations produced in the genes of reproductive cells, such as sperm in the male and ovum (or egg cell) in the female, are passed on to offspring. Changes produced in other body cells are not transmitted. For example, if a woman were to lose a finger, her baby would not, as a result, be born with a missing finger. Similarly, even if an ape ever learned to walk upright, it could not pass this characteristic on to its descendants. Thus, modern biology has disproved the once held theory that acquired characteristics from the environment can be transmitted into the genetic code of offspring." ([22], p.9)
 12. Survival of the fittest is a given but it only explains how an organism survived not how it evolved. Survival of the fittest is natural preservation not natural selection (evolution). ([22], p.11)
 13. Put another way, in regard to mutations, we can say, "Species avoid genetic deterioration due to natural attrition among the genetically unfit. Darwinists claim that the same force of attrition has a building effect so powerful that it can begin with a bacterial cell and gradually craft its descendants...to produce such wonders as trees, flowers, ants, birds, and humans." ([11], p.16)
 14. Breeding reproduces those animals with desired features. It is not evolution of the specimens. It is also within kind not crossing kinds, and all changes through breeding are lost after just a few generations. Breeding also, of course, cannot produce new genetic material or the potential for such. Cloning is the artificial stimulation of mitosis (cell division). It is not the creation of life. ([4], p.37)

15. Regarding the second law of thermodynamics (universally accepted scientific law which states that all things left to themselves will tend to run down) or the law of entropy, it is observed, "It would hardly be possible to conceive of two more completely opposite principles than this principle of entropy increase and the principle of evolution. Each is precisely the converse of the other. As (Aldous) Huxley defined it, evolution involves a continual increase of order, of organization, of size, of complexity. It seems axiomatic that both cannot possibly be true. But there is no question whatever that the second law of thermodynamics is true." ([19], p.35)
16. "...an excess inflow of `ordering energy' into the system from outside may cause it temporarily to grow and become more highly organized. Thus...a child may grow into an adult, or men may build a structure. But each of these, and all other illustrations of apparent decrease in entropy, are only local and temporary." "Negative entropy (is required) for its maintenance." ([18], p.46)
17. A seed, for example, being genetically complete, provides the negative entropy for the growth of a tree.
18. Regarding the first law of thermodynamics (stating that a constant amount of energy is maintained) it is observed, "...all matter in the universe is some form of energy...(and) the total amount of energy in the universe always remains constant (or the same), and, therefore, energy itself is neither destroyed (that is, reduced to nothing) or created from nothing by any natural process. ([19], p.32)
19. These laws state that any natural process would involve conservation (1st law) and disintegration (2nd law). Evolution demands "integration and development" and is therefore impossible. ([18], p.46)
20. Regarding the validity of the laws, we note, "These laws are based upon more evidence than any other principles in science. They have been confirmed by countless thousands of experiments on systems ranging in size from the nuclear to the astronomic, and there is no known exception to either of them."
21. It is noted that the `urge' to evolve is not at all found in chemistry. ([4], p.357)
22. In light of all of these scientific objections to natural selection, perhaps Darwin would have abandoned his own theory since he asserted, "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organism existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down."

EVIDENCE #3

Although evolutionists state that life resulted from non-life, matter resulted from nothing, and humans resulted from animals, each of these is an impossibility of science and the natural world.

Life is far too complex to have resulted from any chance happening. Even the simplest form of life consists of billions of parts working together and needed for the basic functioning of the organism. These could not have sprung into being at the same time and interrelating together by chance. Life coming from matter would violate the law of biogenesis and the cell principle which state that life must come only from life. Secondly,

we find that the first matter could not simply have come into existence from nothing. This is a logical absurdity. Finally, we find that morality in humanity as well as our mental capacity and utter dominance of the physical world make humanity set apart by any reasonable means from the rest of the living world.

1. "The simplest organism capable of independent life, the prokaryotic bacterial cell, is a masterpiece of miniaturized complexity which makes a spaceship seem rather low-tech." ([11], p.102)
2. "The cell needs all its basic parts with their various functions, for survival; therefore, if the cell had evolved, it would have meant that billions of parts would have had to come into existence at the same time, in the same place, and then simultaneously come together in a precise order." ([22], p.15)
3. "...the probability of life originating from accident is comparable to the unabridged dictionary resulting from an explosion in a printing shop!" ([22], p.15)
4. "...research has tended to widen rather than to narrow the gap that exists between organic and inorganic matter." ([4], p.373)
5. "The Law of biogenesis...declares that life must come from life but evolutionists ignore the law by stating that sometime in the past during, supposedly, the early history of the earth, there were processes and conditions that allowed for life to originate from non-life. This, of course, is unproven and an unprovable assumption." ([22], p.14 5)
6. We find that the same elements that supposedly created life in the beginning still exist today. Why can't they then produce life again? ([4], p.373)
7. The cell principle, excepted in Biology and all science, states that all cells come from only pre-existing cells.
8. We certainly observe that life does not derive from non-life now.
9. Life is more than the sum of its parts. This may be why, at least in part, science cannot define life. It can only give the characteristics of living things.
10. Darwin wrote, "The first appearance of new beings...is a mystery of mysteries."
11. All the matter we see, the sun and so forth, are said by evolutionists to have begun by a mixture of gases in the atmosphere. But, from where did the gases come and where did even the space for them come? Science cannot account for something coming from nothing (and neither can common sense account for it) and this is not to even mention the complexity of matter which even adds to this absurdity. In fact, as mentioned, when you have nothing, you do not even have the space for the something that is to come from it.
12. In addition, without the sun, etc., there would be no gravity. Therefore, those supposed gases from which all things supposedly come would simply disseminate into space not draw together to form anything.
13. Morality is generally accepted as a distinct characteristic of humanity. This in itself creates an unbridgeable gap between people and animals.
14. Famous evolutionist Roger Lewin proclaimed of the gap between people and animals, "Our intelligence, our reflective consciousness, our extreme technological facility, our complex spoken language, our sense of moral and ethical values -- each of these is apparently sufficient to set us apart from nature. Together they are seen to give us 'dominion over nature'. He adds that for

- evolutionists this gap is an "embarrassment, something to be explained away." ([15], p.22)
15. Alfred Russell Wallace, considered to be the co-inventor with Darwin of natural selection was said to have "Found this argument (natural selection) convincing until he attempted to explain the advanced state of human faculties." ([15], p.26)
 16. Regarding people's intellectual powers and moral sense among other things, Wallace also asserted that these "could not have been developed by variation and natural selection alone, and..., therefore, some other influence, law, or agency is required to account for them." ([11], p.310) He also concluded, "...a superior intelligence has guided the development of man in a definite direction, and for a special purpose." ([15], p.26)
 17. Wallace along with famous evolutionist Robert Broom concluded "Divine intervention was the only explanation for the origin of the qualities that made Homo Sapiens so special." ([15], p.26)
 18. Many evolutionists have tried to argue that humans are 99% similar chemically to apes and blood precipitation tests do indicate that the chimpanzee is people's closest relative. Yet regarding this we must observe the following: "Milk chemistry indicates that the donkey is man's closest relative." "Cholesterol level tests indicate that the garter snake is man's closest relative." "Tear enzyme chemistry indicates that the chicken is man's closest relative." "On the basis of another type of blood chemistry test, the butter bean is man's closest relative." ([19], p.362)
 19. We find human's dominance over animals as utter and complete making a common ancestry virtually impossible. Wallace and Broom asserted, "The whole purpose, the only raison d'etre (reason for being) of the world...was the development of the human spirit with the human body." ([15], p.26)
 20. Broom asserted, "Much of evolution looks as if it had been planned to result in man, and in other animals and plants to make the world a suitable place for him to dwell in (and therefore)...the evolution of man must have been planned by some spiritual power." ([14], p.42)
 21. Regarding the 99% similarity chemically to apes figure, why is our dominion over the apes so extensive if the 99% is so significant?
 22. Perhaps Darwin would have abandoned his own theory had he realized these three gaps in the order of living things. He stated, "I would give nothing for the theory of natural selection, if it requires miraculous additions at any one stage of descent." ([10], p.33)

EVIDENCE #4

The supposed hominids (creatures in-between ape and human that evolutionists believe used to exist) bones and skull record used by evolutionists often consists of 'finds' which are thoroughly unrevealing and inconsistent. They are neither clear nor conclusive even though evolutionists present them as if they were.

Evolutionists present much of their finds as if they were compelling and factual explanations to human evolution. In fact, they base their conclusions on mere speculation

and often the flimsiest of 'finds'. Many discoveries of supposed hominids consist of only a mouth fragment, a leg bone, a hip bone, or a knee joint. On this alone, they have considered it to be a hominid. They even name it, reconstruct what it looked like, and present it to the public as a fact. Some of these finds have turned out to be those of a pig, donkey, or the result of a hoax. One hoax consisted of someone placing a human skull with an ape's jaw. Evolutionist declared it to be a hominid for fifty years without having done an in depth study of it. Some finds consist of an assortment of fragments found miles apart and then placed together to look as though they came from the same individual. Sometimes rocks as simple as those found in any backyard are called tools of hominids and are pictured in books. Footprints that look identical to any person's today are sometimes declared in books and accepted as those of hominids. The brow ridge that supposedly marked the hominid appears only in one skull.

1. "Our task is not unlike attempting to assemble a 3-dimensional jigsaw puzzle in which most of the pieces are missing, and those few bits which are at hand are broken!" Famous Paleontologist Richard Leakey.
2. "There is a strong tendency for fossils to be presented as if they were lucid texts to be read unambiguously rather than scrappy fragments of unknown morphologies." Famous Paleontologist Misia Landau upon realizing how poor the fossil evidence was. ([14], p.?)
3. "'We've got to have some ancestors. We'll pick those.' Why? 'Because we know they have to be there, and these are the best candidates.' That's by and large the way it has worked. I am not exaggerating." Gareth Nelson of the American Museum of Natural History. ([10], p.74)
4. Several of the supposed finds have relied on mere tooth or jaw fragments. These include Piltdown man, Dryopithecus, Ramapithecus, and Hesperopithecus. (see picture #1) ([9], p.42; [15], p.44)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #1: Ramapithecus, considered the first 'hominid' for twenty years by evolutionists, was based only on these teeth. ([14], p.212)

5. Piltdown was discovered in 1953 to have been nothing more than an Ape's jaw placed with a human skull. It was a hoax placed on purpose. They recognized neither the jaw to be an ape's or the skull to be a human's. Instead, they declared each part as an in between of ape and human. They dated it to be 500,000 years old, gave it a name (Eoanthropus Dawsoni or 'Dawn Man'), and wrote some 500 books on it. The 'discovery' fooled paleontologists for forty five years. (picture #2) ([8], p.24-25)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #2: Scientists often demonstrate an utter inability to interpret their finds with any accuracy. This hoax, a human skull placed with an ape jaw, was not

recognized as a hoax by the field for forty five years. During this time, they declared it to the public as being a human ancestor. ([8], p.25)

6. Ramapithecus lasted twenty years as considered to be the first in-between of humans and apes by judgment based only on teeth. He is now know to be an extinct baboon. (picture #1)
7. Hesperithecus was actually created from one pig's tooth but it fooled the entire paleontology field and dental experts for fourteen years. (picture #3)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #3 Evolutionists often base their conclusions on such small 'evidences' as a single tooth. They reconstruct creatures on this basis alone as pictured here.

8. Similarly, hominids (supposed in between) are declared on the basis of such things as a piece of a leg bone, a hip, or a knee piece, etc. (see picture #4) ([12], p.111; [2], p.51; [9], p.157)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #4: An example of the poor evidence that evolutionists use is this hip bone 'find' that they say marked a 'hominid'.

9. Orce man was based on the skull cap of a donkey.
10. The famous find named Lucy placed together looked nothing more than picture #5 yet it was regarded as a hominid without reservation.

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #5: Popular 'finds' were often based on nothing more than this and even these bones were not even found together or from the same individual. ([8], p.57)

11. Regarding Lucy, in fact, it is known, "Lucy - when they required a knee joint to prove that Lucy walked upright, they used one found more than 200 feet lower in the (earth) and more than two miles away." ([3], p.83)
12. Regarding the finder of Lucy we read, "...he regards the evolution of man from apes as self-evident, but who also regards the evidence as poppycock."
13. Rarely do they even know if the bone set is from the same individual.
14. The Boisei skull was broken in 400 pieces but pieced together and declared as all from the same skull.
15. Regarding the reconstructive drawings always made of these finds we note, "Well-known anthropologist E.A. Hooten has said that from a Neanderthal skull an artist can fashion the features of a chimpanzee or a philosopher and that it is wise to '...put not your faith in reconstructions.'"

16. In addition to being poor, the fossils are also inconsistent. The Boisei skull has a large crest on the top (picture #6) unlike any supposed hominid before it or after it and nothing like any human ever.

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #6: This skull actually has a crest on the top (as ape skulls only, right picture) but it was declared as a human ancestor. ([\[2\]](#), p.139)

17. The brow over the eyes which supposedly characterized lesser humans existed in none of the fossils prior to Neanderthal or after.
18. Paleontologists have called simple rocks as hominid tools. (picture #7)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #7: These simple rocks are actually declared by evolutionists to be tools of 'hominids'. ([\[12\]](#), p.100,105)

19. Even bones and teeth were picked as tools of hominids. (picture #8)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #8: Evolutionists have declared nondescript bone and tooth remains to be tools of 'hominids'. Pictured is one evolutionist demonstrating its use. ([\[8\]](#), p.59)

20. The most non-descript footprints were called those of hominids. (picture #9)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #9: These footprints were actually declared by evolutionists as those of 'hominids'.

21. **Biochemists Allen Wilson and Vincent Sarich discovered that the first people had to originate less than 200,000 years ago and could only have come from an original two people.** This made virtually all the paleontologist's dates wrong and made all the posited bushes of human origins incorrect. ([\[15\]](#), p.130-131)
22. "(That modern humans evolved in many different areas at the same time) is theoretically implausible based on current knowledge (in population genetics)." Popular geneticist Shahin Rouhani ([\[15\]](#), p.133)
23. Famous Paleontologist Roger Lewin admits, "The mitochondrial DNA technique appears to support the Noah's Ark hypothesis (that we originated from one set of people at the same location not many people and places as the evolutionists concluded). ([\[15\]](#), p.130-131)
24. Outside the strict fossil evidence, therefore, each branch of scientific analysis that has focused on the origin of modern humans - mitochondrial DNA, population genetics, ecology - has cast its vote to replacement, the Noah's Ark Hypothesis.

25. The paleontologist dates had to be changed. They had hominids dating as far back as 63 million years.
26. Biochemists and Molecular Biologists note that inferring relationships from fossils was "Fraught with potential error." ([14], p.105)
27. Sarich put it bluntly, "...it (a fossil) could not be (a hominid), because it was too old." ([13], p.76)
28. Paleontologists were slow to admit their errors or even look at any of the data. At first they just "...trimmed (their) dates...just in case there was something in it (the biochemistry data)." Famous Paleontologist David Pilbeam ([14], p.116). Wilson stated that the paleontologists "...functioned as if we did not exist. They just ignored us." ([14], p.116)
29. **After fifteen years, the paleontologists reluctantly accepted the biochemistry evidence. "We anthropologists were forced to admit we had been wrong and that Sarich and Wilson were closer to the right track than any of us had even imagined."** Paleontologist Richard Leakey. ([13], p.78)
30. Paleontologists had been producing a new lineage every 10 - 20 years for 60 years. ([21], p.186) They could not draw these since, "To put it crudely, the appearance in a single species of a combination of characteristics some of which appear early...while others appear late." ([15], p.76)
31. Famous Paleontologist David Pilbeam, regarding two of the finds now known not to be hominids, observes, "We should have been aware how flimsy our original arguments had been and that should have made us more cautious. But it didn't." ([14], p.100)
32. "That 130 years of very determined efforts to confirm Darwinism have done no better than to find a few ambiguous supporting examples is significant negative evidence." ([11], p.84)

EVIDENCE #5

Nine of the twelve popularly supposed hominids are actually extinct apes/monkeys and not part human at all.

The first nine of the twelve popularly regarded hominids put forth by evolutionists by bone and skull finds have been demonstrated as being extinct apes or monkeys and not part human at all. The discovery of extinct apes demonstrated some of the finds to be monkeys/ apes. Close examination of the skulls and bones have caused experts to determine that none of the other skulls have any human characteristics either. The bones and skulls found could be any of the perhaps thousands of monkeys and apes that have existed in the past. These bones and skulls have never been found apart from where apes/monkeys live or have lived.

1. The first nine of the supposed hominids are actually apes/monkeys and nothing more (picture #10).

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #10: The first nine popularly regarded 'hominids' put forth and here reconstructed by evolutionists, have been found to be fully monkeys/ apes and not part human at all. The drawings are very misrepresentative, of course. ([8], poster that accompanies book)

Major Evidences Against Each Supposed Hominid Above

1. PLIOPITHECUS:

- (A) #5, Ramapithecus, was shown to be that of an extinct relative of the orangutan. #1 was placed on the chart before #5 because it seemed more monkey-like than #5. It stands to reason that it too was a monkey and not part human.
- (B) #1 was named as a hominid because it looked like a cross between two monkeys, the spider monkey and the gibbon, not because it looked part human.

2. PROCONSUL:

- (A) Same as above.
- (B) Same as above.

3. DRYOPITHECUS:

- (A) Same as (A) of #1 and #2.
- (B) #3 is based only on a lower jaw fragment which later became known as that of an extinct ape's.

4. OREOPITHECUS:

- (A) Same as (A) of #1, #2, and #3.
- (B) #4 is based only on teeth and pelvis remains.

5. RAMIPITHECUS:

- (A) Fossil finds in 1982 and 1988 showed that #5 was only an extinct relative of the orangutan and not part human at all.
- (B) #5 was based only on a set of teeth.

6. AUSTRALOPITHECUS AFRICANUS:

- (A) #6 was found to be the skull of a baby ape whose apelike features had not yet fully developed because it was still a baby.
- (B) #6 was studied by a team of scientists which concluded that the skull had no human features at all.

7. AUSTRALOPITHECUS ROBUSTUS:

- (A) #7 was based only on a skull with a crest on the top which is a feature in apes but not in humans. The feature does not appear in any supposed hominid skulls before or after it to any degree.
- (B) Same as (B) of #6.

8. AUSTRALOPITHECUS BOISEI:

- (A) Same as (A) of #7.
- (B) Same as (B) of #6 and #7.

9. AUSTRALOPITHECUS AFARENSIS: (Lucy)

- (A) #9 is based on fragments to a skeleton found miles apart and at greatly varying depths and then placed together as if from the same

individual. The fragments are also small with most of the skeleton missing.

- (B) Same as (B) of #6, #7, and #8.

2. Number five of picture #10, Ramapithecus, became known as an ape when a fossil face of an extinct ape was found in Pakistan in 1982 and in Turkey in 1980. It was called Sivapithecus. "(The two finds) allowed paleontologists to recognize that this extinct ape is related to the living orangutan. Now, as Ramapithecus is clearly closely related to Sivapithecus, it too must be related to the orangutan." ([14], p.86) As famous paleontologist Roger Lewin notes, "(The status of Ramapithecus went) from putative first human in 1961 to extent relative of the orangutan in 1982." ([14], p.86) This conclusion is accepted by virtually everyone in the field. (picture #1)
3. Since Ramapithecus was an ape, so too, it should be concluded, were the first four of the supposed hominids. The first four were placed before Ramapithecus precisely because they looked even more ape or monkey like than Ramapithecus itself.
4. In fact, the first and second ones on picture #10, Pliopithecus and Proconsul, were named as hominids only because they looked like a cross between certain known monkeys. It never had anything to do with being part human at all. It is observed, "Pliopithecus resembled a modern day spider monkey except for its skull, face and teeth, which looked like those of a gibbon." ([8], p.41)
5. The third one, Dryopithecus "...has been reconstructed primarily by using (lower) jaw and tooth fragments." ([8], p.42) What is more, its lower jaw was discovered as fitting perfectly with the ape (accepted as not part human) Kenyapithecus. We read, "I was looking at these specimens but the lower jaw (of Dryopithecus) with the Kenyapithecus upper and saw that they fit perfectly the overall shape, the detailed anatomy, everything. They might well have belonged to the same individual." Peter Andrews
6. Oreopithecus, the fourth supposed hominid, is written about as follows, "Once thought to be ancestral to man because of its teeth and pelvis, it is now regarded as an aberrant ape or an aberrant relative of monkeys." Paleontologist Clark Howell ([8], p.42)
7. The sixth one, Australopithecus Africanus, is to be considered an ape/ monkey and nothing more on the basis of several evidences. Dean Falk, specialist in neuroanatomy, concluded this about Australopithecus Africanus, "In his 1975 article, Dart (founder of the fossil that represented Australopithecus Africanus) had claimed that the brain of Taung (the name of the fossil) was humanlike. As it turned out, he was wrong about that." ([2], p.13) Falk explains, "...Taung's humanlike features were overemphasized...because it was a child. Like humans, (apes and monkeys) go through stages as they grow up. In his analysis of Taung, Dart did not fully appreciate that infant apes have not had time to develop features of the skull, such as thickened eyebrow ridges or attachment areas for heavy neck muscles, that set adult apes apart from human. Apparently he did not carefully

- consider the possibility that Taung's rounded forehead or the inferred position of the spinal cord might be due to the immaturity of the apelike specimen rather than to its resemblance to humans." ([2], p.12-3)
8. Roger Lewin, Famous paleontologist concurred saying, "...juvenile apes have a very humanlike form." ([14], p.78)
 9. Falk adds, "In all major respects, the Taung endocast appears apelike, not humanlike." ([2], p.47) "...it was an unfortunate error (misidentifying the lambdoid suture as the lunate sulcus) that caused Dart to suggest that australopithecine brains were humanlike." ([2], p.34)
 10. Prominent anatomist at the time of Dart's discovery, Arthur Keith, wrote, "(Dart's) claim is preposterous, the skull is that of a young anthropoid ape...and showing so many points of affinity with the two living African anthropoids, the gorilla and chimpanzee, that there cannot be a moment's hesitation in placing the fossil form in this living group. ([10], p.56)
 11. Australopithecus Robustus, number seven on the list, and Australopithecus Boisei, number eight, rest on very inconsistent assumptions. Their skulls actually have crests on the top (picture #6). This crest appears in male apes (picture #6) but not in humans at all.
 12. The final Australopithecus, Australopithecus Afarensis or Advanced Australopithecus, also named Lucy and is number nine on the chart, is based only on that of picture #5. What is more, these fragments were placed together by diggers who found them miles apart and hundreds of feet deeper.
 13. In addition, "...Johanson (the one who put the parts together and found them) admits that from the neck up, 'Lucy' was ape (she had the jaws, teeth, face, and brain of an ape)..." ([3], p.83) Roger Lewin notes that Lucy seemed to be an ape's head on a human's body. ([15], p.59)
 14. Regarding all four of the Australopithecus types, we find the following "Lord Zuckerman (Dr. Solly Zuckerman), a famous British anatomist,...had a team of scientists, rarely numbering less than four, who studied the fossils of Australopithecus for 15 years. They used the most sophisticated methods of anatomical study available to analyze these fossils. After many years of study and research, Lord Zuckerman declared that Australopithecus did not walk upright, and that these creatures were not intermediate between ape and man. Lord Zuckerman's team concluded that they were not the same as any modern ape living today, but they were, nevertheless, nothing more than apes." ([1], p.84) He added, "...the anatomical basis for the claim that (they) walked and ran upright like man is so much more flimsy than the evidence which points to the conclusion that their gait was some variant of what one sees in subhuman primates, that it remains unacceptable." ([11], p.82) "He Zuckerman, says that if we exclude the possibility of creation, then, obviously, man must have evolved from an ape like creature but if he did there is no evidence for it in the fossil record. Lord Zuckerman makes no profession of being a creationist. If the evidence supported evolution, he would readily accept it." ([1], p.84)
 15. "Dr. Charles Oxnard, (professor of anatomy), ...studied the postcranial skeleton (that portion of the skeleton below the skull) of Australopithecus. He employed the very latest techniques for his research. Dr. Oxnard, even though he is not a

- creationist, has declared that his research has established that these creatures did not walk upright like humans, that they were not intermediate between apes and man...Other scientists have come to somewhat similar conclusions." ([\[11\]](#), p.84)
16. Dean Falk, brain specialist, regarding the four Australopithecus types, note their rejection by scientists as anything more than monkeys/ apes, "Since 1985, much new evidence has come to light that shows australopithecines were much more apelike than previously believed. As I write this book, the accepted view of Taung and the other australopithecines has taken a 180 degree turn because of the research on dentition and locomotion by numerous young investigators whose work has already been discussed: Bill Jungers, Holly Smith, Tim Bromage, Mike Vannier, and Glenn Conroy. Although the 'australopithecines-humanlike' school still has its diehards, they no longer hold the majority opinion...And, the endocasts of australopithecines are, of course, just as apelike as they can be." (picture #13)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #13: Above are the skulls used for numbers 6-9 on picture #10. They can be shown to be those of extinct monkeys/ apes and not part human at all.

17. It is apparent even to the naked eye that these skulls were monkeylike. Here is another monkey skull for comparison. (picture #11) ([\[12\]](#), p.52)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #11: Many skulls are those of extinct monkeys and apes. Here is a skull of one known extinct monkey. It, of course, greatly resembles the 'finds' of evolutionists. ([\[8\]](#), p.31)

18. We find that all of these species were found only where monkeys and apes exist or have existed and nowhere else. We find also that the total number of species of monkeys and apes is 166 today with a possible hundreds of additional extinct ones. These finds could be any of them. (picture #12)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #12: These charts show where the supposed human ancestors were found (left) and where monkeys/ apes have existed (right). As expected, the supposed 'hominids' are not found anywhere that monkeys or apes have not existed supporting the fact that these supposed 'hominids' are actually only extinct monkey/ apes.

19. Therefore, Solly Zuckerman and many others conclude (paraphrase), "...variation among ape fossils is sufficiently great (such) that a scientist whose imagination was fired by the desire to find ancestors could easily pick out some features in an ape fossil and decide that they were 'pre-human'." ([\[11\]](#), p.82)

EVIDENCE #6

The final three supposed hominids put forth by evolutionists are actually modern human beings and not part monkey/ape at all. Therefore, all twelve of the supposed hominids can be explained as being either fully monkey/ape or fully modern human but not as something in between.

The last three of the popular twelve hominids have been demonstrated as being modern human beings. Human skulls naturally vary in size and many other characteristics. They often also are misshapen by certain diseases such as rickets, arthritis, Paget's disease, congenital syphilis, and starvation. Skulls found with diseases or normal human variations could lead one to suppose that certain modern human skulls are something less than human. This has been a great mistake by evolutionists who not only have failed to recognize variance in human skulls but also to make the public aware of it as well.

1. On picture #14, Homo Erectus, number 10, is an actual modern human being and nothing less. One Homo Erectus find, called Peking Man, was based on but one tooth. "Davidson Black...became convinced that it (the one tooth) was a human tooth...He then confidently announced a new genus of man." ([\[8\]](#), p.78)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #14: The final three popularly regarded 'hominids' put forth and here reconstructed by evolutionists, have been found to be fully modern human and not part monkey/ape at all.

Major Evidences Against Each Supposed Hominid Above

- 10. HOMO ERECTUS: #10 was regarded as sub-human because its brain size was once thought to be out of the range of humans being too small. It is now known that its size is nearly the average size of a modern European's.
 - 11. NEANDERTHAL MAN: #11 was found by medical experts to be a full modern human being whose brain was deformed simply by arthritis deformans.
 - 12. CRO MAGNON MAN: #12 is indistinguishable from a modern human being. It was placed on the chart only because of cave drawings that were found and thought to be primitive.
2. Another, Rhodesia Man (one Homo Erectus), was reported as follows, "Paleontologists pointed out that this...creature...had undoubtedly suffered from tooth decay. It was difficult to imagine how this disease of civilization could have attacked prehistoric man. And two very odd holes in the side of the skull caused

- the experts even greater perplexity. In the view of Professor Mair of Berlin they looked like the entry and exit holes of a modern bullet." ([20], p.155)
3. Regarding another Homo Erectus type, prominent medical authority of the day, Rudolf Virchow, noted, "I know such growths, and have treated many patients who had them. If these patients had not been well looked after they would have died."
 4. Homo Erectus was considered primitive only because of his brain size. He was "...modern of limb but more primitive of brain." ([8], p.42) Yet his brain was considered primitive only because it was supposedly smaller than the modern. However, regarding its size, it is noted, "...there are men of marked intelligence walking about today whose brains are as small or smaller than this." In fact, its brain is said to extend "...into the middle range of Homo Sapiens." ([8], p.42)
 5. Regarding the final two on the chart, Neanderthal Man and Cro Magnon Man, numbers 10 and 11, we read, "...from all the evidence, many scientists agree that they would be indistinguishable from modern man." ([22], p.21)
 6. On the Neanderthal finds, medical expert Rudolf Virchow declared, "The curved leg bones were the result of rickets (vitamin deficiency)...the knots of bone above the eyes had been caused by damage to the skull, and other special features of the skeleton were the result of arthritis deformans." (picture #15) ([23], p.57)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #15: Evolutionists have failed to recognize certain diseases which affect human bone and skull formation. As a result, they have declared deformed modern human bones and skulls to be human ancestors. The photo on the left demonstrates the result of arthritis on human legs making the person walk more apelike. The photo on the right demonstrates a modern human skull deformed by disease. Neanderthal man was based on nothing more than finds of modern human skulls and bones with diseases.

7. One book even pictures a modern man and suggests that Neanderthal looked just like him. (picture #16)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #16: Some books picture a modern man and state it to be what Neanderthal Man would have looked like (left photo) and what Cro-Magnon Man would have looked like (right photo). This supports the fact that they were actual modern human beings. Skulls that are of modern humans have actually been declared to the public by evolutionists to be human ancestors.

8. Decades later he was shown to be correct. The field accepted his conclusion but continued to embrace Neanderthal as less than a person. "The curvatures in the limb bones, and other deformities, led scientists to believe that Neanderthal walked with a stooped, bent kneed gait. Decades later, it was shown that these were in fact the remains of an old individual crippled with arthritis." ([10], p.47)

- Picture #15 shows how rickets affects bones and disease affects skulls. Other diseases which affect skulls are Paget's disease and Congenital Syphilis; both are hereditary. (This is significant since all the Neanderthal people were from the same group of people at the same place.). (picture #15)
9. "Scientists have concluded that all of the so-called primitive features of Neanderthal people were due to pathological conditions, or diseases." ([3], p.81) In addition, we find Neanderthal people to have buried their dead, which demonstrates care for the dead, an awareness of the transitory nature of life, and perhaps has religious significance. These are hardly that of supposed primitive people.
 10. Of Cro Magnon Man, it is reported as "...indistinguishable in body and brain" from modern man. ([2], p.42) It is reported that he is "...identical to a modern European." ([3], p.85) Indeed, authorities agree, "Cro Magnon was, in the anatomical sense, truly modern Homo Sapiens. The fossilized remains are identical with those of people living today." ([12], p.142)
 11. One book even pictures a modern man and says that this is what Cro-Magnon Man looked like. (Picture #16)
 12. Cro-Magnon is credited with the famous cave drawings yet these drawings and sculptures are considered by the same people as "...so powerfully conceived and executed that they rank among mankind's greatest artistic achievements of all time." ([8], p.155)
 13. These drawings and engravings picture people in burial poses and with their hair in a bun or short plaits, and wearing headbands. (picture #17)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #17: One supposed human ancestor, Cro-Magnon Man, was said to have made this sculpture even though the woman has braided hair. Other acts such as the wearing of headbands and burying dead are also attributed to this supposed ancestor.

14. Variance in human skulls should have been expected. The encyclopedia The Human Body notes, "The skull of man demonstrates many variations." Among them is "the pronounced brow ridges." ([21], p.112) (picture #18)

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #18: Normal variation in human skulls has not been taken into consideration by evolutionists. This modern human skull, for example, has the prominent brow ridge that supposedly was the mark of a human ancestor.

15. The fact that evolutionists were attempting to find apelike features in these modern skulls is apparent. The reconstruction in picture #19 makes this point obvious.

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #19: Efforts by evolutionists to find apelike features in modern human skulls is obvious. Above is the reconstruction, by an evolutionist, from a skull that can be shown to be a modern human.

Sorry, no picture yet -- awaiting publisher's approval.

Picture #20: Above are the skulls used for numbers 10-12 on picture #13. They can be shown to be those of actual modern human beings and not part ape at all.

16. Naturally, we find these three supposed hominids to be the only finds to be located where monkeys and apes are not found. ([\[12\]](#), p.88)

EVIDENCE #7

Natural selection can be seen to have insurmountable social and practical inconsistencies.

Socially, natural selection argues that the best and fittest society would be one where its' individuals look out only for themselves and would advance themselves, if possible, at the expense of others. It would even destroy others if possible. Thus barbarianism is demanded by natural selection with the destruction of the weak and the free domain of the powerful. It demands total annihilation of anything weaker than necessary and the ruling of anyone more powerful than others. People exhibit mercy, pity, and morality, all of which inhibit natural selection.

Practically, natural selection has the following and many other inconsistencies: (a.) The natural selection process could not have the forethought to allow an organism to become worse temporarily in order to ultimately form an eye, for example. (b.) Natural selection requires that organisms began as crude, yet an organism could not have survived without basic intricate functions such as respiration and reproduction. These had to exist from the beginning of the organism. (c.) Our bodies depend on systems that run according to intricate order such as from DNA. A system dependent on order cannot be created by disorder.

1. Socially, natural selection requires barbarianism. One famous author, favorable to natural selection, admits, "Barbarism is the only process by which man has organically progressed and civilization is the only process by which he has declined. Civilization is the most dangerous enterprise on which man has ever set." ([\[4\]](#), p.350)
2. It lacks mercy and pity and anything else that might make us moral or even social and not harmful. "No more cruel doctrine was ever promulgated. Those who believe it are robbed of the pity and mercy that comes of civilization." ([\[4\]](#), p.350)
3. Natural Selection commends savages who eliminate the weak. It commended the ruthless takeover of the Native Indian of North America, the destruction of Jews

- in the Holocaust, and all other acts where the powerful ruthlessly have their way. It names all who kill as better. It would name a country that destroys all others as best.
4. Natural Selection argues against such things as vaccinations that help the weak. It demands that the weaker not reproduce so that society not be 'dragged down'.
 5. Even animals, however, exhibit altruism. Walruses sacrifice their lives for their young. Some herd animals provide warning signals for the herd which put themselves at personal risk. Bees and ants function together and not merely in competition. And, of course, so do people do all these things. Yet Darwin stated, "If it could be proved that any species had been formed for the exclusive good of another species, it would annihilate my theory for such could not have been produced through natural selection. ([11], p.30)
 6. Natural selection, practically speaking, is impossible. "How can such things be built up by infinitesimally small inherited variations each profitable to the preserved being? The first step towards a new function such as vision or the ability to fly would not necessarily provide any advantage unless the other parts required for the function appeared at the same time." ([11], p.?)
 7. Natural selection demands progress at every step of change. It cannot have forethought and planning and thus bear up with say a half formed eye in order to form the eye. How then was the eye produced since natural selection demands it to have been partly formed at some point. "It seems that evolutionists, whether consciously or unconsciously, have regarded the blind and inanimate forces of the environment, or nature, as having the ability to create and think." ([22], p.11)
 8. The world is full of interdependence and it makes natural selection unthinkable. How did lungs form if lungs are necessary for our lives from the start? How did we reproduce if it took millions of years for our reproduction systems to evolve? Reproduction was necessary for survival but how could natural selection create this? One sex had to exist before natural selection would bring another sex into existence. How did the first sex get there and how did reproduction take place while the other sex was forming? Or, are we to believe that they just both formed independently perfectly suited for one another? An infinite amount of other such examples can be stated since the world is full of interdependence.
 9. The world is also made up of order. For example, we find that the process by which life sustains itself is a very highly ordered one. "... DNA and protein formation must be described by making quite literal use of the linguistic terms code, transcribe, and translate. We speak of a genetic code, of DNA being transcribed into RNA, and RNA being translated into protein. The genetic code is composed of letters (nucleotide), words (codons or triplets), sentences (genes), and paragraphs (operons), chapters (chromosomes), and books (living organisms). Such talk is not anthropomorphic, it is literal. Living organisms do not contain only order but information as well. By contrast to the simple repetition of ME, the genetic code is like the Encyclopedia Britannica." ([17], p.51) Order, as from DNA, is essential for the survival of living things.
 10. Regarding the parts that make us up, it is obvious that nothing works until everything works as is noted, "...the real trouble arises because too much of the

complexity seems to be necessary to the whole way in which organisms work." ([11], p.10) A.G. Cairns-Smith, pro-natural selection.

11. Indeed, we find as James Crow, a modern leader for the theory of evolution admits, "...the details (of how it could have taken place) are difficult and obscure." ([19], p.48)
12. Creation, as we find it, must have been made complete and functional from the beginning.
13. In addition, we find that there simply is not nearly enough time for change as is given by pro-theory people. If no change has occurred in the last 4,000, it is unreasonable to suppose so much change (or any for that matter) could have occurred in 25,000,000 years. This figure is only about 6,000 times 4,000. Therefore, if we take the amount of change over the last 4,000 years and multiply it by 6,000 we do not nearly get the change evolutionists propose. In fact, we get no change or no evolution. Evolutionists themselves say that species remain unchanged in fossil records for an average of 10,000,000 years. Therefore, how could 60,000,000 years, or even many more, make a creature change in any noticeable way?

EVIDENCE #8

Natural selection has severe logical inconsistencies.

Natural selection has these and many other logical inconsistencies: (a.) Although evolutionists say that organisms are suited for their environment because they evolved into it, being suited for the environment is much better explained by the fact that they were created for the environment rather than that they evolved into it. (b.) The fact that living things have similar patterns and design points to a common designer better than to a common ancestor. In fact, such variety in the world could not have been produced if we all come from the same ancestor. (c.) If we all come from the same ancestor, we would all be murderers and cannibals by the simple act of killing a cow. (d.) While small and undeveloped things do become grown and developed (a baby to an adult, a seed to a tree) it is also true that the small and undeveloped first come from the developed (a baby from its parents, a seed from a tree). The pattern of growth is circular not simply from the crude to the developed as natural selection proposes. (e.) Our needs exceed those of survival. Needs for love and friendship, for example, cannot be explained if all that we do is for survival. (f.) Order and interdependence in the world argues for a designer and against chance.

1. That living things are suited for their environment better explains the fact that they were created for it not that they evolved into it. ([22], p.)
2. Similarity among living things points to a common design by a designer who used similar patterns.
3. Similarity among living things does not point to evolution. "There is no more reason to believe that man descended from some inferior animal as there is to believe that a stately mansion has descended from a cottage." ([4], p.357)

4. It only makes sense that there would be similarities among living things since they all share the same environment. For example, since we all share air, it makes sense that many would have lungs.
5. It only makes sense to create things similar since similarity allows people to identify and work with other living things more easily.
6. In fact, if the environment controls natural selection and we are all from the same ancestor (some single cell or whatever), why is there such variety in the world? With the same ancestor and precipitator, would all not have been brought to at least close to the same end? Instead some living things are cells and plants, others are horses and people.
7. In fact, since the environment is constant, it must be asked, 'Why did some species evolve and not others?' and 'Why did lesser forms survive and more developed ones die off?'
8. In response, statements such as "...the apes ...blew it through indolence. No pain, no gain." ([13], p.70) and "...the gorilla and chimpanzee gave up the struggle for mental supremacy because they were satisfied with their circumstances." ([14], p.35)
9. "It is true that we do see all around us things growing up to perfection from small and rude beginnings but then it is equally true that the small and rude beginnings themselves always come from some full grown and developed thing. All adults were once babies, true: but then all babies were begotten and born by adults. Corn does come from seed: but then seed comes from corn." "The first crude engine, the Rocket, came, not from still a cruder engine, but from something much more perfect than itself and much more complex, the mind of man..." ([4], p.388)
Famous philosopher C.S. Lewis.
10. "In the world I know, the perfect produces the imperfect, which again becomes perfect -- egg leads to bird and bird to egg -- in endless succession. If there ever was a life which sprang of its own accord out of a purely inorganic universe, or a civilization which raised itself by its own shoulder straps out of pure savagery, then this event was totally unlike the beginnings of every subsequent life and every subsequent civilization." C.S. Lewis ([4], p.389)
11. "You have to go outside the sequence of engines, into the world of men, to find the real originator of the Rocket. Is it not equally reasonable to look outside Nature for the real Originator of the natural order?" C.S. Lewis ([4], p.389)
12. We find that natural selection would have had to create not only better survival abilities but also such needs as love, companionship, and other things not bound to personal survival such as reproduction. There is so much more to people than just survival abilities. How could natural selection have produced this?
13. We find that the world was obviously made for humankind and this demands more than change for survival but order, interdependence, and design.
14. In addition, how is it that we do things harmful to ourselves if the environment has created all that we are for our personal good and survival?
15. If there are not fundamental distinctions in the living world, we must be considered murderers when we kill even a cow and also cannibals when we eat it.

16. Do we look at an airplane and say that the order and interdependence could have come about by chance? How can we look at something infinitely more complex (a person, for example) and say it?

EVIDENCE #9

The rock strata finds (layers of buried fossils) are better explained by a universal flood than by evolution.

The Rock Strata is better explained by a universal flood than by gradual normal death of organisms over millions of years recorded in the rock as evolutionists assert. A large flood is necessary for the formation of fossils in the first place. Fossils require quick and tremendous pressure to be formed. Without this, a carcass not only could not form a fossil over time but would be eaten by scavengers or destroyed by bacteria. The circulating water of a flood (along with gravity) would cause smaller organisms to naturally bury lower and more mobile organisms, with ability to temporarily avoid the flood, would be buried close to the top for this reason. Such things as fish, which are already low in the sea, would also naturally be buried low. A universal flood has been well documented historically as having occurred. Evolutionists have used fossils in rock sediments to say that simpler organisms were at the bottom of the sediment and more complex ones were at the top. They have ignored the great inconsistencies in the finds for which a flood could account but not the evolutionary process. In fact, in some strata, a tree can be seen protruding through several layer which supposedly formed over millions of years.

1. The columns in the rock strata are actually made up from different regions of the world. The full rock strata is found nowhere in the world. It is made up of columns superimposed from different regions all over the world. The whole strata is 100 miles thick but there is no locality more than one mile and even this locality is the Grand Canyon. ([18], p.35)
2. The rock strata consists of a plethora of contradictions and reversals. Often the strata that is supposed to be old is found on top and vice versa. Often they are horizontal with one another. ([18], p.35)
3. "Although sometimes there may be evidences of physical disturbance (leading to faulting and holding) in these 'upside down' areas, it is quite often true that they can only be revealed by an 'unnatural sequence of fossils,' which means that the fossils are not found in the order presupposed by their evolutionary relationship." ([19], p.54)
4. Evolutionist Walter E. Lammerts reports, "The actual percentage of area showing this progressive order from the simple to the complex is surprisingly small. Indeed formations with very complex forms of life are often found resting directly on the basic granites. Furthermore, I have in my own files a list of over 500 cases that attest to a reverse order, that is, simple forms of life resting on top of more advanced types." ([19], p.54)
5. "In order to account for these numerous exceptions to the supposed universal order of evolutionary development as revealed in the fossiliferous rocks, theory

- has to be piled on top of theory. Thus, the missing ages indicated by a disconformity are explained by a supposed regional uplift and period of erosion. An inverted order of fossils is explained by a regional uplift followed by a horizontal thrust fault followed by a period of erosion, and so forth. One is reminded of Occam's Razor, the principle that cautions against any unnecessary multiplication of hypotheses to explain a given set of phenomena." ([19], p.54)
6. "...in various parts of the earth there are fossils of trees that protrude through several layers which indicates that these layers were deposited and formed almost simultaneously and not over millions of years..." ([22], p.28)
 7. Rock strata is far better explained by a universal flood rather than millions of years.
 8. "The usual order of deposition of fossils (as noted before, there are many, many exceptions to this usual order) would be such that the simpler fossils would be deposited near the bottom, and the more complex fossils near the top of each local geographic column. The hydrodynamic sorting action of moving water is quite efficient, so that each stratum would tend to contain an assemblage of fossils of similar shapes and sizes. Simple organisms, dwelling at the lower elevations, would normally also be buried at the lower elevations. More complex animals, larger and more mobile, and dwelling at higher levels, would obviously tend to be buried, if caught by the sediments at all, only at higher elevations. Very few birds, higher mammals, and especially men, would be overtaken and buried, but would usually float on the surface until consumed by scavengers or simply decomposed." ([18], p.40) For this reason as well fossil fuels could not have been created as evolutionists state they were; the animals would decompose before they would be buried over years upon years.
 9. A catastrophe such as a universal flood is necessary for fossils to form. "Fossils of animals, for example, are formed when animals are buried quickly and under tremendous pressure so that their bones or imprint are preserved in rock. If living things are not buried quickly and under enormous pressure, they will not be fossilized. Most of the many millions of fossils in the world are found in rock which has been affected by water, and, therefore, the fossils of these animals were formed as a result of the animals being buried suddenly and quickly under tremendous water pressure." ([22], p.27)
 10. An evolutionist geologist wrote, "A carcass after death is almost sure to be torn apart or devoured by carnivores or other scavengers, and if it escapes these larger enemies, bacteria insure the decay of all but the hard parts, and even they crumble to dust after a few years if exposed to the weather. If buried under moist sediment or standing water, however, weathering is prevented, decay is greatly reduced, and scavengers cannot disturb the remains. For these reasons burial soon after death is the most important condition favoring preservation...Water-borne sediments are so much more widely distributed than all other kinds, that they include the great majority of all fossils. Flooded streams drown and bury their victims in the shifting channel sands or in the mud of the valley floor." ([19], p.63)
 11. "For example, there would naturally be a tendency for those sediments and organisms which occupied the lowest elevations before the flood to be buried

deepest by the flood. Thus, simple marine organisms and marine sediments would tend to be buried deepest, then fishes and more complex marine creatures, then reptiles and amphibians, then mammals, and finally, man. Another factor controlling to some extent the order of deposition of the sediments and the organisms contained in them would be that of the relation between the specific gravity and the hydrodynamic drag. Each particle of material, as well as the remains of each animal, would tend to fall by gravity out of the aqueous mixture in which it was being carried. This tendency would be resisted by the hydrodynamic drag force of the water acting upward on it. The latter depends on the state of turbulence of the water and also on the shape of the object, being greatest for objects of complex shape and least for objects of streamlined shape. Thus there would be a tendency for organisms of high density and simple structure to settle out most rapidly and, therefore, to be buried deepest. This factor of hydrodynamic selectivity is often highly efficient and would tend to cause rather highly sorted sediments and fossils, with organisms of similar size and shape being buried together. A third factor which would have an important effect, so far as living organisms were concerned, would be their relative abilities to escape the onrushing flood waters by retreating to higher ground. The simpler, less mobile, smaller creatures would thus be caught and trapped first, whereas higher animals, and especially man, would often be able to retreat to the very highest points of the region before being inundated. This too would mean that most men and higher animals would never be buried at all in sediments, but would float on the surface of the waters until decomposed or destroyed by scavenger fish." ([22], p.73)

12. The flood would have to have been a universal one since local floods would not have produced the pressure that would be needed. ([15], p.27)
13. An event of a universal flood is accounted for "...by hundreds of reflections of this...great event handed down in the legends and historical records of practically all nations and tribes in the earth." ([19], p.65)

Bias Towards Evolution

Evolutionists often have come forth and admitted their own and their colleagues' extreme degree of bias in this matter. Some have admitted that their approach has not been scientific or objective at all. Many admit to the severe lack of evidence for evolution and that they have accepted their conclusions only because they are unwilling to accept that evolution never occurred. (And other final considerations.)

1. "Paleontologists seem to have thought it their duty to protect the rest of us from the erroneous conclusions we might have drawn if we had known the actual state of the evidence." ([11], p.59)
2. "We (evolutionists) have been telling our students for years not to accept any statement on its face value but to examine the evidence, and, therefore, it is rather a shock to discover that we have failed to follow our own sound advice." John T, Bonner ([19], p.91)

3. "We Paleontologists have said that the history of life supports (the story of gradual adaptive change), all the while really knowing that it does not." Miles Eldredge, pro-evolution ([\[11\]](#), p.59)
4. "...the philosophy of evolution is based upon assumptions that cannot be scientifically verified...whatever evidence can be assembled for evolution is both limited and circumstantial in nature." G.A. Kerkut, pro-evolution ([\[4\]](#), p.363)
5. "(the record of reckless speculation of human origins) is so astonishing that it is legitimate to ask whether much science is yet to be found in this field at all." Solly Zuckerman ([\[11\]](#), p.82)
6. "In other words, while Osborn, Gregory, and their colleagues considered themselves to have written scientific analysis of human evolution, they had in fact been telling stories (fiction). Scientific stories to be sure, but stories nonetheless." Misia Landau, paraphrase ([\[14\]](#), p.32)
7. "The more one studies paleontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone." T.L. Moor, pro-evolution ([\[22\]](#), p.22)
8. "We cannot disprove that it (the universe) was created in 4004 B.C...." George Simpson, pro-evolution
9. "...objective examination has rarely been the object of Darwinist paleontology. The Darwinist approach has consistently been to find some supporting fossil evidence, claim it as 'proof' for 'evolution', and then ignore all the difficulties." ([\[11\]](#), p.84)
10. "It is, in fact, a common fantasy, promulgated mostly by the scientific profession itself, that in the search for objective truth, data dictate conclusions." "Data are just as often molded to fit preferred conclusions." Roger Lewin, pro-evolutionist ([\[14\]](#), p.68)
11. "I have come to believe that many statements we make about the how and whys of human evolution say as much about us, the paleoanthropologists and the larger society in which we live, as about anything that really happened." David Pilbeam, pro-evolution ([\[14\]](#), p.85)
12. "We do not see things the way they are; we see them the way we are." David Pilbeam, pro-evolution ([\[5\]](#), p.?)
13. "...in my own subject of paleoanthropology, 'theory' heavily influenced by implicit ideas (assumptions) almost always dominates 'data'...Ideas that are totally unrelated to actual fossils have dominated theory building, which in turn strongly influences the way fossils are interpreted." David Pilbeam, pro-evolution ([\[14\]](#), p.127)
14. "Racism, as we would characterize it today, was explicit in the writings of virtually all the major anthropologists of the first century, simply because it was the generally accepted view." ([\[14\]](#), p.307)
15. We must note then that when Darwin wrote his paper, Origin of Species, he had no skulls, his contemporaries were filled with racism as they tried to find the less than humans, and his Co-founder, Wallace, decided against the theory.
16. "The problem is that because we know the 'end of the story' (that evolution is true), we tend to interpret earlier events as if their sole purpose was to reach that end." Roger Lewin, pro-evolution ([\[15\]](#), p.22)

17. "Evolution itself is accepted by zoologists, not because it has been observed to occur or can be proved by logical coherent evidence, but because the only alternative -- special creation -- is clearly incredible." D.M.S. Watson ([22], p.22)
18. "Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it only because the only alternative is special creation which is unthinkable." Arthur Keith ([22], p.22)
19. "...there is an important difference between going to the empirical evidence to test a doubtful theory against some plausible alternative, and going to the evidence to look for confirmation of the only theory that one is willing to tolerate." ([11], p.28)
20. "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, pro-evolution, in his introduction to Origin of Species by Darwin. ([19], p.90)
21. "...with human origins, each generations explanation appears to contain expository themes that go well beyond what might be implied by the new scientific information of the time." ([11], p.312) "...ideas about human origins turn out on closer examination to tell us as much about the present as about the past, as much about our own experiences as about those of our remote ancestors." Evolutionist John Durant ([11], p.312)
22. "...the only reason why most people seem to believe in evolution is either because they want to believe in it or else because they have been cowed into accepting it out of fear of being called ignorant or reactionary or some such fearful name." ([19], p.92)
23. "The incessant repetition of this unproved claim glossing lightly over the difficulties, and the assumption of an arrogant attitude toward those who are not easily swayed by fashions of science, are considered to afford scientific proof of the doctrine." Richard Goldschmidt, geneticist. ([24], p.21)
24. "The charge of circular reasoning which has been lodged against the critically important paleontological evidence of evolution is not simply to be laughed off or ignored as evolutionists too commonly attempt to do. It quite plainly involves the presupposition of evolution, with numerous involved deductions based on that premise. It is not, therefore, valid to offer this presupposition and these deductions as proof of evolution, and especially in view of the tremendously important fact that there is no real evidence of present evolution." ([19], p.55)
25. The supposed division of the continents, Africa and South America, cannot be considered as having happened since the earth's land cannot be reconstructed to truly fit together in any orderly way. "Recent investigators have used computers to try to fit the continents. But even one of the reconstructions of how Africa, South America, Europe, and North America once fitted together has areas of overlap between these continents, and Central America is omitted altogether." ([7], p.)
26. One must realize that a resemblance of a near fit does not make two things to have been together once in the past. Such would be a logical fallacy.

27. There were once considered to be 180 vestigial organs (organs of no use that evolutionists use to say we evolved out of). Today, there are medically regarded as being no vestigial organs. For example, the appendix is noted as able to fight infection in early life and tonsils destroy harmful bacteria. ([4], p.112)
28. It was once thought that "...an organism was assumed to pass through the stages of its evolutionary history during its development as an embryo." "(This) has been thoroughly discredited by scientists today." ([4], p.354 4) What as thought to be 'gill slits' is actually the formation of the middle ear canal, jaw, and parts of the head and neck. ([22], p.23). The coccyx, once regarded as a literal tail bone, is now known to be a muscle attachment in the embryo and as providing support to the pelvic region in the fully developed bodies.
29. Darwin: "I have asked myself whether I may not have devoted my life to a fantasy." "I...am ready to cry with vexation at my blindness and presumption." ([23], p.59)
30. "And when we examine the respective evidences still more closely...we shall find that there are almost insuperable difficulties with the evolutionary explanation of each of the different evidences. They can all be understood much better in terms of special creation than in terms of evolution." ([18], p.19)
31. "If there are so many problems with Darwinism and no satisfactory alternative within the framework of evolution, why not reevaluate the framework?" ([11], p.62)
32. "Why not consider the possibility that life is what it so evidently seems to be, the product of creative intelligence? Science would not come to an end, because the task would remain of deciphering the languages in which genetic information is communicated, and in general finding out how the whole system works. What scientists would lose is not an inspiring research program, but the illusion of total mastery of nature. They would have to face the possibility that beyond the natural world there is a further reality which transcends science." ([11], p.110)