

the
evolution
handbook

BY

Vance Ferrell

***ONE OF THE MOST COMPREHENSIVE, YET SIMPLE, OVERVIEWS OF THE
ENTIRE CREATION-EVOLUTION DEBATE—IN A SINGLE BOOK.***

THIS BOOK CONTAINS ALL THE PART ONE SECTIONS
(THE "QUICK STUDY GUIDES")
FROM THE FIRST 20 BOOKS IN THIS LOW-COST SERIES.

THE COMPLETE SERIES COVERS NEARLY THE ENTIRE
CREATION VS. EVOLUTION CONTROVERSY.



harvestime Books

THE EVOLUTION DISPROVED SERIES - BOOK 23
A SWEEPING COVERAGE OF THE FIELD - IN LOW-COST BOOKLETS

EDS 23
EVOLUTION HANDBOOK by Vance Ferrell
Harvestime Books
Altamont, TN 37301 U.S.A.
Printed In the United States of America Cover and Text Copyright © 1996
Research Institute for Better Reading, Inc.

**This book contains
the 20 "Quick Study Guides"
in the first 20 books of this
Evolution Disproved Series.**

"Unfortunately, in the field of evolution most explanations are not good. As a matter of fact, they hardly qualify as explanations at all; they are suggestions, hunches, pipe dreams, hardly worthy of being called hypotheses.."-*Norman Macbeth, Darwin Retried (1971), p. 147.

"No one has ever found an organism that is known not to have parents, or a parent. This is the strongest evidence on behalf of evolution."- *Tom Bethell, "Agnostic Evolutionists," Harper's, February 1985, p. 61.

"As by this theory, innumerable transitional forms must have existed. Why do we not find them embedded in the crust of the earth? Why is not all nature in confusion [of halfway species] instead of being, as we see them, well-defined species?-- *Charles Darwin, quoted in H. Enoch, Evolution or Creation (1966), p. 139.

"Where are we when presented with the mystery of life? We find ourselves facing a granite wall which we have not even chipped . . . We know virtually nothing of growth, nothing of life."-*W. Kaempffer, "The Greatest Mystery of All-the Secret of Life," New York Times.

"I think, however, that we must go further than this and admit that the only acceptable explanation is creation. I know that this is anathema to physicists, as indeed it is to me, but we must not reject a theory that we do not like if the experimental evidence supports it."-*H. Lippson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," Physics Bulletin 31 (1980), p. 138.

"I am not satisfied that Darwin proved his point or that his influence in scientific and public thinking has been beneficial.. the success of Darwinism was accomplished by a decline in scientific integrity."*W.R. Thompson, Introduction to *Charles Darwin, Origin of the Species [Canadian scientist].

"The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination."-*Dr. Fleischman. quoted in E Meidau, Why We Believe in Creation, Not Evolution, p. 10 [Erlangen zoologist].

"The hold of the evolutionary paradigm is so powerful that an idea which is more like a principle of medieval astrology than a serious twentieth century scientific theory has become a reality for evolutionary biologists."- *Michael Denton, Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (1985), p. 306 [Australian molecular biologist].

"[Darwin could] summon up enough general, vague and conjectural reasons to account for this fact, and if these were not taken seriously, he could come up with a different, but equally general, vague and conjectural set of reasons."- *Gertrude Himmelfarb. Darwin and Darwinian Revolution (1968). p. 319.

"The particular truth is simply that we have no reliable evidence as to the evolutionary sequence . . . One can find qualified, professional arguments for any group being the descendant of almost any other."-J. Bonner, "Book Review," American Scientist 49:1961, p. 240.

"It was because Darwinian theory broke man's link with God and set him adrift in a cosmos without purpose or end that its impact was so fundamental. No other intellectual revolution in modern times. . . so profoundly affected the way men viewed themselves and their place in the universe." *Michael Denton, Evolution. A Theory in Crisis (1985), p. 67 [Australian molecular biologist].

"I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently assumed it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption . . . The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics; he is also concerned to prove there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do . . . For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom."*Aldous Huxley. "Confessions of a Professed Atheist," Report: Perspective on the News, Vol. 3, June 1966, p. 19 [Grandson of evolutionist Thomas Huxley (Darwin's closest friend and promoter) and brother of evolutionist Julian Huxley. Aldous Huxley was one of the most influential liberal writers of the 20th century].

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

table of contents

Why This Series of Books? page 5

How to Use This Book page 6

THE ORIGIN OF THE UNIVERSE AND PLANETS –

1 - The Origin of Matter page 7

A partial summary of Book 1: The Origin of Matter

2 - The Origin of the Stars page 14

A partial summary of Book 2: The Origin of the Stars

3 - The Origin of the Solar System page 19

A partial summary of Book 3: The Origin of the Solar System

THE ORIGIN AND AGE OF THE EARTH –

4 - The Origin of the Earth page 22

A partial summary of Book 4: The Origin of the Earth

5 - The Age of the Earth page 29

A partial summary of Book 5: The Age of the Earth

6 - Dating of Time in Evolution page 34

A partial summary of Book 6: Dating of Time in Evolution

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE: REQUIREMENTS -

7 - The Primitive Environment page 39

A partial summary of Book 7: The Primitive Environment

8 - DNA, Protein, and Cells page 44

A partial summary of Book 8: DNA, Protein, and Cells

THE ORIGIN OF LIFE: MECHANISMS –

9 - Natural Selection page 49

A partial summary of Book 9: Natural Selection

10 - Mutations page 54

A partial summary of Book 10: Mutations

ANCIENT EVIDENCE AGAINST EVOLUTION –

11 - Fossils and Strata page 59

A partial summary of Books 11-12: Fossils and Strata

13 - Ancient Man page 66

A partial summary of Book 13: Ancient Man

14 - Effects of the Flood page 73

A partial summary of Book 14: Effects of the Flood

CURRENT EVIDENCE AGAINST EVOLUTION –

15 - Similarities page 80

A partial summary of Book 15: Similarities

16 - The Laws of Nature vs. Evolution page 85

A partial summary of Book 16: The Laws of Nature vs. Evolution

HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL EVIDENCE AGAINST EVOLUTION –

17 - History of Evolutionary Theory page 92

A partial summary of Book 17: History of Evolutionary Theory

18 - Scientists Speak about Evolution page 99

A partial summary of Book 18: Scientists Speak about Evolution

19 - Evolution and Society page 104

A partial summary of Book 19: Evolution and Society

20 - The Truth about Archaeology page 111

A partial summary of Book 20: The Truth about Archaeology

BOOKS IN THE ENTIRE SERIES WILL BE FOUND IN THE BACK PAGES

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

why this series of books?

Evolution is a problem for several reasons:

First, evolution makes atheists out of people and lowers morality. Charles Darwin, in a famous statement, admitted the fact. He said that, since people were descended from apes, then mankind is totally untrustworthy and morally bankrupt. Evolution teaches that savage competition and warfare is the highest good and best source of development.

Second, evolution is riddled with fallacious thinking: As you will quickly see in this book, or any others in this series, evolution ignores the most obvious facts and twists and misapplies evidence to fit its objective. Correct logical reasoning is based upon correct premises; if the premises are wrong, the conclusions built upon them will be skewed and unreliable. In the schools of today, evolutionists teach men to ignore and misapply facts.

Third, evolution is false science—and most people, not having been trained to work with scientific tools, feel unable to successfully reply to "science." Please, do not let the subject buffalo you! The problem is not science, but evolutionary interpretations. Although you may not have been educated in scientific research methods, you can understand the basic facts; and that is what counts. All that it takes is common sense. In these books, you will read the facts and find that they disprove evolution.

It has been said that every fact of science can be explained either by creation or evolution. Actually, that is not correct. Most scientific facts can be explained better by creation than by evolution, while many facts cannot be adequately explained by evolution at all.

Fourth, evolution floods the media and the schools with its message. It seems impossible to withstand or oppose the deluge. Yet there is a way: Let the people know the basic facts, so they can learn the truth for themselves. The facts disproving evolution are not complicated. They appeal to thinking minds far better than evolutionary myths.

Fifth, it appears that all the scientists are on the side of evolutionary theory. That also is untrue. Many reputable scientists clearly recognize its falsity (although there are also many who fear to speak up, lest they lose their jobs). In this series, we provide you with thousands of statements by scientists who do not believe in evolutionary theory.

In the summer of 1989, the author learned that the California State Department of Education had recently notified the private, non-taxfunded Graduate School of ICR that it would have to close its doors if it did not teach evolutionary origins and processes in its science classes.

Since the early 1970s, the Institute for Creation Research has been the largest group working to educate the public in regard to the evidence disproving evolution. An attempt to close their college because it will not teach that which it knows to be error—and has satisfactorily been proven to be error—is ridiculous, yet this is what the situation has come to in our nation. We have reached a point in America where evolutionary theorists control the science organizations and are seeking to take over every school in the land.

The ruling, seeking to force the closure of the ICR Graduate School in southern California, crystalized in the present writer a conviction that an in-depth book, or set of books, was needed to help awaken the thinking public to what scientific facts really have to say about creation science and evolutionary theory. These books are the result.

Each volume in this set deals with a special topic area; and, together, all the books cover a far greater scope and include more quotations than any other single book or set of books ever produced. It is our sincere concern that this information will enlighten many minds to the truth of the situation. Evolutionary teaching is one of the greatest hoaxes ever perpetrated.

The author wishes to thank Dr. Henry Morris, director of the Institute for Creation Research, for his encouragement to produce these studies. Grateful appreciation is also extended to the William Jennings Bryan College, in Dayton, Tennessee, for opening their library archives of creation-evolution materials. As some of you may know, Bryan College was founded as a result of the 1925 Scopes trial in that city.

- Vance Ferrell

how to use this book

This book contains all the Part One sections (the "Quick Study Guides") in the first 20 books in this low-cost series.

The complete series covers nearly the entire creation vs. evolution controversy. Within each book a major topic is covered in much detail. Its Quick Study Guide partially summarized some of the most important facts in that book.

So, by placing all those Quick Study Guides into a single volume-we have provided you with one of the most comprehensive, simple overviews of the entire creationevolution debate-in a single book.

Why does this book contain numbered references at the end of many of the paragraphs?

The numbered references at the end of a paragraph in Chapter One refer to page numbers in the in-depth study in Part Two of Book One, where you will find more information, quotations, illustrations, etc. to what was summarized in that paragraph.

Each of the 20 chapters partially summarizes a large amount of In-depth material in its companion numbered book.

You will note that there is no Chapter 12. Book 11 and 12 deals with Fossils and Strata. So much material was included that we could not place it all in one smaller book, so half of it spilled over into a second book. But a Quick Study Guide was only prepared for Book 11. Therefore, to maintain the matching sequence of chapters and books, there is no Chapter 12 in this book.

An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

The first 20 books in this low-cost series were designed to give you a clear, broad understanding of why evolutionary theory on this subject is totally fictional. Each volume was prepared in three levels of increasing simplicity-so everyone could understand it.

PART TWO of each of those 20 books is the most in-depth of the three studies, yet is still written in relatively simple language. The sidelined portions provide the key facts and, by themselves, could be used as a classroom text for 7th and 8th graders. This is LEVEL THREE. It is often 40-50 pages in length, and is suitable for high school and college level students.

PART ONE of each of those 20 books contains the Quick Study Guides—all of which are also in the book in your hands. They provide a brief summary of the best of Part Two. These study guides are quite readable, cover the basic facts, and can be used as a good introduction to the subject before you purchase any or all of the 20 books and read more deeply into the subjects. Each Quick Study Guide is also designed as a grade school classroom textbook. This is LEVEL TWO. It is generally 9-12 pages in length, and is suitable for 5th to 8th grade levels, on up.

PART THREE in each of the 20 books is called "Creation for Kids," and is the most simplified of all. It can be read and understood by children as young as ten years old. With explanations, it can also be read to younger children. Older folk, who do not read a lot, will also appreciate it. This is LEVEL ONE. It usually has 1-2 pages, and is suitable for 4th to 6th grade levels, on up.

During the reading of these 20 books, when you start to read Part Two, if it seems a little deep (though we tried to keep it simple), then go back and first read Part One (Quick Study Guide). If you have trouble with Part One, turn to Part Three and begin there. Wherever you start, do not fear that you cannot grasp it. The truth is simple facts and common sense; it is the evolutionary errors which are devious and peculiar! Only Part Two includes the quotations and illustrations.

All the material in Part One (Quick Study Guide) of the first 20 books in this series is also available in the book you are now reading, ***The Evolution Handbook***.

All the material in Part Three (Creation for Kids) is available in our book, ***Evolution is a Myth***.

In addition, there is a two-volume set, Wonders of Nature: Vols. 1-2, which gives hundreds of examples of how nature points to its Creator. These are additional evidences of Creation.

Origin of Matter 7

quick study guide

the origin of matter

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

The evolutionists' problem: how to explain away the fact that everything in nature exists. In this chapter, we will discuss their attempted solution to the origin of matter. The so-called "science" of cosmology is the inventing of theories to explain the origin of matter and the universe.

We know that everything is made of matter, which consists of the basic 92 natural elements, but where did matter come from? How did it get all over the universe in the form of planets and stars? How did the complicated and delicately balanced solar systems and galaxies form? What keeps them in balance? How did the laws governing matter originate?

A fairy tale was invented to account for the first two questions; the other questions have pretty much been ignored by the evolutionists. Here is their theory, followed by the facts repudiating it:

THE BIG BANG THEORY

The evolutionists' solution. A fantastic theory was invented, called the Big Bang, which declared that everything once exploded out of nothing! Clothed in scientific language and mathematical formulas, the theory was called "scientific." But it is not.

The theory is a fraud. Fortunately, common sense and wiser scientists have refuted it, yet their writings are not well-known. In this chapter is a summary of their findings. These facts annihilate the Big Bang theory.

Science fiction. Several men dreamed up the idea in the 1920s and 1940s. A science-fiction writer, *George Gamow, led out in promoting it to the scientific community pp. 13-14.

Here is what the Big Bang theory teaches:

When nothing gets together. The emptiness is supposed to have gathered together in one place, and gotten so thick that the "nothing" exploded and blew itself into hydrogen gas. p. 14.

Laws appear. The laws of nature somehow invented themselves during the explosion.-p. 14.

Gas gets into clumps. Then the outward exploding gas supposedly gathered itself into clumps.-pp. 14-15.

A universe of explosions. The loose, outward flowing gas next decided to push itself into stars. Then all the stars began exploding in super-nova explosions. But, just before light rays from the explosions could reach our planet in our time in history, the explosions are said to have conveniently stopped.-p. 15.

Heavier elements made. Those explosions are supposed to have made all the heavier elements (those above hydrogen and helium).

Rearranging time. In order to adapt to the theory, the supposed age of the universe has been pushed back to a theoretical age of 15 billion years, when the Big Bang is said to have occurred. p. 15.

FACTS WHICH DISPROVE THE BIG BANG

Here are a number of scientific facts which disprove the theory of fog coming out of nothing and pressing itself into stars:

1 - Not squeezable. Nothingness cannot pack itself together. Try packing some fog into a star. Gas in outer space is millions of times more rarefied (thinner) in density than fog yet it is supposed to have accomplished the trick billions of times by chance. p. 15.

2 - Not stoppable. There would be no mechanism to push nothingness to a single point, and then stop it there. p. 15.

3 - Nothing to explode it. There would be no match, no fire to explode nothingness. pp. 15-16.

4 - No way to expand it. There would be no way to push (explode) nothingness outward. A total vacuum can neither contract nor expand. According to the laws of physics, it takes energy to do work, and there is no energy in emptiness.-p. 16.

5 - No way to slow it. If it could explode outward, there would be no way to later slow outward, exploding gas in frictionless space. p. 16.

6 - No way to clump it. It is impossible for gas to clump together on earth, much less in outer space without gravity. Gas moves from high density to low density, not the other way around. p. 16.

7 - No way to produce stars. There is no way by which gas could clump itself into stars, planets, and galaxies. Only after a star has been formed, can it hold itself together by gravity.-p. 16.

8 - No way to produce complex atoms. Aside from hydrogen and helium, which are quite simple, there is no way that loose gas in space can form itself into complex atoms (elements above helium).-p. 16.

9 - No way to go past the helium mass 4 gap. It is extremely difficult, and perhaps impossible, for hydrogen to explode past the atomic gap which exists at mass 5 and 8. In the sequence of atomic weight numbers, there are no stable atoms at mass 5 and 8. Because of the mass 5 gap, it is unlikely that hydrogen can change into helium. Because of the mass 8 gap, neither of them can change into heavier elements.--pp. 16-17.

10 - No way to compress loose hydrogen gas. There is no way that loose hydrogen could push itself into a solid or semi-solid out in space.-p. 17.

11 - Not enough time. There would not be enough time for the exploded gas to reach the edge of a 20-billion light-year universe and then change itself into billions of stars, before the explosions were theoretically supposed to have stopped.-pp. 17-18.

12 - No way to produce enough of the heavier elements. Even if hydrogen explosions could produce heavier elements, there are several other reasons why it could not produce enough of them.p. 18.

13 - Elemental composition of planets and moons is totally different than that found in stars. Scientists cannot explain why the stars primarily have lighter elements and planets especially have heavier ones. pp. 18-19.

14 - Random explosions do not produce intricate orbits. Haphazard explosions could never produce stellar rotations or orbits. p. 19.

15 - Why did the explosions stop? The theory requires that the star explosions (super-novas) suddenly stopped—conveniently just before light rays could reach us. Yet no adequate explanation is given for the sudden termination. In addition, because of known distant stars, there is not enough time needed for those super-nova explosions to occur-before they had to stop. p. 19.

16 - Too few super-novas and too little matter from them. Super-novas do not throw off enough heavy atoms in each explosion to account for all the stars which exist. Only a few super-novas have occurred in the past thousand years. pp. 19-20.

17 - "Too perfect" an explosion. Many scientists agree that the calculations needed to figure a Big Bang and its aftermath are too close, too exacting to be accepted even by competent scientists.-p. 20.

18 - Not a universe but a hole. *L.S. Peter calculated that, if a Big Bang had occurred, it would have fallen inward on itself (into a black hole), not outward into the universe. What a situation! one imaginary object being swallowed up by another!p. 20.

19 - Non-reversing, non-circling. Outward flowing gas, in frictionless space, does not stop or begin circling. It would just keep moving outward forever.--pp. 20-21.

20 - Missing mass. There is not enough mass in the universe to meet the requirements of the various theories of matter and stellar origin. p. 21.

21 - Only hydrogen and helium found in super-nova explosions. The Big Bang theory requires that elements heavier than lithium were set free by super-nova explosions. But analysis of the Crab nebula (a gigantic super-nova explosion in A.D. 1054) reveals there are no elements heavier than lightweight helium in the outflowing residual gases from it. Thus it appears that hydrogen explosions cannot bridge the mass 4 gap, no matter what the temperature of the explosion. p. 21.

22 - Older stars do not have additional heavy elements: The Big Bang theory requires that stars, which have not exploded, are producing heavier elements within themselves by explosions of hydrogen. But this has been shown to be false. pp. 21-22.

23 - Interstellar gas has a variety of elements. The theory requires that floating gas in space (which is said to be the remnants of the Big Bang) should only have hydrogen and helium from the initial Bang, but research shows that other elements are also present. p. 22.

24 - Stars and galaxies exist. A theoretical explosion could only produce outward flowing gas, not intricate stars, planets, galaxies, and their complex interrelated orbits. Scientists draw a total blank in explaining how this could happen. p. 22.

25 - Only increasingly rarefied cloud. All the Big Bang could produce would be an increasingly less dense (more rarefied) outward flowing gas.p. 22.

26 - There are stars and galaxies all through space. If the Big Bang had really occurred, the stars and galaxies would only be found along the outer edge of the gas flowage instead of throughout space. p. 22.

27 - Disproved by distant universe. According to the theory, the farthest stars should be the youngest and most densely packed. But, instead, the farthest are just like the others. pp. 22-23.

28 - Unexplained angular momentum. Origin of matter and star theories cannot explain "angular momentum," that is, the rotation of stars. In other words, why do the stars turn? -p. 23.

29 - Angular momentum and momentummass relationship. Origin theories cannot explain the delicate relationship existing between mass (size and weight) of an object and its angular momentum (rapidity with which it rotates). -p. 23.

30 - Many stars rotate too fast. According to the theory stars should not have the high rotational speeds they have; in fact, they should not have any p. 23.

31 - High-spin stars. The theory could not produce extremely rapid spinning stars. Yet there are stars in the sky which do rotate at such high speeds.-pp. 23-24.

32 - Stars that orbit backward. Some stars orbit in the opposite direction than the others. The theory cannot explain this. (The same is true of planets.)-p. 24.

33 - Stars that move too fast. There are high-velocity stars which are traveling too fast through space to accommodate the evolutionary theories of origins. p. 24.

34 - Universal rotation. Evidence indicates that not only the galaxies are rotating, but the entire universe is also. This also violates the theory. p. 24.

35 - There is not enough antimatter. Any type of initial origin-of-matter theory requires the simultaneous creation of matter and antimatter (neutrinos, etc.). But only a few neutrinos and other antimatter are found in space. In addition, at the Big Bang, the matter and antimatter would immediately have destroyed one another. An equal amount of each would have been made, and then the two would have united, blotting out both.- pp. 24-26.

36 - A Big Bang explosion would have destroyed all matter. The evidence is clear that, if matter could initially have created itself, that matter would also instantly have destroyed itself. p. 26.

37 - The universe is too lumpy. The outflowing gas from the initial explosion ought to continue smoothly flowing forever. Yet the universe, according to the scientists, is "too lumpy"; it is filled with stars and galaxies. pp. 26-27.

38 - The universe is full of super-clusters. The universe is so lumpy, that, not only is matter clumped in stars, and stars in galaxies, but even the galaxies are clumped together in still larger lumps, called super-clusters. p. 27.

39 - Three lumpy problems. There are several lumpy problems about the universe, which the Big Bang cannot explain. There should be no lumps but there are. How could the smooth gas form itself into stars? Why is there such an astonishing number of "lumps" throughout the universe?--pp. 27-28.

40 - No theoretical "infinite point" for matter. Only in theory can everything unite in one point. In reality, it cannot do that. First, the intruding nothingness would not stop, but go on past the central point. Second, there would be no gravity (because no matter supposedly existed!) to pull it in. Only when there is matter, is there gravity.--p. 28.

41 - No Population III stars. All elements above the two simplest (hydrogen and helium) are called "heavier elements," "post-helium elements," and elements with "more metal." These definitions will help explain that which follows:

According to the theory, the first stars made after the Big Bang were called "Population III stars," and only had hydrogen and helium. They are said to then have exploded in super-novas, which pushed gas around them into "Population II stars," containing more post-helium elements. These are said to then have exploded, making "Population I stars" with still more "metal" elements. (This is how the theory invents the heavier elements.)

But astronomers tell us the theory is incorrect: In the sky they only find stars with a variety of elements. There are no "Population III" stars out there. -pp. 28-29.

42 - Low and high metal stars. According to the theory, younger stars should be in the center of galaxies, and they should be "low metal stars"; that is, have less heavier elements. Yet all stars are found to have far too much "metal." p. 29.

BACKGROUND RADIATION

43 - Background radiation is not a proof. "Background radiation" is a very weak microwave radiation flowing throughout space in all directions. It was first discovered in 1965, and is said to be the final leftover outer-space radiation from the Big Bang. Although called the "dying breath of the Big Bang," it is not an evidence of it (pp. 29, 31), and for several reasons:

(1) It is omnidirectional. Background radiation flows toward us from all directions; yet it would come from only one direction if it was from the Big Bang. pp. 31-32.

(2) It is too weak. The radiation should be between ten and a thousand times more powerful than it is. p. 32.

(3) It lacks the proper spectrum. The radiation does not have the ideal "black body"; that is, it should have total light absorption capacity p. 32.

(4) Its spectrum should be far hotter (5°K) than it actually is (only 2.73°K). If the explosion had occurred 15 billion years ago, the background radiation should now be emitting a far higher temperature heat [K = Kelvin, or absolute zero, which is -273.15° centigrade]. p. 32.

(5) It is too smooth. Research proves that this radiation is definitely too smooth to agree with the Big Bang theory. -pp. 32-33.

(6) A failure from the beginning. Predictions made as to the nature of the required radiation (its temperature and its single directional source) were not fulfilled even when background radiation was first discovered in 1965.-p. 32.

(7) What is the source of the radiation? Everything in the universe is lumpy, except the gas in outer space: (1) background radiation (which is microwave radiation) and (2) infrared radiation. It appears that the source of both types of radiation is nothing more than the outflowage of radiation from the stars and galaxies on all sides of us. pp. 33-34.

THE REDSHIFT THEORY

According to how far away they are, light from the stars is pushed toward the red end of the color spectrum. The amount of skewing is proportional to the distance to the star which sent the light ray to us. What is the cause of the shift toward the red? Evolutionists rely on a disproved theory (the speed theory) of the red shift to show there was a Big Bang. Using the speed theory makes it appear that the universe is expanding (expanding universe theory). The evolutionists need an expanding universe, because their theory teaches that everything flowed outward from the Big Bang, and this is shown by the fact that the universe is still moving outward.

44 - The redshift theory is incorrect. Claims of a lumpy background radiation and the foolishness of the "speed theory of the redshift" are the two primary evidences used to prove that there once was a Big Bang.

Like background radiation the speed theory is false evidence, based on a misinterpretation of the data. There are other theories which explain the redshift much better. p. 34.

(1) The speed redshift. Also called the "Doppler theory of redshift" this speed theory supports the evolutionary position, and therefore is tenaciously clung to by the

evolutionists. According to it, the farther that stars are from our planet, the faster they are moving away from us. pp. 34-35.

(2) Other explanations of the redshift. What is the solution? *All agree that the distance of our planet to the star has something to do with the redshift.* Aside from the speed theory, there are three other possible explanations. The speed theory has several flaws; but each of the following three possibilities are based on solid, known scientific facts:

[a] Gravitational redshifts. Light rays from the stars must travel vast distances to reach us. It has been proven that the pull of gravity; from the stars the light rays pass, could indeed cause a loss in lightwave energy-thus moving that light toward the red on the spectrum. Einstein was the first to predict that gravity would affect starlight, and this was shown .. to be true in the 1960s. p. 35.

[b] Second-order Doppler shift. It is known that a light source moving at right angles to an observer will be redshifted. Compare this fact with the known fact that all stars are definitely circling galaxies. In addition, many scientists suspect that, just as all planets and stars are kept in position by orbiting, so, for purposes of stability, the entire universe is probably circling a common center! pp. 35-36.

[c] Energy-loss shift Light waves could themselves lose energy as they travel across the long distances of space. This is called "tired light." The energy-loss shift is probably the primary cause of the redshift.p. 36.

Initial summary. Evolutionists stay with the speed theory of redshift, in an effort to support their idea that outward pushing gas made an expanding universe of outward rushing stars. But, as we will note below, new discoveries produce the ridiculous situation that, if the theory is correct, the most distant stars are said to be traveling faster than the speed of light! Energy loss from gravity pull and distance traveled, and sideways movement of stars, provide a far better explanation of the redshift.

(3) The Arp Discoveries. *Halton C. Arp, of the Mount Wilson and Las Campanas Observatories, made several discoveries which threaten to overturn stellar evolutionary theories, especially those concerning the speed theory of the redshift. Here are several of them:

[a] Bridged galaxies disprove the speed redshift theory. Arp has found connected galaxies which have different redshifts. p. 36.

[b] Quasars disprove the speed redshift theory. Quasars with one redshift have been found alongside galaxies with a different redshift. p. 37.

[c] Summarizing the Arp discoveries. Arp has found differential redshifts associated with over 260 galaxies, and has published a catalog of hundreds of discordant redshifts. But his work has been ignored (and, as we will later learn, was eventually fired). Arp says that energy loss ("tired light") is the cause of the redshifts.-pp. 37-38.

(4) There are other evidences that the speed theory is incorrect:

[a] Slight blueness of distant galaxies. According to evolutionary theory, the bluest stars are the youngest, and, therefore, the most distant stars should be the bluest. But they are just like the nearest ones.-pp. 38-39.

[b] Redshift distance multiples. An oddity has been discovered that does not agree with the speed theory, but could fit into the energy-loss theory: Stars tend to be most often located at certain distances from us! This totally defies the speed theory. But

it may be that starlight loses energy as it travels, and this weakening especially reveals itself at multiples of 72 kps [42 mps].-p. 39.

[c] Galactic shape factor. When elliptical galaxies are in the same cluster with spiral galaxies (and therefore the same distance from us), the spirals will have a higher redshift. The second-order Doppler shift would explain this, but not the speed theory.-p. 39.

[d] Photons slow down. Arp and his associates have shown that photons (unit pieces of starlight) actually do slow down as they travel toward us. Evolutionists refuse to accept this fact, because it would destroy their "expanding universe" theory. -pp. 39-40.

Only one stellar distance measurement is reliable. Keep in mind that only one method of ascertaining stellar distance is accurate. It is the parallax method which can only be used on a few of the closest stars. p. 40.

QUASARS

45 - Quasars may hold the key to an understanding of the redshift.

According to the speed theory of redshift, quasars must be the most distant objects in the universe. Yet light from them is quite bright, and some can be seen through optical telescopes; therefore, they cannot possibly be very distant.

Here are several facts about quasars which help disprove the speed theory:

(1) Violates inverse-square law. The fact that quasars can be seen through optical telescopes, yet are supposed to so far away, violates the inverse-square law. They just could not possibly be so far away, and yet so bright. p. 40.

(2) 16 percent. In 1962, a quasar was found which, according to the speed theory, is moving away from us at the amazing velocity of 16 percent of the speed of light! This just cannot be true, and thus disproves the speed theory of redshift. pp. 40-41.

(3) 200-300 percent. Since then, quasars have been found with speed theory redshifts of 200 and 300 percent of the speed of light! If the speed theory were correct, this would be recession speeds exceeding 90 percent of the speed of light! p. 41.

(4) 350-400 percent. In 1973, a quasar was found which had a speed redshift of 350 percent. In 1986, one had more than 400 percent! If the speed theory was true, these quasars would be fantastic distances of 15 billion light-years away, and traveling outward at impossibly high speeds. Since then more "4 redshifts" have been found.-pp. 41-42.

Gravitational redshifts. As mentioned earlier, Albert Einstein was the first to predict that gravity would be able to affect the transmission of light. This fact could easily explain the redshifts which have been found.--p. 42.

(5) Eight times faster than the speed of light Three quasars have been found which, according to the speed theory of redshift, would be moving eight times faster than the speed of light! As of 1990, over thirty faster-than-light quasars have been found. pp. 42-43.

Light, matter, and gravity. It is a known fact that gravity from the sun actually bends light rays from stars.-p. 43.

Getting rid of the opposition. Halton Arp was eventually fired for presenting evidence contrary to the Big Bang theory.-pp. 43-44.

STEADY STATE UNIVERSE THEORY

In 1948, working with two other theoreticians, *Fred Hoyle, a British astronomer, devised the steady state universe theory. According to this concept, galaxies are continually disappearing while new ones are appearing. Totally new matter is constantly inventing itself out of nothing! At the same time, other matter—entire constellations—are disappearing! Like the Big Bang theory, it was a theoretical Idea without any evidence to support it.

Seventeen years later (1965) Hoyle made a public statement, repudiating his theory as unsupported by the facts and totally false-pp. 44-47.

THE OSCILLATING UNIVERSE THEORY

The oscillating universe theory was devised by *George Gamow, the prolific science-fiction writer who, a few years earlier, had promoted the Big Bang as the only correct concept of origins. According to this idea, when the universe finally runs down, another Big Bang will get it going again. The difference is that the first Bang is matter exploding out of nothing, while subsequent Bangs will result from matter contracting down to a single point, and then exploding outward again. As usual, there is no evidence, just theory-pp. 47-48.

Here are several points which specifically disprove this theory, which is now widely believed by many theoreticians:

1 - Running out of hydrogen. Robert Jastrow, a leading scientist, explained that the theory is impossible since hydrogen, once used up, can never be restored.-p. 48.

2 - Stop and reverse. The theory requires that all matter stop traveling outward, change directions, and go backward. But there would be no reason for this to happen-p. 48.

3 - Leaving its gravitational field. The center of gravity, by that time (assuming an expanding universe), would be on the outer perimeter of the universe, not at its center-so there would be nothing to draw it back to where it theoretically came from.-P. 48.

4 - Not enough matter. There is not enough matter in the universe to cause it to collapse inward. p. 48.

5 - Getting to the point. Matter would not all rush to a common center and stop right there at a single microscopic dot. Like the other theories, this is science-fiction foolishness -pp. 48-49.

THE INFLATIONARY UNIVERSE THEORY

This new idea imagines that the universe (including all space and time!) began as a single infinitesimal particle, composed of all the matter in the universe! But no one has figured out how it all got in there, where it came from, how it exploded, or how it developed into our present universe. A few details need clarifying-p.49.

CONCLUSION

Worthless theories. Scientists themselves admit that the theories are meaningless.--p. 49.

Violates natural law. These theories violate known, unchangeable laws of matter and physics. Especially powerful is the first and Second Laws of Thermodynamics. (We cover that in detail In Book 16: The Laws of Nature vs. Evolution.) Because of those laws, all theories of matter, stellar origins, and evolution are totally impossible. Disorganized matter can never change itself randomly into highly organized materials,

systems, or life forms. The Second Law of Thermodynamics, alone, refutes all possibility of any evolution of matter or living species. pp. 49-50.

The Sorry State Universe. Thoughtful scientists admit that, if evolutionary theories of the origin of the universe were true, life would be purposeless and a continual misery pp. 50-51.

A CLASSROOM TEST FOR PART ONE (Quick Study Guide) - will be found on the next page.

STUDY AND REVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PART TWO (Complete Study) -will be found on page 59.

A NUTSHELL SUMMARY - will be found on page 62.

**ORIGIN OF MATTER
CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO Air can push itself into a solid.
- YES NO Hydrogen is a gas.
- YES NO In outer space, when not near a star or other large object, a gas will always expand.
- YES NO If it does not run into something, does a moving object in outer space ever stop?
- YES NO In outer space, is there enough gravity in loose gas to push it together?
- YES NO Are many stars exploding today?
- YES NO Could a star make itself?
- YES NO Background radiation is a type of microwave radiation.
- YES NO Background radiation is too weak to be from a "Big Bang."
- YES NO Leftover radiation from a "Big Bang" would be coming from the direction of the explosion.
- YES NO Background radiation only comes from one direction.
- YES NO It is true that, the more distant a star is, the more it produces a redshift in its spectrum.
- YES NO Quasars prove the speed theory of the redshift.
- YES NO The parallax method is the only fairly reliable measure of the distance of a star from us.
- YES NO Can hydrogen be remade, after it is used up?
- YES NO The Second Law of Thermodynamics disproves the Origin of Matter theories.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

quick study guide

the origin of the stars

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

The evolutionists' problem: how to explain away the fact that everything exists. They call it stellar evolution. In this chapter, we will discuss their theory.

How did the stars come into existence? How did the complicated and delicately balanced solar systems and galaxies form? What keeps them in balance? How did the laws governing the stars and galaxies originate?

Special note: The preceding book in this series, The Origin of Matter, lays the groundwork for this present book on the origin of the stars. In addition, this and the next book in this series (The Origin of the Solar System) are especially closely related.

A fable was invented to account for the first two questions; the other questions have pretty much been ignored by the evolutionists. Here is the theory, followed by the facts repudiating it:

THE STELLAR EVOLUTION THEORY

The evolutionists' solution. A variety of fantastic theories were invented, called stellar evolution. The basic theory teaches that free-floating hydrogen gas, in outer space, pushed itself into stars, and then those stars exploded (super-nova

Special note: The scientific facts, disproving stellar evolution, are given in this book. But the history of theories on the formation of stars, planets, and moons is given in the appendix of the next book in this series: The Origin of the Solar System.

explosions, they are called). Those explosions are supposed to have pushed gas into more stars! (For more on this, see Book 1: The Origin of Matter) p. 11.

The stellar evolution theory is foolishness. Fortunately, common sense and reputable scientists have refuted it. Yet their writings are not well known. Here is a summary of their findings. Here are the facts which ruin the stellar evolution theories:

FACTS WHICH DISPROVE THE STELLAR EVOLUTION THEORY

Here are many scientific facts which disprove the theory of fog coming out of nothing and pressing itself into stars:

SEVENTEEN FATAL FLAWS

1 - Where did the gas come from. Hydrogen gas is supposed to have made itself into stars, but where did the hydrogen come from? p. 12.

2 - How could random gas movements produce stars and galaxies? The intricate design and balance of the galaxies renders the theory impossible. Gas, floating in outer space, does not push itself into stars. p. 12.

3 - The birth of a star has never been observed. How then can anyone presume to tell us how it came about? p. 12.

4 - We should see exploding stars today, since the theory requires that billions and billions of exploding stars occurred. Why would they have stopped exploding? p. 13.

5 - It is not possible for loose, free-floating hydrogen to push itself into even one star, much less billions of them. Gas in outer space only expands; it does not contract. The pull of gravity within the gas, would not be strong enough to push it together p. 13.

6 - A star (super-nova) explosion would blow everything outward; it would not compress gas into new stars. p. 13.

7 - Stars are too far apart for even combined explosions to push gas into more new stars.-p. 13.

8 - There is not enough evolutionary time for the stars to be formed. The theory requires that they all explode themselves into existence, and then stop exploding just before their light could be sent for us to see. p. 13.

9 - There is a universal law requiring star degeneration, not star formation. It is called the Second Law of Thermodynamics. p. 13. (See Book 16: The Laws of Nature vs. Evolution.)

10 - The stars should be alike, if they were all formed the same way. Yet each one differs from all the others in their chemical signature. p. 13.

11 - Explosions could not produce what we find in the skies. All about us are the complicated orbits and careful balancing of the stars around galaxies. p. 13.

12 - The theory does not explain the working of gravity; yet, if it is a comprehensive theory of self-originations, it should do so. p. 14.

13 - The theory requires that stars are fueled (shine) by hydrogen explosions, but that cannot- be true since not enough neutrinos (subatomic antimatter) are formed. p. 14.

14 - Evolutionists dare not accept the truth of the missing neutrinos, because they know it would .destroy their theory of star origins. p. 14.

15 - Stars shine because of solar collapse, not hydrogen explosions. This fact means the universe is much younger than the evolutionists theorize.-pp. 15-16.

16 - Solar shock waves (160-minute oscillations) on the sun's surface, support the concept of solar collapse.-p. 16.

17 - Abundant evidence points to a young universe and a very young Planet Earth.-(See Book 5: The Age of the Earth.) p. 16.

SEVENTEEN MORE PROBLEMS

1 - Galaxies never exist alone; they always exist in pairs or larger groups. Yet, the theorized "cloud condensation" would not result in nearby pairs or groups.-p. 17.

2 - Stars are too far apart, within galaxies, for the galactic systems to form or hold together. The amount of matter within a galaxy could not produce the formation of individual stars. The space-to-mass ratio is too great to bind them together. p. 17.

3 - Galactic stars travel too fast. The velocity of stars, traveling around the central galactic core, is too fast for galaxies to be very old. p. 17.

4 - Wrapping-up factor. The galaxies cannot be very old because the galactic magnetic field would cause a too-quick wrapping-up of the stars.-p. 17.

5 - The usual saucer shape of galaxies defies explanation by the laws of physics. They should not hold together as they do.-p. 18.

6 - If the evolutionary redshift theory were true, stars within galaxies would fly apart, but they do not do so. (See Book 1: the Origin of Matter, for an explanation of the redshift)p. 18.

7 - Some galaxy groups are joined by luminous bridges of matter. This cannot be explained by the stellar evolution theory p. 19.

8 - Hydrogen gas in outer space cannot possibly stick together. This important proof was worked out by Harwit p. 19.

9 - Each galaxy must be as young as its youngest stars, because of the mass-luminosity law and the fact that all types of stars are found in each galaxy p. 19.

10 - All stars are chemically similar, yet they should not be if the theory was true. p. 19

11- Outflowing gas cannot possibly clump together into stars. There is no scientific way it can happen.-pp. 19-20.

12 - There is not enough matter in gas clouds to form a star. There are just not enough particles, close enough together, for them to push themselves into a ball. p. 20.

13 - Gas clouds expand, they do not contract. Therefore they cannot form stars.-p. 20.

14 - The theory says stars are formed by explosions, but: (1) If one star exploded to form a second star, where did the first star come from? (2) If a star has to be destroyed, to make another one,-where did all our billions of stars come from? (3) If a star exploded, the outrushing gases would keep flowing outward. According to the theory, the first stars only had hydrogen in them, and they had to explode in order to make heavier element stars. But, if each exploding star only made one new star, where did the billions of heavier stars In the universe come from? p. 20.

15 - Over half the stars are binary or multiple star systems. How could they possibly originate from random gas movements and star explosions? Only God could make two stars encircle each other, without crashing into one another.-p. 20.

16 - No evidence exists that evolution theory has occurred anywhere in the universe. p. 20

17 - The First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics are powerful and cannot be broken. They deny the possibility of stellar evolution. (See Book 16: The Laws of Nature vs. Evolution, for more on this.) pp. 20-21.

The search continues. Evolutionists desperately continue searching for some scrap of evidence which will really support their theory that the universe made itself. But they labor in vain. pp. 21, 23.

Conclusion. The truly great men are those who acknowledge that God made the universe and everything within it p. 23.

CHAPTER APPENDIX

STELLAR EVOLUTION

1 - Stellar evolution. Scientists speak about the impossibility of gas forming itself into stars. p. 24.

2 - More evidence against stellar evolution. Here is yet more evidence, cited by scientists, that stars could not evolve:

(1) Stars should not exist at all. p. 25.

(2) Stars never get closer than a certain distance. This appears to be according to preplanning.--pp. 25, 27.

(3) A physical barrier exists between the smallest and largest stars; the red giants and the white dwarfs they are supposed to evolve into.--p. 27.

BINARY SYSTEMS

3 - Binary star systems defy the possibility of accidental star formation! How did they get there, without crashing into one another? p. 27.

(1) Multiple star systems could not produce themselves, yet are in the majority p. 27.

(2) Differential binaries. are too close to have occurred by a chance accident, yet most binaries are differential. pp. 27-28.

(3) There are no binaries in star clusters, yet nearly all stars outside of clusters are binaries. Evolutionists cannot explain this. -p. 28.

GLOBULAR CLUSTERS

4 - Globular clusters defy evolutionary formation.

(1) How can they even exist, since they are too packed in to form accidentally? p. 28.

(2) The location of globular clusters cannot be explained by the theory. The clusters are always above or below galactic disks, but never in them. p. 28.

(3) The clusters orbit up and down through the orbiting disk, without ever crashing. Such precise relationships are astounding. pp. 28-29.

(4) Globular clusters exist, without collapsing in on themselves. Yet this disagrees with random, accidental formation theories. Any force bringing them together should crush them. p. 29.

DISK GALAXIES AND SUPER-CLUSTERS

5 - Here are additional facts about galaxies which disagree with evolutionary theories.

(1) Their existence and formation defies evolutionary answers. pp. 29-30.

(2) The existence of super-clusters is opposed to stellar evolution. Galaxies are clumped together into still larger formations. p. 30.

(3) The motion of outer stars in disk galaxies is far too rapid. pp. 30-32.

(4) Elliptical galaxies have too many clusters in them. p. 32.

(5) The largest central disk galaxy will be axially the same as the others, p. 32.

(6) Galaxies should never be disk-shaped.-pp. 32-33.

(7) The outer arms of disk galaxies should tear apart. p. 33.

DO BLACK HOLES REALLY EXIST?

Do these horrible things really exist, or are they just the result of fevered imagination?

1 - A strange story. The theory is totally imaginative.-pp. 33-34.

2 - Black holes are a theoretical extreme. This theory is actually a statistical abstraction carried to an extreme. It has no reality, and could not possibly be true. p. 34.

3 - Black holes are needed in order to protect the stellar origins theory against the reality of quasars. p. 34.

4 - What then are quasars? We do not yet know. They may be stellar clusters or special energy relay centers. pp. 34-35.

5 - Reputable scientists declare black holes to be non-existent. They are neither star eaters nor galactic cluster centers. Black holes were only invented to salvage a worthless theory of origins.-pp. 35-37.

A CLASSROOM TEST FOR PART ONE (Quick Study Guide) - will be found on the next page.

STUDY AND REVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PART TWO (Complete Study) - will be found on page 30.

A NUTSHELL SUMMARY - will be found on page 41.

ORIGIN OF THE STARS CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Circle the correct answer.

- | | |
|--------|--|
| YES NO | Can nothing explode? |
| YES NO | Do the evolution theories explain the balancing and orbits of the stars in their galaxies? |
| YES NO | Do we see many exploding stars today? |
| YES NO | Can loose, free-floating gas In outer space push itself into a solid? |
| YES NO | A star explosion would blow its contents outward. |
| YES NO | The missing neutrinos is an evidence that the theory is not true. |
| YES NO | Galaxies never exist alone, but always in pairs or groups. |
| YES NO | The fast orbit of outer stars in galaxies disproves the theory. |
| YES NO | Each galaxy must be as young as its youngest star. |
| YES NO | There is enough matter in gas clouds to form a star. |
| YES NO | Gas clouds contract; they never expand. |

SCORE

NAME

DATE

quick study guide

the origin of the solar system

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

In the first book in this series, we found the evolutionary view of the origin of matter to be in error. In the second book, we saw that, just as only God can make matter, He is the only One who could make the stars.

But what about the planets and moons? The evolutionists have several theories about how they came into existence.

Here are the theories and the facts which disprove them:

Our solar system contains nine planets and, at last count, sixty moons. It also has many asteroids and several comets.

The planets majestically circle the sun, and the moons circle the planets. They all ought to fly apart or fall into one another. Yet they are all maintained in a perfect balance. p. 9.

The evolutionists' theory about matter and star origins. Hydrogen gas exploded out of nothing, then rushed outward, and pushed itself into stars. Then the stars repeatedly exploded like firecrackers and made themselves into more stars. (See Books 1 and 2 in this series [Origin of Matter and Origin of Stars] for reasons why that could not happen).

But how did our solar system form?

The evolutionists' theory about the origin of our solar system. There are seven different theories. We will list each one, and briefly give reasons why it cannot be true.

DISPROVING THE SEVEN THEORIES

NEBULAR HYPOTHESIS

The theory: Hydrogen and other gases swirled around and condensed into our sun and its planets.-p. 9.

Why it is not true:

- 1 - Gas in outer space (as here on earth) expands; it does not contract.-pp. 9-10.
- 2 - There would be nothing to swirl it around; and, even if it could, there would be nothing to push gas into suns and rock.-p. 10.
- 3 - If swirling gas formed itself into separate bodies, why did it not keep going and push it all into one giant body? p. 10.
- 4 - What would have kept the smaller bodies from falling into the larger one? It is obvious that everything is perfectly balanced. p. 10.

5 - Interstellar gas is not today condensing. It is always expanding. p. 10.

6 - Our sun is rotating too slowly for the theory to be true. p. 10.

FISSION THEORY

The theory: One day our sun burst open, and planets and moons shot out at high speeds and went to their respective places, then stopped, and started orbiting the sun, as the moons began orbiting the planets. (Charles Darwin's son, *George Darwin, said the moon lifted out of the Pacific Ocean and began orbiting the earth.) -p. 10.

The above theory is absurd for obvious reasons. Here is why the moon could not leave the earth:

1 - It could not possibly achieve escape velocity, and; if it did, would have pulverize into fragments.--p. 10.

2 - Moon rocks are somewhat different than rocks on earth. (Since the first edition of this book was published, in March 1995, the discovery was announced on BBC Science News broadcast that the minerals in moon rocks are remarkably different than those on the earth. This discovery was made by means of the Clementine Research Project, which was able to analyze rocks beneath the moons surface.)-p. 10.

3 - If an explosion on earth was powerful enough to hurl material into outer space, that material would continue moving outward. It would not stop and then circle the earth.-p. 10.

4 - If thrown off by the earth, the moon would encircle the earth at the equator, not at a tilt of 18-28°.p. 11.

CAPTURE THEORY

The theory: Planets and moons were flying around, and some were captured by our sun and began circling. p. 11.

Why it is not true:

1 - Outer space is too large for nine planets and sixty moons to be caught by our sun. Millions would have to pass, in order for one to be caught. p. 11.

2 - No planets or moons are flying by us today.-p. 11.

3 - They would tend to crash into the sun, not fly by it or begin encircling it. p. 11.

4 - Moons would not begin orbiting around planets; they would crash into the sun or into the planets.--p. 11.

ACCRETION THEORY

The theory: A pile of space dust and rock chunks pushed together into our planet, and another pile pushed itself into our moon. Then the moon got close enough and began encircling the earth.-p. 11.

Why it is not true:

1 - Where did the space dust and rock come from? p. 11.

2 - Loose gravel, etc., in outer space would not push itself together; it would push apart.-p. 11.

3 - The moons and planets would crash together.-p. 11.

PLANETARY COLLISION THEORY

The theory: Our world collided with a small planet, and the explosion threw off rocks which became the moon, and then it began orbiting us.

Why it is not true:

- 1- Such an impact would destroy the earth. p. 11.
- 2 - Material from the explosion would keep moving outward forever p. 11.
- 3 - Outward moving material would not stop and begin circling. p. 11.
- 4 - Such an event would have to happen to all the other planets. p. 11.
- 5 - Thousands of near misses would have to occur, for one to crash together; yet no moons are passing us today pp. 1], 13.

STELLAR COLLISION THEORY

The theory: Our planets, moons, and suns spun off from the collision between stars. p. 13.

Why it is not true:

- 1 - The collision would hurl material outward, and never veer from that outward course. p. 13.
- 2 - Any pieces drawn together would smash, not orbit one another. p. 13.

GAS CLOUD THEORY

The theory: Gas clouds were captured by our sun. But instead of being drawn into it, they began whirling and pushing themselves into planets and moons.-p. 13.

Why it is not true:

- 1 - Gas does not lump together; it only spreads outward. p. 13.
- 2 - if gas could stick together, it would not produce objects which would encircle the sun nor would smaller bodies encircle them. p. 13.

SEVEN MORE FLAWS

- 1 - These theories do not explain where stars, planets. and moons came from.--p. 13.
- 2 -The theories assume that the complicated and carefully balanced orbits and distances of planets and moons came about by chance.-p. 13.
- 3 - How could each one be so different, structurally and chemically, from the others?--p. 13.
- 4 - None of these theories agree with the laws of physics, Including the laws of thermodynamics. p. 13.
- 5 - Nowhere In the universe are such events occurring, as required by these theories. p. 13.
- 6 - None of the theories explain what produced the careful balancings and orbits of the various spheres.-pp. 13-14.
- 7 - Hydrogen never pushes itself Into solids. p. 14.

FACTS ABOUT PLANETS AND MOONS

There are other facts about the planets and moons which disagree with the various evolutionary theories of origins-p. 14.

Why it is not true:

1 - Nearly all the sideways movement is in the planets. yet nearly all the mass is in the sun! The theories require the opposite. p. 14.

2 - The orbits of Mercury, Pluto, asteroids, and comets are not in the same level plane as the others.-p. 14.

3 - Both Uranus and Venus rotate backward instead of forward. Uranus is literally rolling along! pp. 14-15.

4 - A third of the sixty moons orbit backward or forward. No theory or self-origin can possibly explain that.-p. 15.

5 - One example would be Triton, one of Neptune's inner moons. It revolves backward, has a nearly circular orbit, and is so close to the planet that it should fall into it. p. 15.

6 - There are many differences between the various planets and moons. Yet, if they came from the same gas, they should all be alike.--p. 15.

7 - The elements in the sun are very different than in the earth or other planets.-p. 15.

FACTS ABOUT SATURN

The rings of Saturn are mainly ammonia, yet it should vaporize away. How could the rings have been formed? Why do its 17 moons never collide with its rings? How could Phoebe, the farthest moon, not collide with the others?-pp. 15, 17.

FACTS ABOUT OUR MOON

1 - The moon is very different than the earth. p. 17.

2 - Our moon should not be orbiting the earth! It should, long ago, have crashed into us. Our moon is the largest moon that encircles its planet. Yet it is just too close] Even man-made satellites orbit. If not frequently readjusted; it decays and then the satellite crashes. p. 17.

3 - New evidence indicates the moon is only a few thousand years old! p. 17.

ORIGIN OF THE SOLAR SYSTEM

CLASSROOM TEST - BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Circle the correct answer.

YES NO Hydrogen gas is like air. Can swirling air change itself into a planet or star?

YES NO Does the evolutionary theory explain what keeps the moon from falling into the earth?

YES NO According to the theory, thousands of stray moons and planets should be shooting through our solar system each year. Is this happening?

YES NO Our sun is rotating too slowly for the theory to be true.

YES NO Could an exploding star make circling planets?

YES NO Could a collision between two planets make a circling moon?

YES NO There are nine planets and sixty moons in our solar system.

YES NO Our moon is really quite young.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

quick study guide

the origin of the earth

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

The discovery. This is the story of the discovery of certain amazing facts, which clearly prove that our entire world was made quickly and in solid form.

Robert V. Gentry, a Tennessee researcher, has made several astounding discoveries. The most important rock on our planet is granite. This is because it is the foundation rock undergirding every continent in the world.

Evolutionists theorize that our world was the result of a collision, a spin-off from the sun, or condensation of gases in outer space. After a long age at molten temperatures, our planet is supposed to have gradually cooled-and rocks formed from the liquid. But Gentry's discovery establishes the

fact that those basement rocks did not originate from a gradual cooling of lava, but came into existence in their present solid form! p. 13.

That theory completely disproves every possible variation of stellar and earth origins, and shows that our world was created entirely at one time! p. 13.

Gentry's research establishes the fact that all of this granite came into existence in solid form within less than three minutes time. Yet if this is so, then all the rest of the world had to be brought into existence just as rapidly. How can we be sure of that? If the granite had suddenly appeared in less than three minutes, while the rest of the world was molten rock, then the granite would have melted. Therefore our world-all of it-came into existence within that same three minutes. No cooling down occurred. p. 13.

It is, indeed, an astounding discovery. Here are further details:

1 - ROCKS AND GRANITE

Types of -rocks. There are several types of rocks, but we will especially give our attention to granite. It is a hard crystalline rock which tends to be light colored. With crystals large enough to be seen, granite is an attractive mixture of very light quartz and feldspar crystals, along with some darker crystals which are usually mica and hornblende.

Granite is very solid and hard because it tends to have no cracks or seams. Unlike most other rocks, granite can support great weight because it does not easily crack.

Rhyolite is chemically similar to granite, but has much, smaller crystals. p. 14.

More on granite.- Granite is original and undervived. A key factor is that granite, when melted and rehardened, changes into rhyolite. -But nothing, when melted and rehardened- changes into granite! For this reason, it is impossible for scientists to artificially produce granite.

Another special quality -of granite is that it never contains any fossils. But this is understandable, since granite is a Creation rock,-whereas the sedimentary strata rocks were formed during the Genesis Flood, after the Creation of our world occurred.-p. 14.

How thick is granite? Granite is the bedrock undergirding all continents. Until quite recently, it was speculated that the granite would extend down into the earth to a distance of about 4.35 mi [7 km], where the Conrad discontinuity occurs. But recently it has been discovered that the granite keeps going down, far below the Conrad discontinuity. It may continue on down to the 20-mile [32 km] depth. p. 15.

Yet Gentry's research shows that all that granite came into existence within just three minutes. Here is the story of the discovery:

2 - HALOS IN THE GRANITE

Halos in the granite. Working with microscopes in the late 1800s, scientists found small halos in granite. These are tiny, colored concentric circles ("concentric" means circles within circles, as in a bull's eye).

But the scientists could not figure out what caused them. Gentry finally solved the riddle, and that unveiled the discovery to us.

When cut exactly through the middle of the halo, there would be a small grain in the center. It was found that the halos were not flat circles, but tiny spheres etched in the rock around the central grain.-p. 15.

Colored halos. It was not until radioactive elements were discovered, about the beginning of our century that scientists realized that these grains and their halos were the result of radioactivity.-p. 15.

What is radioactivity? Certain chemical elements (radioactive elements) continually disintegrate and emit several types of radiation from their nuclei: alpha, beta, and gamma radiation. These are small radioactive particles which are continually shot out from the element, until they are all gone. Of these three, only the alpha particles develop halos. p. 16.

Joly's research. Working earlier in the century; *John Joly, an Irish researcher, tried to figure out the cause of these halos. Granite includes tiny pieces of biotite, which is a dark mica. Joly found that the halos in that mica were the easiest to observe, because they were the easiest to slice for examination under a microscope.

By the time Joly began his work, it was known that, during radioactive decay, each radioactive parent element changes into another one (a daughter element). The whole thing is called a chain, and each member of the chain is an isotope.-p. 16.

What is this decay chain? There are many radioactive isotopes in nature, but only three are at the very top of decay chains. We will here especially give our attention to the uranium 238 chain.

Uranium 238. begins a radioactive decay chain which ends with lead 206, which is stable without any more radioactivity. pp. 16-17.

Alpha particles make the halos. Joly discovered it was only the alpha particles which made the halos. The halos are formed where the alpha particles stop. p. 17.

The uranium 238 halos. Of the several halos which are produced in the granite, all are formed by only eight alpha particles (the other particles shot off are not alphas, hence leave no halos). p. 18.

The half-life clock. There is a clock hidden in each halo. That is what makes Gentry's discovery so important. We can actually know how long it took for each halo to form. p. 18.

Henderson studies the halos. *G.H. Henderson, in eastern Canada, studied the halos for ten years in the 1930s. Four of the halos he worked with he labeled the A, B, C, and D halos, p. 18.

Gentry becomes interested. Robert Gentry wanted to do his doctoral research on radioactive halos, but was refused permission because such research might conflict with evolutionary theories about the age of the earth. So he went to Nova Scotia and examined Henderson's slide collection. After a third refusal by Georgia Tech, Gentry dropped out of school and began studying the halos on his own. Eventually, he was able to obtain a position at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, in northeastern Tennessee. He used its multimillion dollar facilities for over a decade.-p. 19.

The D halos first. Gentry began his research with the D halo, which was the shortest.

It is of crucial importance that you understand that it is not necessary for the parent element to be uranium 238. The chain could start with one of the elements further down the decay line. At the Creation, not only was uranium 238 made, but also many daughter elements. Each of these, in turn, became the parent of its own chain of radioactive decay. For example, polonium 218 (further down the complete U-238 chain) can begin its own chain, without having uranium 238 as the starter of the polonium 218.

Gentry found that the D halo was caused by uranium 238, and therefore was not important. But he discovered that the A, B, and C halos were not the result of uranium decay, that is, not the daughters of a U-238 chain. This was a key discovery.-p. 19.

The A, B, and C halos. At first, Gentry had liked the D halos because their emitted particles made dark trails. But the A, B, and C halos left no trails.-Then Gentry realized that it was the A, B, and C halos which were important, because they were completely extinct! Time wise, they had totally ended their half-lives. Although once radioactive, they had entirely changed into lead.

Gentry was now on the verge of making his big discovery.--pp. 19-20.

Extinct and identified. Obviously, the A, B, and C halos must have very short half-lives. And during the time they were radioactive, the granite had become solid. But what were they?

Keep in mind that there are trillions and trillions of these halos in the granite of Planet Earth! Whatever time it took for those halos to form would tell how long it took for the granite in the world to become solid.

Finally, Gentry identified Henderson's A, B, and C halos. The A halo was polonium 210 (Po-210); the B halo was Po-214; the C halo was Po-218.p. 20.

Isotopes of Polonium. These three are called isotopes, because they are three types, or forms, of the same element, polonium. They could come from U-238, but they could be parents on their own.-p. 20.

Henderson's theory. Gentry found that Henderson had written a paper. In it, he said that he assumed that the A, B, and C halos were daughters of U-238, because otherwise their presence in the granite would destroy the evolutionary age-of-the-earth theories.

Henderson assumed the three halos were caused by U-238 seeping through tiny cracks in the granite. p. 20.

Research not completed. Although Henderson said that he did not have time to check out whether his idea was correct, he assumed he must be right. Then he died.-p. 20.

Henderson incorrect. Careful investigations by Gentry established that the polonium halos (A, B, and C) could be primary (from a polonium parent), and not secondary (from a polonium daughter of a uranium 238 parent). Gentry had access to specialized equipment which clarified this.

Most of the time the halos were isolated, with no other uranium halos nearby, with no evidence of contamination from uranium flows, and not near any cracks- therefore, they had to be primary. pp. 20-21.

Problems with the A and B halos. Because of a decay chain factor, Gentry could not have total certainty that the A and B halos were always primary.-p. 21. I

Problems from non-halo isotopes. For technical reasons, only an alpha-emitting isotope in the uranium chain-which immediately follows another alpha-emitting isotope--could have its half-life clearly identified. Therefore, only the C halo could be used for definite clock purposes.-p. 21.

Diagrams of the A, B, and C halos. The A halo (Po-210) has a half-life of 138.4 days, which is very short.

The B halo (Po-214) has a half-life of only 164 microsecond! That is extremely short! pp. 21, 23.

The C halo (Po-218) has a half-life of three minutes! It is the KEY radioactive element in this study, and can definitely be used to pinpoint the fact that the granite had to be solid at the beginning or, at the latest, by the end of that three-minute period. (Actually, quicker than that, for much of the halo marking on granite is formed within a minute and a half.)-p. 23.

3 -. POLONIUM 218 HALO

Polonium 218, the key. Only in Po-218 can we know the beginning and end,- and thus the exact time cycle-of a very short radioactive isotope. In every instance in which we find it, we can know the rock, in which it is isolated, came into existence solid within less than three minutes.

Polonium 218 is an original isotope. Evolutionists declare that all the radioactive elements had to decay from the top of the chain. They say this, hoping that, in this way, to prove their theory that the world is billions of years old.

But this aspect of their theory is also wrong, and for this reason: If all the radioactivity in the U-238 chain began at the same time, at the top of the radioactive ladder (from U-238), then, throughout the world, all the U-238 chain would be in equilibrium today. Instead, we find all levels of disintegration, including lead-which is the final end product.

Thus it is only an assumption that only U-238 was present at the beginning.

In contrast, there is proof that multiplied trillions of PO-218 halos did not originate with uranium or any radioactive substance above polonium 218. pp. 23, 25-26.

How can a few Po-218 halos provide such amazing proof? All the granite in the world is time dated by the isolated polonium 218 within it. And there is lots of polonium 218!

Using the halo counts he had been able to make in many samples, Gentry estimates there is one octillion Po-218 halos in the world:

1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000.

Some of Gentry's sample rocks contain more than 10^4 of PO-218 halos/cm³. Imagine a sample of granite in your hand, the size of a golf ball, containing over 10,000 Po-218 halos!-p. 26.

An underlying problem. There is no possible way that the evolutionary theories of stellar and earth origins could be true-if the basement-rock of our planet came into existence within three minutes! Keep in mind that, if the granite was made solid, the rest of the world could never have been molten, or it would have melted the granite-and destroyed all the polonium halos. In addition, the molten mass would have melted the granite; and, upon rehardening, it would have become rhyolite and there would be no granite in the world! pp. 26-27.

Gentry reclassifies granite. According to the evolutionary theory, granite is officially classified as an igneous rock, that is, a rock formed from lava flows. Molten rock is said to have cooled and formed granite.

But Gentry declares this to be untrue. Granite did not come from molten material, but was formed solid in the beginning! He calls it a "Genesis rock." Granite never has fossils in it, and it can never be produced by scientists from molten materials.-p. 227.

4 - SECONDARY HALOS

What about molten rock in the earth? As you will recall, a thick layer of granite is underneath all the land on the continents. It is light colored. Beneath it is molten rock (magma). When magma comes to the surface through cracks, it spews out of volcanoes and makes either light-colored rhyolite (which is melted granite which has rehardened) with very small crystals, or black basalt (which is melted gabbro which has rehardened).

Both granite and gabbro are Genesis rocks, formed at Creation. Neither came from molten rock. When they melt and reharden, they change into different rocks with smaller crystals (rhyolite or basalt). Scientists cannot make granite or gabbro, and the reason is simple: Both were created solid, and not formed from molten materials. p. 27.

Can Po-218 halos be made in the laboratory? It should be easy to do: Just lay a grain of polonium 218 on a rock and let it form a halo in three minutes time. Yet man cannot do it. The problem is that polonium is a gas, and it cannot "be put" anywhere; it just goes where it wants to.

How then did polonium ever get into granite to begin with? How could it penetrate solid, thick granite, and then push itself into solid mica crystals within the granite? First, the gas could not do that. Second, it would have to do it in just a few seconds,-since it only lasts three minutes before it is changed into lead! It would have to enter almost instantaneously, or the halo could not form properly. Much of the halo is formed within a minute and a half.-pp. 27, 29.

The crucial question: secondary origin. Trying to narrow this matter down, Gentry considered all the possibilities, and found four:

1 - The polonium entered the granite by itself but it could not penetrate it in a hundred years, much less than a minute! Keep in mind that the rock had to be solid when the polonium first entered it.

2 - A uranium 238 isotope could have already been in that rock-but then the parent isotopes would have had to leave other halos there also. And they are missing.

3 - A traveling parent isotope could send out a Po-218 halo as it moved along-but, because the Po-218 halo is made within three minutes, the parent would have left other halos in that area. It could not enter and leave fast enough.

4 - A polonium 218 halo could have been in that rock in the very beginning. Then the polonium would be primary-but, if that were true, the rock would have to have been created solid almost instantaneously! That could happen, if the rock was suddenly created solid, with those specks of polonium inside it when it was made. p. 29.

Gentry decides to find secondary origin halos. Gentry was patient and thorough. The next step was to try and find secondary halos, and see what they looked like. He had written many articles, published in scientific journals, and the angry readers either replied that it was a mystery which would eventually be solved or that, somehow, the Po-218 halos must be secondary.

Gentry answered this in two ways. First, he tested the Po-218 halos with the alpha-recoil technique. Second, he went out and located actual secondary halos to see what they looked like. In the process, he made still more discoveries! p. 29.

The alpha-recoil technique. This new analytic method has the power to tell with certainty whether any other radioactive substance had ever been in a given location, including near Po-218 halos.

Flowing uranium always left pit damage on the rock, but Gentry found none of it near the Po-218 halos. Therefore they had to be primary! pp. 2930.

Additional evidence from fluorite. Gentry not only found Po-218 halos in mica crystals, but he also found them in fluorite. The halo crystals are quite common in both. However, the fluorite crystals do not have the perfect cleavage qualities of mica, and often the halos are found deep within them. This is very significant since there is no way that those halos could be secondary. Checking them with the alpha-recoil technique, he found that no traces of uranium had ever been near those halos.-gyp. 30.

The right conditions needed. Gentry decided to begin searching for secondary polonium halos. But where would he find them? Three factors were needed: There would have to be uranium flowing nearby; the polonium would have to have something to stick to, and the substance would have to be open enough for uranium seepage to occur.

Gentry found it difficult to find secondary halos; but, eventually, he learned of some uranium mines in Colorado. Ancient wood in those mines had, at some earlier time, been in a water-soaked, gel-like condition, while uranium solutions passed through them. p. 30.

More discoveries. In that wood, Gentry found secondary halos. Examining them closely, he was startled to find additional evidences of the Flood.

The primary polonium halos, found in granite, had been formed within three minutes after Creation. But these secondary halos, found in wood, were formed at the time of the Flood.

The granite halos demonstrated that Creation occurred very rapidly, while the wood halos showed the rapidity with which the rock strata were laid down by the Flood. This would be understandable; for, during the Flood, sediments would have been laid down very quickly.--pp. 30-31.

Only the Po-210 halo. When the specimens arrived from Colorado, Gentry found large numbers of polonium halos, sometimes over a hundred to the square inch. They came from coalified wood specimens, from trees growing just before the Flood began.

But only Po-210 halos were there, no Po-218 or Po-214 halos. Why was this?

Gentry realized it was another proof of origins. All three halos were in granite, because it had been created solid. But no Po-218 or Po-214 could form in the conditions imposed by the Flood. This is because, while the other two have extremely short half-lives (three minutes or less), Po-210 has a half life of 138.4 days. Although there was abundant uranium in that area, the Po-218 and Po-214 made their halos in the water, as soon as they were released from the uranium. But the Po-210 was able to stick somewhere long enough to make its halo. p. 31.

Elliptical halos. Most of the halos in the wood were elliptical in shape. Why? As more sediments were deposited overhead, they squashed the gel like wood somewhat, as it was compressed under more and more weight. In contrast, the halos in the solid granite were always round. p. 31.

One flood or several? Further study revealed that all the samples were squashed in the same manner, revealing that only one flood had caused them all.-p. 31.

Evolutionary theory of strata disproved. That fact is very important, since these wood samples all came from three different rock strata, supposedly millions of years apart in age. According to evolutionary teaching, there was 119 million years between the three strata! pp. 31-32.

Dual Po-210 halos. The presence of dual halos (one superimposed over another) revealed that the Flood continued laying down sediments for several years, as the washing back and forth occurred. Clearly there was deformation for several years.-p. 32.

Wood specimen conclusions. It was clear that, instead of requiring long ages to change wood into coal, it had occurred only a few thousand years ago.-p. 32.

5 - FALSIFICATION TEST

A falsification test. After being met for several years with denials from evolutionists that he could be right, Gentry issued a challenge. He challenged any scientist or laboratory to change molten material into granite or produce one Po-218 halo on just one piece of granite.

But no one could do it (Gentry later learned that they had tried, but had failed.)-pp. 32-33.

6 - OTHER FACTORS

Additional evidence for an early age. Robert Gentry later did research on rock cores from a hole in a granite formation in New Mexico which was nearly three miles deep (15,000-feet [4,572 m]). Core sections were taken at five different depths. Each contained small samples of radioactive zircon.-p. 33.

What would zircon analysis prove? If the world actually was millions of years old, all the lead in the zircon crystals would have diffused out ages ago. But if the granite

was only 6,000 years old, then most of the lead would still be in it--even at those high temperatures. p. 33.

Results of zircon analysis. Gentry discovered that essentially none of the lead had diffused out, even from the bottom core samples. This was striking evidence for a young earth. p. 33.

Helium analysis. At the same time, Gentry checked for loss of helium from the samples. When uranium and thorium decay, they leave helium behind. If the world was only 6,000 years old, there might still be some helium left, which had not seeped out. p. 33.

Results of helium analysis. Gentry found that amazingly high amounts of helium were still in the zircon samples--even though the temperature at the bottom of the hole was 386.6°F [197°C]. p.33.

Has there been a change in the decay rates? A question which arises is whether the decay rates have changed. Gentry found that the halos were always the same size, even though samples were taken from all over the world. This means the polonium decay rates are very reliable. We can know the world was created within less than three minutes.

The appearance of age factor should be kept in mind. At the time of the Creation, everything would be made in full-grown condition. Just as trees and chickens were created full size, so all the varied radioactive minerals were made at various stages of decay pp. 33, 35.

No uranium in the centers. Gentry found four other evidences that Po-218 is primary.

First, there is no uranium residue at their centers. It has such a long half-life, that if it had once been present it would still be there, actively decaying. p. 35.

Lead 206/lead 207 ratio. Second, the lead ratio in the central grain reveals that only primary polonium had ever been there.-p. 35.

Unique ring structures. Third, the number of rings and their structures reveal that the polonium at the center was primary and not secondary.-pp. 335-36.

Sunburst pattern missing. Fourth, the sunburst pattern--always present when uranium is present is missing from the Po-218 halos, so they must be primary.

Within the polonium grains and halos is to be found the proof that the message they tell us is true: The granite foundation of the continents had to be made in solid form in less than three minutes.-p. 36.

**ORIGIN OF THE EARTH
CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO Granite usually has lots of cracks.
YES NO Granite is the basement rock under all the continents.
YES NO Both uranium and polonium are radioactive.
YES NO Polonium can be a daughter product of uranium decay. Can it also be a parent?
YES NO Gentry estimates there are one octillion Po-218 halos in the world.
YES NO According to Gentry's findings, all the basement rock in the world came into existence within three minutes.
YES NO Gentry says granite was not formed by lava, but is a "Genesis rock."
YES NO Can polonium 218 halos be made in the laboratory?
YES NO Can granite be produced from any kind of melted-down rock?
YES NO The alpha-recoil technique supported Gentry's findings.
YES NO Po-210 halos in coalified wood were always elliptical.
YES NO Zircon analysis showed the world was 60 million years old.
YES NO Helium analysis revealed that the world was only a few thousand years old.

29 Age of the Earth

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide
the age of the earth

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

How old is our world? This is an important question; even though long ages of time are not a proof of evolution, the evolutionists admit that, without long ages, their peculiar theories could not succeed.

For your information, the evolutionary age of the universe is 15 billion years, and the evolutionary age of the earth is 5 billion years.

Actually, there are many evidences that our planet is quite young! Here are sixty reasons why our world is not very old!

These are facts which evolutionists do not like to discuss. We can be thankful the evidence is available. Keep in mind that different research studies indicate different maximum age lengths for our world. Obviously, the smallest fixed time spans must have precedence. On this basis, our planet appears to have been brought into existence about 6,000 years ago.

EVIDENCE FROM THE STARS

1 - Star clusters. One type of galaxy in outer space is the star cluster. There are many of them; and, within each one, are billions of stars. Some of these clusters are

moving so rapidly, that it would be impossible for them to remain together if the universe were very old. p. 11.

2 - Large stars. Some stars are so large, and radiate energy so rapidly, that they could not have contained enough hydrogen to radiate at such fast rates for long ages, because their initial mass would have had to be too immense. p. 11.

3 - High-energy stars. Four types of stars radiate energy too rapidly to have existed longer than 50,000 to 300,000 years. pp. 11-12.

4 - Binary stars. Most stars in the disk of galaxies are binary stars (two stars revolving about one another); yet, frequently, one is classified as very old and the other very young. This cannot be. p. 12.

5 - Hydrogen in the universe. Hydrogen cannot be made by converting other elements into it; therefore, if the universe were as old as the theory requires, there would now be very little hydrogen in the universe. p. 12.

6 - Age of the universe. A sizeable amount of information on this is given in Book 3: The Origin of the Solar System. p. 12.

EVIDENCE FROM OUR SOLAR SYSTEM

7 - Solar collapse. Our sun is gradually shrinking at a steady rate. It is occurring fast enough that, as little as 50,000 years ago, the sun would have been so large that our oceans would boil. In far less time in the past (25,000 years or so), all life on earth would have ceased to exist. p. 12.

8 - Solar neutrinos. The sun is emitting hardly any neutrinos. This, coupled with the fact that the sun is shrinking, points to a recently created sun. p. 12.

9 - Comets. Comets circle the sun and are assumed to be as old as our solar system. Since they are continually disintegrating, and a number are known to have broken up, evidently all of them self-destruct within a relatively short time period. It is estimated that the comets cannot be over 10,000 years old. pp. 12-13.

10 - Comet water. Comets are primarily composed of water. So many small comets strike the earth that, if our planet was billions of years old, our oceans would be filled several times over with water.-p. 13.

11 - Solar wind. The sun's radiation blows very small particles in space outward. All particles smaller than a certain size should, millions of years ago, have been blown out of the solar system. Yet these micro-particles are abundant and still orbiting the sun. Therefore our solar system is quite young.-p. 13.

12 - Solar drag. Small and medium rocks circling the sun are gradually drawn by gravity into the sun. Careful analysis reveals that most would have been gone within 10,000 years, and all within 50,000 years. There is no known source of rock or particle replenishment. pp. 13-14.

EVIDENCE FROM THE OTHER PLANETS

13 - Temperature and erosion on Venus. High surface temperatures on Venus (900°F [482°C]), combined with other of its surface features, support a young age for Venus. If the planet was 4 billion years old, as taught by the theory, its dense atmosphere should long ago have worn away all the craters. p. 14.

14 - Erosion and water on Mars. Only a few thousand years of the type of harsh dust storm weather occurring on Mars should have seriously eroded its many craters and volcanoes. Long-term erosion should also have obliterated the strong color

differences on the surface. The small amount of water on Mars should long ago have been split apart into hydrogen and oxygen by solar ultraviolet rays. The hydrogen should have escaped and the oxygen should be in the atmosphere, but this is not so. p. 14.

15 - Composition of Saturn's rings. Trillions of particles in Saturn's rings are mainly solid ammonia. Because of its high vapor pressure, it could not survive long without vaporizing into outer space.-p. 14.

16 - Bombardment of Saturn's rings. Meteoroids bombarding Saturn's rings would have destroyed them in far less than 20,000 years. p. 14.

17 - More ring problems. Rings found on Jupiter, Uranus, and Neptune indicate that they too have a very young age. p. 14.

18 - Jupiter's moons. One of Jupiter's largest moons, Io, ejects large amounts of material through volcanoes. Although quite small, it has the most active volcanoes we know of, and must be quite youthful. pp. 14-15.

EVIDENCE FROM OUR OWN MOON

19 - Moon dust. Ultraviolet light changes moon rocks into dust. It had long been predicted that a thick layer of dust (20-60 miles [32-96.5 km], caused by ultraviolet radiation on the moon's 4 billion-year-old surface, must cover the moon's surface. But scientists were astonished to learn that there is not over 2-3 inches [5.08-7.62 cm] of dust just the amount expected if the moon was only a few thousand years.-pp. 15, 17.

20 - Lunar soil. The dirt on the moon's surface does not show the amount of soil mixing it should have, if the moon were very old. p. 17.

21 - Lunar isotopes. Short-term radioactive isotopes (uranium 236 and thorium 230) have been found in the collected moon rocks. These isotopes do not last long and rather quickly turn into lead. If the moon were even 50,000 years old, these short-life radioisotopes would long since have decayed into lead. The moon cannot be older than several thousand years. p. 17.

22 - Lunar radioactive heat. Moon rocks have relatively high radioactivity, indicating a young moon, because of the large amount of heat generated.-p. 17.

23 - Lunar gases. Small amounts of several inert gases have been found on the moon. At today's intensity of solar wind, the amount of inert gases found on the moon would reach their full amount in less than 10,000 years-and no longer p. 17.

24 - Lunar phenomena. Transient lunar activity data (moonquakes, lava flows, gas emissions, etc.) reveals the moon is still remarkably active, showing it is quite young. p. 17.

25 - Lunar recession. The moon is already far too close to the earth; and, due to tidal friction, is gradually moving farther away from us. Based on the rate of recession, the moon cannot be very old. If it were even 20,000 to 30,000 years old, it would at an earlier time have fallen into our planet.-p. 17.

EVIDENCE FROM EARTH'S ATMOSPHERE

26 - Atmospheric helium. Our helium comes from three sources: Radioactive decay of either uranium or thorium produces helium. Helium spewed out by the sun, is pulled in by earth's gravity. Helium is also produced in the upper atmosphere. All of that helium is accumulating, since helium is not able to reach escape velocity and go into outer space. But the amount of helium we have is too small if our world has existed for long ages. Based on all three helium producers, earth's atmospheric age cannot be over 10,000 years. pp. 17-18.

27 - Carbon 14 disintegration. The present worldwide buildup of radiocarbon in the atmosphere would have produced all the world's radiocarbon in only several thousand years. Based on this, earth's age is estimated at 8,000 years. p. 18.

EVIDENCE FROM METEORITES

28 - Meteor dust. Micro-meteors, composed of iron, nickel, and silicate compounds that are continually entering our atmosphere, adds 25 tons [22.7 mt] to the earth daily. Based on the amount here, earth's age should be in the thousands, not millions of years. Regarding nickel content, the amount in the oceans could have been carried there from land in 9,000 years (or half that time, if nickel had already been there). pp. 18-19.

29 - Meteor craters. Meteor craters are never found in the rock strata! Yet they would be found there, if millions of years were required to lay down that sedimentary strata. Meteor craters always lie close to or on the earth's surface. Thus, all the meteors which have struck the earth-have hit it within the last few thousand years. p. 19.

30 - Meteor rocks. When meteors strike the earth, they are called meteorites. Supposedly, this has happened for millions of years, yet the meteorites are only found at, or close to, the earth's surface. None are ever found in the deeper sedimentary strata. Therefore, the earth is young and the strata was quickly laid down not too long ago. p. 19.

31 - Tektites. Tektites are a special type of glassy meteorite. They are especially found in large areas, called strewn fields. Each shower lies on the surface or in the topmost layers of soil; they are never found in the sedimentary fossil-bearing strata. If the earth were billions of years old, they should be found in all the strata. They never show more than a few thousand years of weathering. Carbon-14 tests show them to be no older than 6,500 years. pp. 19, 21.

EVIDENCE FROM THE GLOBE

32 - Earth rotation. Because of solar and lunar gravitational drag forces, the spin of the earth (now about 1,000 mph (1,609 kmph)) is gradually slowing down. If our world was billions of years old, it would already have stopped turning. Or, calculating differently, a billion years ago our planet would have been spinning so fast-it would have become a pancake. So, either way, our earth cannot be more than a few thousand years old. p.21.

33 - Magnetic field decay. Earth's magnetic field is slowly, relentlessly lessening. Even 7,000 years ago, the earth would have had a magnetic field 32 times stronger than it is now. Only 20,000 years ago, enough heat would have been generated to liquefy the planet. Therefore, the earth cannot be over 6,000 or 7,000 years old. This is an important matter, affects the entire planet, and has been measured for over 150 years. pp. 21-23.

EVIDENCE FROM BENEATH THE SURFACE OF THE EARTH

34 - Escaping natural gas. Oil and gas are usually located in a porous and permeable rock like sandstone or limestone. Fluids and gas can easily travel through the containing rock, but more slowly pass out through the impermeable rock cap. The rate of gas escapement has been found to be far too rapid to agree with long ages. If the theory were true, all the natural gas would now be escaped.-p. 23.

35 - Oil pressure. When drillers first penetrate into oil, there is a "gusher." This is caused by high pressure in the oil vein. Analysis of surrounding rock permeability reveals that any pressure within the oil bed should have bled off within a few thousand

years, but it has not happened. These deep rock formations and their entrapped oil cannot be older than 7,000 to 10,000 years. pp. 23, 26.

36 - Oil seepage. If much oil seepage had occurred from out of the ocean floors, all the oil in offshore wells would be gone if the earth were 20,000 years old. p. 26.

37 - Lack of anciently destroyed reservoirs. All the oil in the world must have been placed there in relatively recent times. If long ages had elapsed, the oil reservoirs would be gone, and we would only find the cavities where they had been. But such locations are never found. p. 26.

38 - Molten earth. Deep within the earth, the rock is molten; but, if the earth were billions of years old, long ages ago our planet would have cooled far more than it now has. p. 26.

39 - Volcanic eruptions. There are many extinct volcanoes, but evidence indicates that volcanic activity has only continued a relatively short time since the world began. Otherwise, there would be far more lava than now exists.-pp. 26-27.

40 - Zircon/lead ratios. Lead gradually leaks out of radioactive zircon crystals, and does so more rapidly at high temperatures. Yet very little lead has escaped from zircon found deep in the earth at temperatures above 313°C [595.4°F]. This points strongly to a young earth.-p. 27.

41 - Zircon/helium ratios. Helium is a gas and can diffuse out of crystals much more rapidly than many other elements, including lead. Since heat increases chemical activity, there should be no helium left in the zircon in that same deep hole. Yet amazingly little helium has escaped. Therefore the world must be very young. p. 27.

42 - Soil-water ratio. The earth is still in the partially soaked condition it became at the time of the Flood. This indicates that the Flood occurred only a few thousand years ago. p. 27.

EVIDENCE FROM ON THE SURFACE OF THE EARTH

43 - Topsoil. It has been calculated that 300 to 1,000 years is required to build one inch [2.54 cm] of topsoil. Yet the average depth of topsoil is about eight inches. On this basis, the earth could only be a few thousand years old.-p. 27.

44 - Niagara Falls. Erosion of Niagara Falls is about 3.5 feet [106.68 cm] per year. Since the length of the gorge is about 7 miles, the age of the falls would normally be about 5,000 to 10,000 years at the most. However, the Flood would have greatly accelerated that erosion. p. 27.

EVIDENCE FROM THE OCEANS

45 - River deltas. The Mississippi River dumps 300 million cubic yards [229 million cm] of mud into the Gulf of Mexico each year continually enlarging the delta area. Yet the Mississippi delta is not large. Calculations reveal it has only been forming for the past 4,000 years (4,620 years, to be exact). If the world was 120,000 years old, that delta would extend all the way to the North Pole.-pp. 27-28.

46 - Sea ooze. Soft mud from dead plants and animal life form on the floor of the oceans, at the rate of about one inch (2.54 cm) every 1,000 to 5,000 years. The depth of ooze indicates the earth is quite young. p. 28.

47 - Erosion in the ocean. We do not find the erosion in the ocean floors which ought to be there if the world were millions or billions of years old.

There are ragged cliffs and steep mountains. Indeed, the continents should have eroded into the oceans by now. p. 28.

48 - Thickness of ocean sediments. If the earth was billions of years old, the ocean floor would be covered by sediments from land, measuring 60 to 100 miles [96.5 to 160.9 km) thick, and all the continents would be eroded away. Instead, we only find a few thousand feet of sediment. Based on known yearly sediment deposition, calculations yield only a few thousand years for our planet.--pp. 28-29.

49 - Ocean concentrations. We have a good estimate of the amount of various elements and salts in the ocean, and the amount being added each year. On this basis, our world is fairly young, For example, the age of the earth, based on nitrate analysis, would be 13,000 years.-p. 29.

50 - Growth of coral. Coral growth rates indicate the earth is quite young. No known coral formation is older than 3,500 years.--p. 29.

EVIDENCE FROM LIVING THINGS

51- Tree rings. Sequoias are never older than 4,000 years, yet are the oldest living thing in our world. Bristlecone pines are said to be older (over 4,000 years); however, it is now known that some years they produce a double tree ring. Therefore, the sequoias remain the oldest. Only man or flood can destroy the sequoia. It appears that climatic conditions, prior to 600 B.C., was erratic and produced difficult conditions, enabling tree-ring counts to provide longer ages than actually occurred.-pp. 29-30.

52 - Mutation load. Calculations based on genetic load (the gradually increasing negative effect of mutation on living organisms) indicate that life i forms could not have continued more than several thousand years,-and still be as free from mutational defects as they now are. (The deteriorated atmosphere after the Flood, with the consequent increase of solar radiation, probably increased this genetic load.) p. 30.

EVIDENCE FROM CIVILIZATION

53 - Historical records. If mankind had been living on earth for millions of years, we should find records extending back at least 500,000 years. (Evolutionists claim that man has been here for a million years.) But, instead, records only go back to about 2000-3500 B.C. When writing began, It was fully developed. The earliest dates are Egyptian (Manetho's king lists), but should be lowered for several reasons. Well-authenticated Egyptian dates only go back to 1600 B.C.-pp. 30-31.

54 - Early Biblical records. Bible records carry us back to a Creation date of approximately 4000 B.C., with a Flood date of about 2348 B.C. Scientific facts, such as we find in this chapter point us toward the same dates. pp. 31-32.

55.- Astronomical records. Prior to 2250 B.C., we have not one record of a solar eclipse ever having been seen by people! Because It is totally accurate. that earliest recorded astronomical event is a significant date. It comes only about a hundred years after the Flood. We have reason to believe the sky was darkened with volcanic eruptions for years after the Flood ended.-p. 32.

56 - Writing. The oldest writing (pictographic Sumerian) is dated at about 3500 B.C. The earliest Western script (Proto-Sinaitic) somewhat before 1550 B.C.-p. 32.

57 - Civilizations. No really verified archaeological datings predate the period of about 3000 B.C. More ancient dates come from radiocarbon dating, which, prior to about 600 B.C., is known to be much more inaccurate. In every instance, our earliest aspects

of civilization (crops, animal husbandry, metallurgy, building, cities, etc.) go back to the Near East. This agrees with the Bible record (Genesis 8:4).-p. 32.

58 - Languages. Records of ancient languages never go back beyond 3000 B.C.; yet, beginning in the Near East, there are language families which have spread all over the world since then.-pp. 32-33.

59 -Population statistics. Estimates, based on population changes, indicate that, about the year 3300 B.C.. there was only one family-p. 33.

60 - Facts vs. theories. Evolutionary estimates of the age of the earth have constantly changed and lengthened with the passing of time (it currently stands at 5 billion years). But the scientific evidence remains constant and, as new authentic evidence emerges, it only fastens down the dates even more firmly. It all points to a beginning for our planet about 6,000 years ago. Some may see it as 7,000 to 10,000 years. but the evidence points most distinctly toward a date of about 4,000 B.C. for the origin of our planet. The evidence for an early earth is not only solid, it is scientific-pp. 334-35.

-For more information on this, see Book 13: Ancient Man, and Book 20: The Truth about Archaeological Dating.

**AGE OF THE EARTH
CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- | | |
|--------|--|
| YES NO | Our sun is gradually shrinking in size. |
| YES NO | The comets are gradually going to pieces. |
| YES NO | There is not over 2-3 inches [5-7 cm] of dust on the moon. |
| YES NO | Tektites are a special type of swamp grass. |
| YES NO | There is never any pressure in oil wells. |
| YES NO | The oldest living tree is never older than 4,000 years. |
| YES NO | Historical records only go back a few thousand years. |
| YES NO | The earliest astronomical record is 2250 B.C. |
| YES NO | There are no verified civilizations older than 3000 B.C. |
| YES NO | No languages go back beyond 30,000 years. |
| YES NO | The evidence indicates that our world is quite young. |

SCORE

NAME

DATE

34 Origin of the Stars

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide
dating of time in evolution

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

In this book we will consider every significant method used by scientists today to date ancient substances.

THE FACTOR OF TIME

Evolutionary theories cannot do what is claimed for them, even when given long ages in which to do it. Yet, without long ages, evolutionists cannot make their theories plausible.

Long ages is not evolution. Whether or not scientific dating methods are accurate has nothing to do with whether evolutionary theories work. However, in this chapter, we will learn that the time dating methods, which appear to stretch out the past to great lengths, are amazingly unreliable.

Magical time. Time is not a magical substance that can work great wonders. If a cow cannot change itself into a whale today, how could it do it in a thousand years? Yet, as we shall learn in Book 18 in this series (Scientists Speak), evolution teaches that, if given enough time, a cow (or some other mammal) will eventually swim out into the ocean and become a whale. pp. 11-12.

More time, less likelihood. Actually, a reputable scientist has deduced that, the longer the amount of time that passes, the less likely it is that the desired evolutionary change could possibly occur! p. 12.

Real time- vs. theory time. As noted in the preceding book in this series (Book 5: The Age of the Earth), actual human records reveal that past time has been very short.-pp. 12-13.

Flawed time date methods. Did you know that none of the evolutionary dating methods agree with one another! They all give different dates! There are so many false assumptions, errors of various types, and misinterpretations that researchers discard most of the dates and never report on them. Instead, only those dates are used which nicely support evolutionary theories. The laughable part is that the stated ages of the strata were hunched out in the nineteenth century, long before modern dating methods were discovered . p. 13.

Long ages needed. Evolutionists need long ages in order to pretend that their theories are true. Yet all the non-historical dating methods are unreliable. In contrast, as shown in Book 5: Age of the Earth, the evidence points toward the origin of our world being about 6,000 years old, with the universal Flood somewhere around 2348 B.C.-p. 13.

RADIO-DATING

Major dating methods. There are three primary radioactive dating methods: (1) uranium-thorium-lead dating, (2) rubidium-strontium dating, and (3) potassium-argon dating.

In each system, the "parent" element decays to a "daughter" element, and a certain amount of time is supposed to elapse throughout the decay process.-pp. 13-14.

Seven initial assumptions. Each of these dating methods can only be accurate if each of the following assumptions always apply:

1 - Nothing can contaminate the parent or daughter products during the process. When something is in the ground for a long period of time, how can anyone be certain that this is true?

2 - Each system must initially contain none of the daughter products. But, of course, no one was back there then to know that.

3 - The decay rate must never change. Who was standing there all those years with a time clock in his hand?

4 - There can be no variation in decay rates. But one researcher has already demonstrated that it actually happens.

5 - If any change occurred earlier in certain atmospheric conditions, this could profoundly affect radioactivity. There are reasons to believe this has happened. (See Book 14: Effects of the Flood)

6 - Any change in the Van Allen radiation belt would greatly affect the rates, and that could also have occurred.

7 - No daughter products could initially be present, yet there is good reason to believe that this assumption is also not correct. pp. 14-15.

Five radiometric dating inaccuracies. Here are several reasons why uranium and thorium dating methods cannot be relied on. Each of these five problems is very, very likely to have occurred over past time, thus devastating the value of the computed dates:

(1) Lead could originally have been mixed in with the parent substance. (2) Part of the uranium and its daughter products could previously have leaked out. (3) Inaccurate lead ratio computations may have been worked out in the lab. (4) During the decay process, neutron capture (from a radio-genic lead) may have contaminated the results. (5) Clock settings would initially be greatly varied, if the substances originally were (as evolutionists claim) derived from molten materials. pp. 17-19.

Thorium-lead dating. The same flaws with uranium are applicable to thorium. In addition, contamination factors, common to both, may trigger different results in thorium than in uranium. A powerful evidence that these dates are useless is the fact that uranium and thorium dates always widely disagree with one another. p. 19.

Lead 210 and helium dating. These are two other dating methods. Lead 210 can leak or be contaminated by entry of other leads. Helium, being a gas, leaks so radically that it is also useless for dating purposes. p. 19.

Rubidium-strontium dating. This is a widely used dating method at the present time. But, in addition to all the other problems mentioned earlier,--the experts have been unable to decide on the half-life of rubidium! This is like saying we will use a certain wall clock to figure time with, while having no idea what each "hour" that passes on that clock equals: five minutes or two days. To add to the problem, strontium 87 is easily leached away, thus ruining the computation. p. 19.

Potassium-argon dating. Since potassium is found in fossil-bearing strata, this is a favorite method. But the experts cannot agree on the half-life of potassium, and argon is a rare gas that quickly escapes from the rock into the atmosphere. In addition, potassium can easily be leaked. Finally, the notoriously defective methods used for uranium dating must be used to figure potassium-argon dates.

Yet, in spite of these mammoth defects, potassium is the most common method of dating fossil-bearing rocks. As with the other dating methods, its results are reported only in those instances in which they seem close enough to the nineteenth century strata dating theory. pp. 19, 21.

Problems with all radiodating methods. Here is a remarkable example of what we are talking about: All the dating methods were applied to the moon rocks. The result: dates varying from 2 million to 28 billion years! Yet, as we found in Book 5 (Age of the

Earth), non-radiogenic dating methods show the moon to be only a few thousand years old.-p. 22.

Emery's research. *G.T. Emery discovered that long half-life radioactive elements (the kind discussed in this present chapter) do not have consistent half-lives! This would be like having a clock, with one "sixty minutes" actually eight minutes long, with another two days in duration.

In spite of these facts, evolutionists, in desperation, continue to hang their theories on cobwebs.-pp. 22-23.

Just one catastrophe. *FB. Jeaneman noted that just one catastrophe, such as a worldwide flood, would throw all the dating clocks off. Immense contamination of all radioactive sources would occur; there would be major shifting of rock pressure and reversals in earth's magnetic core. p. 23.

Five ways to change the rates. All aside from contamination and other problems, everything hinges on unchanging decay rates. But 'H.C. Dudley noted five ways they could change. Dudley actually changed the decay rates of 14 different radioisotopes by means of pressure, temperature, electric and magnetic fields, and stress in molecular layers. He also cited research by Westinghouse laboratories which changed the rates simply by placing inactive iron next to radioactive lead. p. 23.

ROCK STRATA DATING

Strata and fossil dating. An in-depth analysis of fossil and strata dating will be given in Books 11 and 12 (Fossils and Strata-Parts I and 2). But, right here, we will note the relationship of radioactive dating to fossils and strata-and find there is no relationship!

Fossil and sedimentary strata dating were imaginatively invented in the nineteenth century, and are totally useless. Radioactive dating of fossils and strata are also useless. Consider this:

Only three usable test results. It is impossible to date fossils or strata by radioactive dating. In fact, only three test dates have ever been accepted! All the others vary so wildly that they have been thrown out. Tens of thousands of tests, costing millions of dollars in salaries and lab time, have been discarded because they have been found to be useless.

Random guesses, unproven possibilities, and confused data; that is the story of fossil and strata dating.-pp. 23-25.

Astounding discrepancies. Of the 1400 radioisotopes known to exist, only 75 have half-lives longer than 700 years. In 1978, John Woodmorappe carried out exhaustive research to ascertain the dates given to materials in the 11 major strata levels. In each case, he found variations in the millions or billions of years! The dates just do not agree with one another. p. 25.

RADIOCARBON DATING

Carbon 14 cycle. Carbon 14 (C-14) dating was devised in 1948. Theoretically, it sounds like a good method, but in practice it does not turn out that way. Radiocarbon dating is only "consistent," because the large number of C-14 dates which do not agree-are thrown out. pp. 26-27.

Thirteen assumptions. As with uranium and other radioactive dating, carbon 14 dating requires flawless uniformity, down through the centuries, in regard to 13 assumptions. If one or more are incorrect, then C-14 dating will be unreliable. p.27.

Seventeen radiodating problems. In addition, there are 17 reasons why radiocarbon dating is seriously flawed:

1 - Type of carbon. There can never be certainty as to what type of carbon may be present. It might be from carbon 14, but it might be a different carbon. p. 28.

2 - Variations within samples. There can be biological alteration of materials within the soil, which can radically affect the dating over a period of time, p. 28.

3 - Loss of C-14. Moisture intrusion of any kind will dramatically affect the dating outcome. p. 28.

4 - Lesson from Jarmo. Eleven C-14 tests, made at Jarmo (in modern Iraq), yielded dates with a 6,000 year spread! p. 28.

5 - Changes in atmospheric carbon. We do not know what were the carbonic and atmospheric conditions in ancient times. Yet we must have that information, in order to start the radiocarbon clock and keep it running right for the first part of its cycle.-pp. 28-29.

6 - Sunspot cycles. Sunspot production greatly affects C-14 activity, yet all we know with certainty is that there have been changes in the past. However, radiocarbon dating is based on the assumption that there have been no such changes! p.29.

7 - Radiocarbon date survey. A survey of 15,000 carbon 14 dates reveals a wide variation from other radiodating techniques. Yet they all ought to agree. p. 29.

8 - Change in neutrino radiation. A change in neutrino radiation into our atmosphere, in earlier times, would also dramatically affect radiocarbon dating. But nothing is known definitively.p. 29.

9 - Recent dates are most accurate. One landmark fact is that C-14 dates, from the present time back to 600 B.C., tend to be more accurate. Before that time, the results are highly speculative.-p. 29.

10 - If warmer and more water vapor. It is highly significant that, if the earth was either warmer at an earlier time or had more water in the atmosphere, the C-14 clocks would slow down dramatically; that is, register longer periods of time than they should. (There is indication, from Flood evidence, that both occurred; see Book 14: Effects of the Flood.) p. 31.

11 - Cosmic rays. The amount of cosmic radiation entering the atmosphere and reaching the earth would also be crucial, since it is cosmic rays which make carbon 14 in the first place. p. 31.

12 - Magnetic field. The greater the strength of earth's magnetic field, the more cosmic rays would enter our atmosphere. And it is the cosmic rays which change C-12 into C-14 (which is then absorbed by body tissues). p. 31.

13 - Moisture conditions. Even small changes in atmospheric or ground moisture, would greatly affect the C-14 clock.-How about a worldwide Flood?-p. 31.

14 - Dramatic changes after the Flood. Immense changes occurred worldwide (during and just after the Flood) In the atmosphere, vapor canopy, and temperature. Immense volcanic output for about a century thereafter would have had significant impact on the clocks. pp. 31-32.

15 - Even modern specimens are inaccurate. Not only are ancient specimens inaccurate, but recent ones also are. Freshly killed seals have been dated as having lived 1,300 years ago, etc.-p. 32.

16 - Carbon inventory. Drastic changes during, and following, the Flood produced immense variations in the amount of carbon in the atmosphere.-p. 32.

17 - Four radiocarbon samples. Four examples of ridiculous C-14 date results are cited. pp. 32-33.

Throwing off the clock. *W F Libby, inventor of the C-14 dating technique, found that, prior to 1600 B.C., the radiocarbon dates go wild. But, since he assumed earth was millions of years old, he went ahead with his work and ignored the problem. (Book 14, Effects of the Flood, will explain that the Flood very likely dated at about 2348 B.C., resulted in over a century of dramatically changed conditions.)-p. 33.

C-14 data points to the Flood. If the Genesis Flood actually occurred, there should be a lot of specimens which died at about that date. One research scholar found such evidence. A gigantic loss of life occurred at approximately 2500 B.C.-pp. 33-34.

Mass spectrometer. This new and expensive technique shows all ancient dates should be very low.-p. 34.

AMINO ACID DATING

Amino acid decomposition. This dating method, devised in 1955, analyzes ancient amino acid remains and tries to date them. Each type of plant and animal has its own special amino acid ratios. Researchers have reported that this dating method can only yield broad ranges of possible dates.-p. 34.

No ancient fossils. Traces of amino acids are today found on all ancient fossil remains! This means that none of the fossils are very old. p. 34.

Racemic dating. This is a second amino acid dating method, based on the fact that all animals only have L (left-handed) amino acids. (In Book 7, The Primitive Environment, we will learn that this fact is a powerful evidence that God made them; since, in a laboratory, amino acid synthesis results in a 50/50 mixture of left and right.)-pp. 34-35.

Seeking a racemic mixture. At death, some of the L amino acids begin converting over to D (right-handed ones). Eventually, a 50/50 pattern emerges, which is called "racemic." Scientists prefer racemic amino acid dating, since it is easier to do. p. 35.

Ten racemic problems. Ten different factors affect the results of racemic dating, yet no one knows which ones are off or to what degree. So racemic dating is practically worthless. p. 35.

Most easily contaminated. Water-contaminated materials have their racemic clocks thrown off. Bone from a given period will yield 20,000 years, while comparable seashell meat will be 150,000 years. p. 35.

Temperature changes. Racemic dating also requires that the temperature not change for thousands of years! Just a one degree increase in temperature at 73.4°F [23°C] will produce a nearly 16 percent increase in the rate at which racemization occurs.-pp. 35-36.

Cold storage problem. But cold is as much a problem as is heat. As the cold increases, racemization slows down. Example: It is known that, because of the overcast caused by heavy volcanism, the world became much colder for about a century after the Flood. Yet this cold factor would cause creatures buried in the sedimentary strata to appear to be over 100,000 years older than they really were! p. 36.

Moisture: A double problem. The experts tell us that moisture must be present for racemization to occur. Yet that continual inflow of moisture would bring with it various kinds of contamination. One such contaminant would be the pH of that moisture. For example, a higher pH (as would occur if the penetrating water had some dissolved limestone in it, not an uncommon occurrence), would cause very rapid racemization-and impart an apparently great age to the sample. p. 36.

Another radiodating problem. As would be expected, racemization results do not agree with radiocarbon test results. Yet they ought to agree.p. 36.

OTHER DATING METHODS

Astronomical dating. We discussed this in great detail in Book 1 in this series (Origin of Matter). The methods used to date the stars and galaxies are wildly incoherent, because they are based on a theory which is incorrect (the speed theory of the redshift).pp. 36-37.

Paleomagnetic dating. Paleomagnetic dating is also based on incorrect theories. This is discussed in greater detail in Book 16: Laws of Nature.-p. 37.

Varve dating. Certain sedimentary deposits are composed of extremely thin layers. Evolutionists theorize that each band must be exactly one year. But any limnologist will tell you that a brief flooding into a lake will cause a varve, which is a settling out of finer particles. In addition, only a rapid laying down of sediments could produce the plant and animal fossils we find in varves. p. 37.

Tree ring dating. Bristlecone pine rings indicate an apparent age somewhat older than that of the giant sequoias. But evidence reveals that more than one bristlecone ring can be laid down in a single year. Sequoias are the oldest living thing, and their age closely correlates with the end of the Flood. See Book 5: Age of the Earth for more on this.-p. 37.

Buried forest strata dating. Sometimes vertical trees are buried in sedimentary strata. Because they are found at various levels, it is said that this proves long ages. But how did vertical trees remain in place for long ages, while they were gradually covered over? Vertical trees in strata prove the Flood, not long ages of evolution.-pp. 37-38.

Peat dating. Evolutionists theorize that peat moss forms at the rate of one-fifth inch per century. But there is evidence indicating that this assumption is not true. p. 38.

Reef dating. *Darwin theorized that coral reefs grew as the oceans, over long ages, gradually filled with water. Yet the truth is that the Flood occurred rapidly--and coral is only found fairly close to the surface. Thus, they began forming after the oceans were rather quickly filled. p. 38.

Thermo-luminescence dating. This little known dating theory has also failed to find scientific support. pp. 38-39.

Stalactite formation. Stalactites (the long conical formations which hang from cave ceilings) are said to require long ages to develop. But there is abundant evidence that they can form much more quickly p. 39.

**DATING OF TIME IN EVOLUTION - CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO If a cow could not change itself into a whale in one day, could it do it in a thousand years?
- YES NO Evolutionary radiodating techniques require that a given substance must remain uncontaminated, for millions of years, by outside factors (heat, water, air pressure changes, etc.). Could that ever happen?
- YES NO For radioactive dating to be correct, each sample would have to be pure at the beginning, and remain that way for millions of years.
- YES NO Helium dating would be very stable, since it is a gas and stays put.
- YES NO Water flowing onto a sample could not only bring contaminants, but could leak out (carry away) part of the sample.
- YES NO Using a variety of methods, the moon rocks all dated the same.
- YES NO A worldwide flood would greatly affect the radioactive clock settings.
- YES NO Of the tens of thousands of radiodating tests made on fossils, only three have agreed with evolutionary theories. All the rest were discarded.
- YES NO None of the carbon 14 test dates are ever thrown out.
- YES NO Eleven tests at Jarmo, Iraq, produced dates which were as much as 6,000 years different from one another.
- YES NO Tree ring dating is always accurate.

SCORE NAME DATE

39 Primitive Environment

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide
the primitive environment

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

The evolutionists' problem. Our world teems with life forms-plants and animals of all types. Yet evolutionists cannot explain how even one of them could have come into existence.

Although we are here talking about "the origin of the species" the basic issue in evolutionary theory yet Charles Darwin never touched on that point in his book by that name. Later, he wrote a letter in which he expressed a wish that somehow it might have happened in a "warm little pond" somewhere. But the truth is that evolutionists cannot satisfactorily explain how even one life form came into existence, much less millions of them.

The evolutionists' solution. What is the primitive environment? A fantastic yarn has been dreamed up, in the hope that it might explain how dirt or minerals in water might somehow have changed into a living creature.

Let us look at this theory. We will discover that, scientifically, it could not have produced life out of non-life.

THE ERROR OF SPONTANEOUS GENERATION

One of the superstitious beliefs of the Dark Ages was the theory of "spontaneous generation." That was the idea that if you threw a bunch of clothes in a corner, after a time it would turn into mice. If you kept some old flour for a time, it would change into worms.

Of course, that superstition was not true. Yet it is actually the basis of modern "scientific evolution"!

We all know that everything alive ultimately had to come from something else that was alive. Parents have babies, and they grow up and have more babies. Mice make nests in clothes, and insects lay eggs in grain.

But way back in the beginning, something got this life-from-life process started. There is only one answer: It began when God designed and made our first parents. All of the complicated and carefully interrelated details in your body systems-were designed by a Person with super intelligence and immense power.

However, in order to deny the existence of God, atheists say that the first mice, men, and microbes sprang forth from sand and seawater! That is impossible, and knowledgeable chemists declare the idea to be utter foolishness.

In the last century, Louis Pasteur and other scientists conclusively proved that "life comes only from life." The scientific name for that fact is "biogenesis."

Here are several reasons why it would be impossible for even a small creature to arise from rain water on a dirt pile or from seawater in an ocean:

Instant success necessary. In order for life to arise from non-life, there would have to be immediate and total success. All the complicated body parts, enzymes, etc., would have to be there instantly at the very beginning-or the next instant that life form would be dead. p. 15.

Immediate reproduction needed. As soon as the first life form existed, even though it be a small microbe, it would have to be able to divide and make copies of itself, or reproduce and bear young.-p. 15.

CHEMICAL COMPOUNDS

Chemical compounds and laboratories. The only place you will find the immense variety of chemical compounds, found in a living organism, is in a million-dollar chemical laboratory. You will not find it in a dirt pile or in seawater.

Interestingly enough, those laboratories which are well-enough equipped to consider "making life"-still cannot do it! Even when the chemicals and lab equipment are in hand, life can never be made from nonlife. A dead animal is full of the right chemical compounds, but it is no longer alive. A trained scientist can make nonliving amino acids, but he cannot make them come to life. Only God can do that. pp. 15-16.

Chemical compounds and the law of mass action. According to the law of mass action, even if a life form could be made in seawater, it would immediately disintegrate back into chemicals.

This is because chemical reactions always proceed in a direction from highest to lowest concentration.

For example, even if an amino acid (a building block of protein) could be made in seawater, the next instant, the law of mass action would eliminate it. The amino acid would hydrolyze with the abundant water-and return back into separate chemicals!

Because this law applies to chemical reactions which are reversible, it applies to all life compounds.-p. 15.

Chemical compounds and concentrations. Evolutionists recognize that there is only one possible place where life could have originated by itself--and that is in warm seawater.

Yet we never find the rich concentrations of chemicals, in seawater, that would be needed. p. 14.

Seawater does indeed contain all the elements, but in extremely small amounts. Seawater is far too diluted to be useful. In addition, it does not have the remarkable number of chemical compounds found in a living organism.-p. 16.

Chemical compounds and precipitates. Even if the chemical compounds, needed to produce a living creature, could make themselves the next instant they would start to precipitate; that is, they would start uniting with still other chemical compounds. For example, fatty acids would combine with magnesium or calcium; and arginine (an amino acid), chlorophyll, and porphyrins would be absorbed by clays.

Oddly enough, many of the compounds in your body have to be kept separate-or they will mutually destroy one another! An example would be sugars and amino acids, when brought together.-p. 17.

Chemical compounds and fluid condensation. Certain compounds can only exist when the water is carefully drained off. This would include fats, sugars, nucleic acids, and proteins. So they could not be made in any kind of water.-p. 17.

Chemical compounds and water. Lab technicians do most of their work with fluids other than water. They do not use seawater or even tap or distilled water to make amino acids. And the amino acids they make are always dead; no one ever makes life or puts life into anything.- P p. 17.

Chemical compounds and energy. There would have to be an energy source in the task of making life. In desperation, evolutionists speculate that perhaps a lightning bolt supplied it! Now, really! Lightning kills; it does not impart life!

By the way, once lightning has passed through an object, no energy remains. Yet living creatures must have ongoing energy sources within themselves.-p. 17.

Chemical compounds and oxygen. A major obstacle to producing life from non-life is the presence of oxygen. The chemicals of life will decompose if oxygen is in the air.

When the chemical compounds within the life form are opened to the presence of oxygen, those compounds decompose. They oxidize. That is another reason a living creature could not be invented by ocean water; there is oxygen there. pp. 17, 19.

Chemical compounds and supply. There has never been enough of the needed chemicals available to make the needed compounds found in living things.

For example, there is not enough concentration of nitrogen in air or water for amino acids to form by themselves. The same holds true for phosphorus, yet it is a vital component of DNA and other high-energy compounds.

None other than *Carl Sagan, a leading evolutionist, declared that adenosine triphosphate (high energy phosphate) could not possibly form by itself.-p. 19.

Chemical compounds and rich mixtures. Evolutionists have searched the globe for places where rich mixtures of chemicals might be found-rich enough to be suitable for making life compounds. But there are no such places. They just do not exist p. 19.

PROTEINS AND OTHER SUBSTANCES

Protein synthesis. Without protein, there can be no life. Protein, a basic constituent of all life forms, is composed of amino acids. There are 20 essential amino acids. None of them can produce any of the others or change them at all.

Mathematically, even if they were all together in a rich mixture, it would not be possible for all the necessary chemicals to make even the simplest amino acid (glycine). p. 19.

Proteins and hydrolysis. Even if one of these amino acids could have formed, it would immediately hydrolyze; that is, it would reconnect with other chemicals and self-destruct pp. 19-20.

Fatty acid synthesis. Scientists are not able to even guess how fatty acids could originally have come into existence. Yet they are an important part of living things. p. 20.

Other syntheses. What about enzymes and other substances? No one has any idea how to make them from inorganic materials.-p. 20.

THE PRIMITIVE ATMOSPHERE

Atmosphere without oxygen. We earlier mentioned that the complex chemical compounds, found in living things, could not be made in the presence of oxygen. Yet there is no place in the world where they could be made--except within living cells. Each cell carefully organizes which parts will not have oxygen, so the compounds can be made there.

Could a non-oxygen atmosphere ever have existed on earth, so vital body compounds could be made outside the cell? Evolutionists theorize that it must have happened anciently when life forms first "made themselves." Yet there are immense problems to such a theory:

- 1 - There is no evidence that our planet ever had a non-oxygen atmosphere.
- 2 - There is no explanation of how oxygen could have been kept out of a worldwide atmosphere for long ages-and then suddenly injected into it.
- 3 - Geologists have-found that oxidized rocks (containing rusted iron) existed at the time that life was supposed to have formed and the atmosphere was supposed to have contained no oxygen.
- 4 - It is known that there were oceans and seas back then. Indeed, evolutionists require seawater as the medium in which life must have been made. Yet water requires an oxygen atmosphere and is itself two-thirds oxygen.
- 5 - As soon as a living creature existed, it would have had to have oxygen in order to survive even one minute!
- 6 - An oxygen-free atmosphere would have deadly peroxides, which would kill life forms.

7 - An atmosphere without oxygen would not have the protective ozone layer. Lacking it, living creatures would be killed by ultraviolet light from the sun.

8 - An instant atmospheric change (from non-oxygen to oxygen) would be required at the moment that even one living creature was formed. Yet that would be a rank impossibility.

Thus spontaneous generation (which is what evolution teaches and requires for its theory that life forms originally made themselves out of inorganic materials) is a no-win situation. Spontaneous generation could not occur with oxygen or without it! pp. 20-21.

THE LABORATORY EXPERIMENTS

The Miller experiment. In 1953, Stanley Miller put together a complicated collection of glass tubes, chemicals, special non-water solvents, gases, and continuous spark discharges and succeeded in changing some chemicals into a few random amino acids. But he had shown how life could have originated:

1-The newspapers said he had "created life." But that which he made was not alive!

2 - The amino acids which were formed were not biologically useful, for the mixture was both left- and right-handed. This seemingly little problem is actually a major hurdle.

You see, all amino acids in animals are left-handed amino acids; none are right-handed. Yet, whenever amino acids are made in the laboratory, the result is always an equal amount of both types. An animal would die if any of its amino acids were right-handed.

(What is the difference between the two kinds of amino acids? The difference is one of shape, not chemicals. It is like two gloves, a right- and left-handed one. Both contain the same type of materials, but are shaped opposite from one another.)

3 - Laboratory synthesis (such as Miller did) has never been able to produce exactly the right kind of amino acids (those 20 which are crucial to life). Most of those it makes are nonessential or totally useless.

4 - Other experiments have also been carried out, in an effort to produce particles of dead flesh, but without true success. Yet those experiments all rely on very expensive laboratories, college-trained technicians, and a roomful of chemicals. But evolutionary theory is based on the idea that sand and seawater sloshed together and made living creatures! There are no expensive laboratories, trained technicians, and lots of chemical compounds present inside the ocean.

5 - And what about life itself? The truth is that life cannot be made in seawater or even in million-dollar laboratories by university-trained men, working on the task for years.-pp. 22-24.

MORE PROBLEMS

1 - A scientific conclusion, known as "*Life Niche Limits*," requires that a large number of special factors and preconditions be present, in order for a living creature to be born and then live. Kicking sand at the seashore or sloshing in the water could not make some of the sand or water alive.

2 - Each living creature would also have to have a mate. It would not do to just make one life form; its mate would have to be made at the same time.

3 - In addition to oxygen, that living creature would immediately require food! Yet, when that first theoretical creature was made, there would be no organic food-anywhere on the planet.

4 - It would need complete respiratory, digestive, and eliminative systems-and more besides.-pp. 25, 27.

CONCLUSION

Reputable scientists will tell you that life cannot come from non-life. Louis Pasteur and others have proven the fact. Yet every evolutionary theory of life origins is based on the error of spontaneous generation.

*Fred Hoyle and a research assistant concluded that the likelihood that a single cell could originate in a primitive environment, given 4.6 billion years in which to do it,- was one chance in 10^{400000} ! Yet all the atoms in the universe only total 1 in 10^{80} . pp. 25, 29.

THE PRIMITIVE ENVIRONMENT CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO A pile of old clothes can change into mice.
YES NO Charles Darwin wished there was a way a living creature could be made out of seawater.
YES NO A non-oxygen environment would be necessary, but our world has always had oxygen.
YES NO As soon as a living creature existed, It would have to have oxygen.
YES NO Chemical compounds can easily be made In water.
YES NO There has never been enough nitrogen In the air for amino acids to form.
YES NO Fatty acids can easily be formed In seawater.
YES NO There is never oxygen where there is seawater.

List eight reasons why it would be impossible for living creatures to be formed spontaneously out of seawater.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

quick study guide

DNA, protein and cells

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

The evolutionists have a problem. DNA provides the basic codes that each plant and animal is made according to. The evolutionists' problem is the fact that DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) has such complicated codes and locks each type of creature into its own pattern. Because of this, it would be impossible for evolution (which is the origin of species and change across species) to occur.

THE DNA MOLECULE

Inside every cell in your body is a microscopic ball. Inside it is a coiled six-foot strip of code! It is your DNA code, the primary code for your entire body. The whole thing is amazing.

In the center of each cell is a nucleus, and, among the complicated things in it, are 23 pairs of chromosomes. These are the strips, and on them are genes. They are like beads on a chain. Each gene has a large number of DNA units. There are about 60 thousand billion (60,000 x 1,000,000,000) cells in your body! Each one has your complete code. This code fixes your physical characteristics; it is your gene pool. All the data in each code set is equivalent to an unabridged dictionary.

It is clear that only a super mind could make all this! God made you; you did not make yourself. Seawater did not slosh around and do it. pp. 11-14. k

Translation package needed. Not only was ' that astounding DNA code needed in your body for it to exist, but a translation code had to be there also!

Termed an "adapter function," this machinery had to be in your body—the first instant it came into being. Yet it could not be produced by accident.

No scientist can begin to explain how your body obtained the translation package, much less the DNA code. pp. 14-15.

Messenger RNA. Not only is DNA code and code translator needed, but also messenger units.

These are called "messenger RNA" molecules, or "s-RNA."

There is a specific s-RNA for each individual amino acid. They pass the message for the code, so that a certain type of amino acid can be made.

So you are a living computer and did not know it. Throughout the body and in each cell, we find the most advance scientific technology and apparatus. Just as the "byte" is the basic eight-unit binary pattern in computers, the "codon" is the basic three-nucleotide pattern in living creatures. p. 15.

The biological compiler. Then there is the "t-DNA" This element carries out the code tasks. Without it, the code would be useless. pp. 15-16.

DNA indexing. Every computer requires a data bank, so the information can be accessed. The DNA contains the data bank, but "indexes" are needed in order to find it.

These are different than the translators. They are non-DNA chemicals which function to locate specifically needed information.

The production of materials by DNA is triggered by these indexes. Their presence, in turn, initiates further indexing as new materials are made. Additional indexes are to be found in specialized functions, such as nervous, muscular, hormonal, circulatory, etc. The utter complexity of all this is astounding. p. 16.

Cell switching. This function is needed to switch the DNA codes from one process to another. The signal to do it is provided by other functions, but the actual switch is called the "cell switch. p. 16.

An exact fit required. Every aspect of the DNA function must be perfect. The polynucleotide strands have to be formed in exactly the shape needed to neatly wrap about the DNA helix molecule. There must be a 100 percent fit.

Scientists, working in million-dollar laboratories, are unable to accurately synthesize the polynucleotides or make them in predetermined sizes and shapes. p. 16.

Not randomness, but intelligence. It is obvious that nothing about this is random. Everything reveals highly intelligent designing and production. Obviously, a tiny cell cannot be that smart. Who keeps it running right? Who designed it in the beginning? Surely, it did not come together by chance.-pp. 16-17.

Multi-gene characteristics. Did you know that each characteristic in a living creature is controlled by several different genes? This only makes the process all the more complicated.

There would be no way the DNA code could gradually "evolve." Everything had to be there from the beginning. p. 17.

MATHEMATICAL POSSIBILITIES

Math looks at DNA. DNA is not the result of an accident. The mathematical possibilities that all this intertwining of codes and processors could come together by accident-is totally impossible.

That is what the experts tell us.

For example, we are told that the information content of the gene in its complexity must be as great as the enzyme it controls. Yet just one medium-sized protein will consist of about 300 amino acids! That protein was made by a DNA gene, which would have to have about 1,000 nucleotides in its chain. Since there are four kinds of nucleotides in a single DNA chain, one with 1,000 links could exist in 4^{1000} different forms. -That is 4 followed by a thousand zeros!

Yet all this complexity is required to make the simplest living creature.

Everything had to be in place at once from the beginning. Whether it be a one-celled or a multi-celled creature, all the cellular functions had to be there from the start. pp. 17-18.

Goley's machine. A communications engineer tried to figure the odds for bringing a non-living organism with few parts (only 1,500) up to the point of being able to reproduce itself. Requiring 1,500 right choices from the beginning, he found there was only one chance in 10^{450} that there could be success. That is 1 followed by 450 zeros.

Yet there are only 10^{80} particles in all the universe!-pp. 18, 20.

Too many nucleotides. Actually, there are too many nucleotides in DNA for Goley's machine! There are 5,375 nucleotides in the DNA of an extremely small bacterial

virus (theta-x-1 74). There are about 3 million nucleotides in a single cell bacteria. There are over 3 billion nucleotides in the DNA of a mammalian cell. (People and most animals are mammals.)

A "nucleotide" is a complex chemical structure composed of certain chemicals. Each one of the thousands in your DNA cells are aligned sequentially in a very specific order! Imagine 3 billion complicated chemical links, each one of which has to be in a precisely correct sequence! p. 20.

Not possible by chance. The possibility that a pile of sand or a mud puddle could make any living creature-is totally remote. It just could not happen.

The truth is that something totally impossible can never happen. If I throw a book into the air, it will never change into a live pigeon, never.

The evolutionary error is that, if something is totally impossible, it will eventually happen, if given enough time. Accepting such an error is self-deception in the extreme.

Wysong explains why evolution is totally impossible:

" $1/10^{89190}$ DNA molecules, on the average, must form to provide the one chance of forming the specific DNA sequence necessary to code the 124 proteins. 10^{89190} DNAs would weigh 10^{89147} times more than the earth." p. 20.

DNA different in each species. Although it is utterly impossible for DNA to be formed by chance for even one species,-the DNA codes for each species is different from another! This only multiplies the odds against all the living creatures in the world having been formed by chance! (By "species," we mean basic kinds; the "species" listed by biologists are sometimes varieties of a single true species.)-pp. 20-21.

AMINO ACIDS AND PROTEIN

Complexities of protein. The complexities of protein are so great, that the various kinds (of which there are 20 essential types) could never have been made by chance. pp. 21-23.

Synthesized proteins. Scientists are now able to make protein from chemicals. Evolutionists claim that, therefore, seawater could do it by chance also. But keep this in mind:

The scientists have million-dollar laboratories, and are specially trained. They have to purchase special chemicals made by chemical companies. Yet the proteins they produce are random types. It is impossible to make them in the right pattern or sequence. What they get is in no particular sequence or use. It is also impossible to make only left-handed ones, which are the only kind in animals.-pp. 23-24.

Consider the chances. What are the chances of a million-dollar laboratory correctly synthesizing left-hand amino acids for one small protein molecule? It is 1 in 10^{210} . That is 1 with 210 zeros after it.

To properly understand the immense size of these impossible chances, consider this:

Ten billion years is 10^{18} seconds. The earth weighs 10^{26} ounces. The entire universe is has a diameter of only 10^{28} inches. There are 10^{80} elementary (subatomic) particles in the universe.

Now, please! Compare these numbers with the inconceivably larger numbers needed to accidentally produce DNA or protein!

In order to succeed, evolution requires total impossibilities! -pp. 24-25.

FIVE BIOLOGIC MATERIALS

It would be impossible for chance activity to produce a variety of materials used in plants and animals.

Proteins. Fifteen very complicated functions must be carried out before a random protein can be made. -p. 26.

Sugars. Five complicated functions are required.-pp. 26-27.

Fats. Seven functions must be fulfilled in exact order. p. 27.

DNA. Twenty-six functions must be systematically done.

Keep in mind that, if any of the above materials were actually made in a laboratory, they would still be dead materials) There would be no life in them. pp. 27, 29.

Essential amino acids. Twenty of the amino acids are essential. Protein cannot be made without them, yet none of the 20 can be made from any other amino acids.

How did all 20 of those special amino acids come into existence, when it is totally impossible to make even one of them by chance? p. 29.

ADDITIONAL MATH IMPOSSIBILITIES

Chance is not good enough. Every protein must have its amino acids in the proper amount and order. Yet there are 2,500,000,000,000,000 different ways that the 20 basic amino acids can be arranged. Get just one out of order, and death or serious damage will result to the organism. (In a later book in this series (Book 10: Mutations), we will learn that one misplaced amino acid is the cause of sickle-cell anemia, which causes the death of 25 percent of the children of those having it.)

According to evolutionary theory, every aspect of a persons structure and function came about by chance-till just the right one was hit upon. How long would you live, if you had to wait 20 billion years for each of your millions of proteins to be developed by chance? pp. 29-30.

The stream of life. Each one of your red blood cells has a complicated formula of 574 amino acids in it. How long would it take for chance to produce them? It would be totally impossible.

Each red blood cell has about 280 million molecules of hemoglobin, and it would take about 1,000 red blood cells to cover the period at the end of this sentence.

Without blood, you would quickly die--yet you did not get your blood by chance. p. 30.

Making protein by chance. But, for a moment, let us try to make-not 574 but only 124 specifically sequenced proteins. The possibility that it could be done by chance would be 1 in 1064469 If we put a thousand zeros on each page, it would take a 64-page book just to write the number!

Evolution is "scientific?" Evolution is foolishness.

Yet half those proteins, if made by chance, would be right-handed and half would be left-handed. In order for them all to be biologically useful (left-handed only), the chances would be astronomically greater. pp. 30.

Enzymes. Then there are the enzymes. These would also have to be made by chance. It is estimated by one evolutionist (*Hoyle) that there are 2,000 different complex types of enzymes in a living organism. Not one of them could be formed by random, shuffling processes in even 20 billion years!-pp. 30-31.

***Dixon-Webb calculation.** Two evolutionists estimated that, in order to get the needed amino acids in close enough proximity to form a given protein molecule, a rich mixture of already formed amino acids, with a total volume equal to 10^{50} times the volume of our earth would be needed. p. 31.

One hemoglobin molecule. Using the above method of calculation, a volume of amino acid soup 10^{512} times the volume of our entire known universe would be required to produce one hemoglobin molecule. (And that molecule would be dead, since synthesis and life are two different things.)

Keep in mind that there are thousands of other types of protein molecules in living cells. p. 31.

Evolving upward. Evolutionary theory requires that, after one living creature was formed, it would have to evolve into still other kinds. Yet to do so would require immense changes in DNA and other things.

*Julian Huxley, a leading evolutionist, estimates that a terrific number of mutations would be necessary. Yet each one of them would have to be totally accurate, or the creature would die.

(In a later study on Mutations, we will learn that mutations always injure, maim, or kill; they never improve.)-pp. 31.

Beyond DNA and protein. We have not mentioned the requirements needed to produce hormones, the glands, the bones, the digestive system, the lungs, the brain, the nerves, the eye, or the ear.

In a famous passage, *Darwin wrote that it made him sick every time he tried to think how the human eye could have been formed by chance.-p. 32.

Computer simulation. A gathering of leading scientists met, in 1967, at the Wistar Institute. *Schutzenberger, a computer scientist, explained to them that the entire evolutionary process had been fed into computers and simulated. He announced that, mathematically, it had proven to be totally impossible for evolution to occur.---pp. 32-33.

***Eden's research.** Another scientist, attending the same Wistar Institute, explained that DNA was like a language-and could not be produced by tinkering. He said that one could not produce an encyclopedia (or even a small booklet) by randomly inserting a letter here and there until the finished production was complete. The language had to be there when the book was first written. In the same way, DNA had to be there when you were first made. The same holds true for every species of plants and animals, each with its own DNA formulas. pp. 32-33.

Delays destroy the possibility. *Pitman explained that the evolutionary dogma, given enough time, anything can be made is an error. He said that time, decomposes complex systems. The more that time elapses, the less possibility that the desired system could be developed.-p. 33.

All at once. Everything would have to be perfect and fully there at the very beginning. Yet the possibility of chance productions of simultaneous, perfect productions on many levels would, of course, be impossible. -p. 33.

Species do not change. Once a species exists, it may produce varieties, but never will it change into a different kind.

An example of this is the Escherichia coli, a very small colon bacteria which has been studied for over a century yet which never changes into anything else. It is one of

the simplest of creatures, and has about 5,000 genes in its single chromosome strand, equaling about a million three-letter codons. Yet it always remains the same.

That little creature cannot change its coding, any more than you can. And neither it nor you are able to invent and install the coding.--p. 33.

Frame shifts. This is a fabulous discovery: Scientists discovered an even "simpler" creature that lives in the human bowel. Called the theta-x174, it is so small that it does not contain enough DNA to produce the proteins in its membrane! How then does it make them? The astounded scientists found that it does it by frame shifts."

A gene is read off from the first DNA base, then the same message is read again, but this time omitting the first base and starting with the second! This produces a different protein. On and on it goes. Obviously a Creator, with the highest level of intelligence, designed these functions. pp. 33-34.

The central dogma. *Crick, the co-discoverer of the DNA structure, announced this basic biological principle: What is in the body and what happens in the body--does not affect the DNA coding. Yet that means that one type of creature cannot evolve into a different one! pp. 34-35.

Conclusion. Chance cannot produce usable codes. It is only intelligence that can produce coded order. It is only intelligence that can replicate it.

If so much intelligence was needed to discover the DNA code, how much intelligence was needed to create it in the first place?

For any one honestly willing to consider them, the facts in this chapter are enough to crack evolutionary theory to pieces, stamp it to powder, and blow it away p. 35.

Additional Information is given in the chapter on Cells (found later In this book), which is not summarized here.

DNA, PROTEIN, AND CELLS CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO DNA is the primary code for your entire body.
- YES NO Inside the cell nucleus are the chromosomes; Inside the chromosomes are the genes; Inside the genes is the DNA.
- YES NO That code affects your body, without any help from any thing else in your body.
- YES NO Each body characteristic is controlled by several different genes.
- YES NO According to mathematicians, It is not possible for DNA to be brought into existence by chance.
- YES NO All the different species have the same DNA codes in them.
- YES NO Amino acids and protein are also extremely complicated.
- YES NO You could live just fine without DNA and protein.
- YES NO Proteins, sugars, fats, and enzymes could never be made by random chance.
- YES NO Each red blood cell has about 280 million molecules of hemoglobin.
- YES NO Correctly formed amino acids would have to fill many universes in order to have a few of the right combinations close enough to form just one of those 280 million molecules of hemoglobin.

YES NO Escherichia coli, a small bacteria, actually uses a more complicated method of making new DNA-than your body does.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

49 Natural Selection

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide natural selection

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

The evolutionists' problem. how to explain how every living creature is supposed to have "evolved" from something else. Evolutionists say that all evolution of life forms occurred either by "natural selection" and/or "mutations."

In this book, we will learn that "natural selection" is a concept without real meaning. In the next book in this series (Book 10: Mutations), we will learn that mutations could not possibly produce a transition from one species to another.

"NATURAL SELECTION" ACCORDING TO EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

Evolution can only occur if one creature produces ("evolves into") another distinct species. If a rabbit becomes a beaver, that is evolution; but, if a red rose is bred to produce an orange rose, that is not evolution.

The basic teaching. We know that when plants or animals bear young, there are variations. But these variations are always within the same species, or type, of creature.

Yet evolutionary theory teaches that these changes cross over from one species- and produce totally new, different types. The changeover mechanism is called "natural selection."

Some evolutionists say that only natural selection produces evolutionary (cross-species) changes, while others say that mutations also do it. pp. 11-12.

(Keep in mind that when we speak of "species," we are referring to true species. Many species (and even some genera) listed in botanical and zoological lists are only subspecies. Because natural selection and species are so closely linked, we will provide you with a special report on species at the back of this book.)

FACTS WHICH DISPROVE

THE THEORY OF NATURAL SELECTION

It is a remarkable fact that the fiction of "natural selection" survives when there is so little evidence to support it and so much evidence against it

What is the evidence favoring it?

Natural selection sounds like a good idea, because, all about us, we see variation within species. There are many kinds of roses, finches, dogs, and horses-but all the roses, finches, dogs, and horses are just that; they never change into daisies, parrots, cats, or cows.

What is the evidence against the theory of natural selection? Just look at it all:

Always within the same species. All the offspring produced in the plant and animal kingdom remain in the same species. The production of new creatures never occurs.

Entirely random. Not only is natural selection supposed to have produced everything, the process is said to be entirely random! Evolutionists can never admit that any intelligence was involved in the formation of squirrels, humming birds, or human beings.

Yet, how can it be called "selection"--when nothing was selected! And, surely, it cannot be considered "natural" since cross-species transitions never occur.

Evolutionary theory requires change by random action alone. Yet, if even half those random changes were positive, the other half would have to be damaging.

How can total randomness select only that which is better, and move only in advantageous directions?-pp. 11-12.

Neo-Darwinists. Charles Darwin said that natural selection made every single transition from one species to another. Those who adhere to natural selection as the only way evolution can occur are called Darwinists or Darwinian evolutionists.

But, earlier in this century, some evolutionists already recognized that natural selection was a laughing stock and never produced new species. So they said that the trans-species changes were made by mutations and only the finishing touches within a species was done by natural selection. These evolutionists are called Neo-Darwinists. p.12.

In the next book in this series (Mutations) we will show that scientific facts annihilate the possibility that mutations could ever accomplish anything worthwhile.

A basic issue. If natural selection and mutations cannot produce new species, - then there is no way that new species could occur by evolution! Although they have tried for decades to invent something better, evolutionists have no other methods to offer.

Keep in mind that changes within a species are not evolution. They occur all the time.

One of the first scientific statements. The first scientific book in the world (the book of Genesis) declared that no trans-species changes would ever occur. And they never have. (Read Genesis 1, and note verses 12, 21, 24, and 25. The key phrase here is "after his kind.")p. 12.

Genesis kinds. The "Genesis kinds" are those original types, or species, of living creatures brought into existence during Creation Week. One Genesis kind never changes into another. It cannot do so. We will learn, in this entire series of books, that there is no evidence in biology or geology that it is now happening or has ever happened. The species are always separate and distinct.

Yet there are many, many variations within the species. Some we call subspecies, and some we call varieties. But, in spite of how many there are of them, - roses are still roses, mums are still mums, dogs are still dogs, and horses are still horses.

In most (but not all) cases, subspecies can interbreed. But, with the passage of time, changes in characteristics, such as size, and exceptions occur p. 12.

Mutational changes. We will learn in the next book in this series that mutations always damage and never help the organism. Therefore, they cannot improve a species, much less make new and more advanced ones. p. 12.

Survival of the fittest: This is another buzz word of evolutionists: "survival of the fittest." But it is meaningless, as far as enabling new kinds to occur. The truth is that "survival of the fittest" is the opposite of evolution; it means that creatures which are not fit enough, whether produced by mutations or by accidents, are eliminated, thus returning the species closer to its pure species pattern.

Interestingly enough, as the mechanism for evolution, the term was invented by a man while in a fever in the Moluccas. More on this in a later book (Book 17: The History of Evolutionary Theory).-p. 12-13.

EVIDENCES THAT IT DOES NOT OCCUR

Evolutionists point to two examples as the outstanding evidences that natural selection actually does occur. But, examining them, we find that neither supports evolutionary theory. The first is the peppered moth, and the second is the Galapagos finches.

The peppered moth. Evolutionists cite the peppered moth more than any other single item-as evidence that "natural selection" can produce a change of one species to another. Even *Isaac Asimov, the leading evolutionary science writer of our century, declared that the peppered moth was the best example.

Before 1845, in England, the peppered moth was primarily light colored. Some were born with light-colored wings, while others had darker ones. But, since the bark on the trees was light, the darker moths were eaten by the birds. Yet both varieties continued to be produced.

By the 1880s, soot on the trees was turning the bark darker-and the birds were eating the most visible of the moths: the light ones. As a result, there were more dark peppered moths. But both varieties continued to be produced.

Well, what had happened?

First, both were variants of the same species. So a changeover from one to the other would not be evolution, since no new species had been produced. Both the light and dark varieties were regularly produced by their parents.

Second, both the dark and light varieties continued to be produced. The only thing that had changed was which subspecies was more likely to be eaten by birds. Both moths were the same species: *Biston betularia*.

We have here nothing more than a color variation within a stable species. pp. 13, 15.

Galapagos finches. *Charles Darwin said that his visit to the Galapagos Islands, and particularly the finches there, was his best proof that natural selection makes evolutionary changes from one species to another.

Yet an examination of those finches reveals they are all varieties of the same finch species. All are nearly the same size and color.

There has been adaptation to different diets, but the species has remained the same. pp. 16-17.

The dog and the pigeon. There are more varieties of dog (over a hundred) than any other creature, yet every biologist will readily agree they are all part of the same species.

There are more color variations among pigeons than among any other animal or bird in the world. Yet they all are variations of the same species, and recognized as such. p. 17.

Larmarkianism. This is a discredited theory which was widely believed in the 19th century. It is the theory of "inheritance of acquired characteristics." No reputable scientist today will admit that Larmarkianism is true, yet evolutionary theory is based on it.

If your finger is cut off, your children will not inherit that loss. Why not? because they inherit not accidents--but DNA patterns. Many examples could be cited. p. 17.

WHY NATURAL SELECTION CANNOT OCCUR

The DNA barrier. The DNA code is a wall which evolution cannot pass across. A creature is born like its parents. There are variations within species, but these variations are within limits permitted by the DNA code for that species. We call this the "Mendelian laws of heredity." The code locks each species into a certain pattern, which it cannot escape from. Yet each species is permitted to have a certain range of variation.-pp. 17-18.

The variation range within each species. Some plants and animals have a greater range than do others. For example, the chrysanthemum has been found to produce a very wide range of variations. In contrast, the cheetah has been found to have one of the narrowest ranges of any mammal. This means that one cheetah looks almost identical to the next, yet its amazing speed and athletic ability is not in the least weakened because of its narrowed range of variations. pp. 18, 21.

The amazing eye. Every eye is amazing, no matter which creature it is on. Did you know that there are a remarkable number of totally different types of eyes? Yet it would be impossible for one eye to change over to another type. The differences are too great. Each eye would have to come into existence exactly right and all at once. What good would half an eye be to anyone? pp. 18, 20.

The cell battery. ATP is the chemical compound in cells, which provides them with energy. Yet the formula for making the battery is totally complicated! On one hand, there would be no possible way that it could gradually be brought into existence by "natural selection"; and, on the other, the cell could not exist without it! Without electrical energy, every plant and animal cell would quickly die. Without continual ATP production and utilization, you would be dead in a minute.-p.19.

The marvelous organic fit. Every species of plant and animal is perfectly adapted for its environment. It was brought into existence that way. Not only is it perfect in form and structure, but it is provided with the exact food it needs to survive.

Keep in mind that "natural selection" is always said, by evolutionists, to be totally random. Then how could it make every creature have just what it needed and work just right?

Try letting "natural selection" make a pocket watch. How could iron, copper, and sand change itself into steel and brass wheels, springs, and crystal covers? Yet a pocket watch is much simpler in design and function than is a living creature!-p. 20.

Natural selection destroys evolutionary change. The only natural selection there is, is the kind we find working within species. Anytime an individual is born with traits too far from the species norm, it dies. It does not change into a new species! p. 21.

There should be no distinct species. Any thinking person will agree that this is a powerful argument against evolution: If natural selection really did make new variations, wandering away from the basic species, -then, if evolution was true, there would be no distinct species! Yet, instead, all we find in life today, and in the geologic strata of life in earlier times, are definite types of creatures. p. 21.

An intelligent purpose. Evolutionists fear to admit that there is any purpose in the formation of galaxies, stars, planets, or living creatures. They fear it, because purpose points to a super intelligent Creator.

Therefore, evolutionary theory requires total randomness in everything made.

Yet all about us we see purpose in everything. The plant is given roots to extract water and minerals; and leaves to process sunlight and water, and produce sugar. The animal is given legs, eyes, ears; and marvelous internal organs. Everything is purposive. Nothing is random or haphazard.

How long would you live without kidneys? or a heart? Yet both are very complicated and impossible to come into existence by chance. pp. 22-23.

Staying by the average. Statisticians well know that all living creatures tend to keep coming back to the average. Even though varieties can be bred, If not continually guarded, their descendants will tend back toward the average. Educational psychologists call it "regression toward the mean." The offspring of the gifted will move back toward the mean, or mathematical average.

The principle of regression toward the mean rules out the possibility of evolution.-p. 24.

Mutations. Mutations are the only way that something quite different from the average could be produced. But, as we will learn in the next book in this series, mutations only damage or kill; they never help or improve.

You will find the words, "mutation" and "mutant," tossed around a lot in contemporary literature. Much of this concerns variations within species, within the natural range permitted by the genetic code of that species.

A true mutation only wounds, sterilizes, or kills. Examples of true mutations can be found at Hiroshima and Chernobyl. pp. 25-26.

NATURAL SELECTION CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- | | |
|--------|--|
| YES NO | There are variations within species, called "natural variations." |
| YES NO | Because of the DNA code, which controls the traits of each species, a cow cannot produce a horse or a rose a cabbage. |
| YES NO | Changes within a species are not evolution. |
| YES NO | "Survival of the fittest" disproves evolution, for It really means only those creatures closest to the species will survive. |
| YES NO | Before 1845, there were more dark-colored moths; later on there were more light-colored ones. |
| YES NO | There are over a hundred different varieties of dogs, yet they are all within the same species. |

- YES NO The cheetah has a wide range of possible variations, and the chrysanthemum has a very narrow range.
- YES NO It would be impossible for the eye to develop by accidental changes. It had to be perfect from the beginning.
- YES NO Evolutionists fear to admit that there could be Intelligent planning and purpose in the making of the different species.
- YES NO Every organ and function in the body is planned; nothing is random and purposeless.
- YES NO It is the DNA code which keeps every creature within the limits of its species.

SCORE NAME DATE

54 Mutations

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide

mutations

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

Evolution requires that new kinds of plants and animals be able to be made. But changes within species are normal and do not show or prove evolution.

Evolution of life forms requires that changes be made which cross over from one species-and produce a different one.

According to evolutionists, natural selection and mutations are the only two ways that new species have ever been made.

In the previous book in this series (Book 9: Natural Selection), a surprising amount of scientific information was given, which clearly disproves the idea that natural selection could produce even one new true species.

In this chapter, you will learn that mutations cannot do it either.

Evolutionists who believe that natural selection accomplished the task are called Darwinists. Evolutionists who believe that mutations can make the evolutionary changes are called Neo-Darwinists.

Many evolutionists have recognized that natural selection could not possibly produce transspecies changes, so they declare that mutations must have produced the multitude of separate species found in our world today.

But there are clear-cut facts which reveal that it would be totally impossible for mutations to produce even one new species. pp. 11-12.

Here are these facts:

FOUR SPECIAL QUALITIES

1 -Rare effects. Mutations are very rare. They hardly ever occur in the natural world. Their very rarity dooms the possibility that they could produce the prolific number of plant and animal species found in our world.

Mutations are simply too rare to have produced all the necessary traits of even one life form, much less millions. For each plant and animal has millions upon millions of specific characteristics. p. 12.

2 - Random effects. Mutations are always random-always! They are never purposive or directed. Yet the millions of characteristics in a living creature are very special: Each one is needed and serves an important function.

A mutation is a random, wild event. It is something like an automobile crash: It comes suddenly, when least expected, and no one can predict the outcome. But one thing you can be sure of: It will produce damage. p. 12.

3 - Not helpful. Evolution requires improvement, but mutations never help anyone. They only weaken or injure. p. 13.

4 - Very harmful effects. Nearly all mutations are harmful. In most instances, they weaken or damage the organism so seriously that it will not long survive. If it does survive, its offspring tend to eventually die out. p. 13.

Mutations are rare, random, almost never an improvement, always weakening or harmful, and often fatal to the organism or its offspring.

Why mutations? Why then do the evolutionists cling to mutations as the means of producing species crossovers?

They stay with mutations because, apart from the foolish theory of natural selection, they have nothing else! pp. 13-14.

At this point, someone might ask how we can be sure that mutations are always random and negative. This is known for a certainty because research scientists have spent decades carrying on research experiments with X-rays, radiation, and chemicals, in the hopes of producing new species-and thus proving that evolutionary theory is true. But they have totally failed. More on this later.

FLAWS IN THE MUTATION THEORY

1 - Not once. Not once has there ever been a recorded instance of a truly beneficial mutation!

There are instances of reshuffled genes, which produced better varieties of grapes, apples, and roses. But those were normal changes within species. (They were still grapes, apples, and roses.) None of these are mutations. A true mutation is a damage factor which produces injury or death.

As a result of millions of fruit-fly experiments, under intense radiation, not one useful mutation has ever been found. p. 14.

2 - Only harm. Those organisms, which mutate and do not outright kill, are generally so weakened that they or their offspring tend to die out. Given enough mutations, not evolution into something better--but death--would come to everyone on earth. p. 14.

3 . Usually eliminate. Organisms which have mutations are so badly weakened, that they tend to die out or be weeded out by the problems of life.-p. 14.

4 - Mutagens. For decades, scientists have been warning us about the dangers of radiation. What is that danger? It is X-rays, radiation, and certain chemicals which can

cause mutations in our body. How can such a terrible curse benefit us or produce new species? pp. 14-15.

5 - Dangerous accidents. It is only the rareness of mutations in the natural world (apart from X-rays and atomic bombs) which protect the race from being destroyed by mutations. p. 15.

6 - Intertwined catastrophe. Each gene affects many characteristics, and each characteristic is affected by many genes. This complicated interweaving of the DNA codes means that each mutation can result in damage to many things. There is no way that a bunch of mutations could help anyone. p. 15.

7 - Only random. People can never predict in advance when or where a mutation will occur, or what type of damage will result. It is a totally random event. p. 15.

8 - Small changes cannot do it. Evolutionists say that, given enough time, a few mutations, here and there, can produce new species. Each one changes one species a little more toward another. But that is not true, for we find no halfway species anywhere! All are distinct and different. pp. 16-18.

9 - Mathematically impossible. Not enough mutations could naturally occur to accomplish any trans-species changes. Mutations usually occur only once in every ten million duplications of a DNA molecule.

Assuming that all mutations were beneficial (which none are), the odds of even several mutations naturally occurring within one organism would be very unlikely. Four mutations, for example, would only occur once in billions times billions of times. p. 17.

10 - Time no solution. Evolution requires millions of beneficial mutations, all working closely together to produce delicate living systems full of fine-tuned structures, organs, hormones, and all the rest. This could not be done in a little amount of time or immense amounts of time. How long would a new type of animal last, while waiting for millions of years of mutations to put it together? p. 17.

11 - Gene Stability. There is a reason we can know that mutations have been as infrequent in the past as they are now: the factor of gene stability. If mutations had been abundant earlier, then, during past centuries, our bodies would have been destroyed by them. p.17.

12 - Syntropy. *Szent-Gyorgyl, a two-time Nobel Prize winner, pointed out that it would be impossible for any organism to survive even for a moment, unless it was already complete with all its functions and they were all working perfectly or nearly so. Everything in a species has to work right, or it becomes weak and eventually dies out. Mutations do not strengthen; they only weaken. They do not produce new, stronger species; they only injure the ones which already exist. p. 18.

13 - Minor changes damage offspring the most. Most mutations are small, but it is those little changes which would hurt offspring the most. That is because major mutations kill too quickly for there to be offspring. p. 18.

14 - Single generation required. Hundreds and even thousands of positive mutations, working harmoniously together would be needed-and it would all have to occur very fast. It would be impossible for mutations, strung out over centuries or ages to produce the needed changes from one species to another. p. 18.

15 - Not big enough. Most mutations are so minor that, although they are damaging or deadly, they could not possibly change one species to another. They just do not make a large enough change.-pp. 18-19.

16 - Reproductive changes too infrequent. Mutational changes in the reproductive organs occur far less often than elsewhere. Yet it is reproductive changes which would especially be needed for new species to be formed. pp. 19-20.

17 - Evolution requires increasing complexity. Evolution, by its very nature, must continually move upward. Yet mutations only tear down and disintegrate.-. 20.

18 - Evolution would require new information. Vast, new information banks in the DNA would be required, for a new species to be produced. Mutations could never accomplish that, any more than swinging a bat in a china closet would improve the glassware stored there. pp. 20-21.

19 - Evolution requires new organs and different structures. But mutations would not provide the new physical equipment and capabilities.-p. 21.

20 - Not enough visible mutations. For every visible mutation (which changes a body part in a way to be seen), there are 20 invisible ones which generally kill the organism. p. 21.

21 - Never higher vitality than the parent. Geneticists tell us that each mutation weakens the organism. Never is its offspring stronger than the damaged parent. Soon the family line ends.-p. 21. -

22 - No evidence of species change. Mutations are not producing new species, yet we should see it occurring. In two later books in this series (Fossils and Strata Books 1 and 2), we shall learn that there is no evidence of new species production in the past. (We can know this, because we should be able to find the halfway species in between, yet they have never existed.)-p. 21.

23 - Gene uniqueness forbids species change. Because there are millions of factors in every DNA code, it forbids the possibility of wholesale change by mutations.-pp. 21.

THE ONE BENEFICIAL MUTATION

Yes, evolutionists have one beneficial mutation that they can cite--as proof that positive, helpful mutations do occasionally occur.

It is sickle cell anemia, which is a mutation which occurred in someone in Africa centuries ago. Was that mutation beneficial? Far from it; it damaged the red blood vessels so they became quarter-moon shaped instead of round. This produced a special type of anemia. The person with sickle cell anemia cannot properly absorb food and oxygen.

How then can anyone call that mutation beneficial?

Well, the evolutionists do it--on the basis of the fact that people with sickle-cell anemia are less likely to contract malaria from mosquitoes!

Really now, that is begging the question! If I had bulbar polio, I would be less likely to be killed in an auto accident because I would be paralyzed on a bed and less likely to be riding in a car. But one would not say that polio was, for that reason, beneficial!

In return for the advantage of being 25 percent less likely to contract malaria, 25 percent of the children of people, in Africa, with sickle-cell anemia-will die! What advantage is that?-pp. 21, 23.

MUTATIONAL RESEARCH

As mentioned earlier, researchers spent most of this century trying to get mutations to produce new species. The problem, of course, was the fact that they are so rare. p. 23.

The new discovery. But a major breakthrough came in 1928, when *Muller discovered that X-rays could speed up mutations. Whereas, in nature, there might be one mutation, now the number could be increased a millionfold--and focused on just one organism!

How wonderful, the evolutionists thought! Now we shall be able to create new species!

Instead, they damaged, mutilated, and killed experimental insects, animals, and birds for decades--without accomplishing anything worthwhile.-pp. 23-24.

The great fruit fly experiment. The humble fruit fly was selected as the best single creature to torture with radiation. The reason was its extremely short reproductive cycle. A new generation of fruit flies occurs every few days. In addition, the creature is large enough that it can be seen far easier than worms or microbes.

Since the late 1920s, hundreds of thousands of generations of fruit flies have been irradiated with X-rays and nuclear radiation. -Yet in all that time, two facts have emerged: (1) They have been damaged, not helped. (2) No new species have been produced. The fruit flies have remained fruit flies-in spite of experiencing countless millions of mutations. pp. 24-25.

Resistant strains. It has been said, by evolutionists, that "resistant strains" of bacteria are the result of mutations. These are bacteria which are more resistant to the wonder drugs.

Yet the truth is that every species has a variational range of traits. Some of those bacteria could resist the drugs, while others could not.

When the drugs were applied, the non-resistant strains died off, and the resistant strains survived. What the physicians were doing, by administering drugs, was to breed new, stronger strains of bacteria! Mutations had nothing to do with the process. pp. 25-26.

The Benczer studies. In the early 1960s, *Benczer discovered a chemical which could incredibly increase the number of mutations. This was a great breakthrough in science, for henceforth the data could be collected much more rapidly and thoroughly.

As a result, they were soon able to report that there was no longer any uncertainty: Mutations were not 99 percent harmful; they were 100 percent harmful!

In addition, they discovered that the slightest mutational change in the DNA ruins the code entirely. Even the simplest organism is damaged when its DNA is struck by a mutation. p. 26.

MAMMOTH MUTATION THEORY

We noted earlier that some evolutionists adhered to the natural selection, as the cause of cross species changes. Later, when mutations were discovered and the inadequacies in natural selection were realized, many turned to mutations as the solution.

But, later still, several prominent evolutionists turned to a new variation on the mutation theory:

They came up with the "hopeful monster" theory. This is the idea that, once every 50,000 years or so, a gigantic set of helpful, positive mutations occurs all at once: a lizard lays an egg and a beaver hatches from it!

Flaws in the theory. Here are some of the reasons why this mutation theory is desperately impossible:

1 - It never happens. We never see the theory in action. p. 27.

2 - Two required. Every time a hopeful monster is produced, two would have to come into being within a few miles of each other: a male and female. Yet, according to *Gould, this rare event only happens once every 50,000 years. p. 27.

3 -Massive mutations required. Multi-billion mutations would suddenly have to occur, each time a hopeful monster was produced. p. 26-27.

4 - All positive. Mutations are always negative, and generally lethal; but these would have to be all positive.-p. 27.

5 - All dovetailed and according to plan. All these mutations would have to fit perfectly together in a harmonious whole: body organs, bones, head, feet, DNA, and all the rest. p. 29.

6 - It is a mathematical impossibility. It sure is. -p. 27.

7 - Not frequent enough. *Gould set the hopeful monsters 50,000 years apart, to help cover over the fact that they are not occurring today. But one new species every 50,000 years would only yield 20 new species every million years! Yet there are immense numbers of species in the world right now.-pp. 26-27. 29.

SUMMARY

Evolution cannot succeed without mutations, and evolution cannot succeed with them. Evolution is an impossibility--and that is it.

SIX STRANGE TEACHINGS

Here are the six strange teachings of evolution, each of which is inherently incorrect and unscientific:

1 - Evolution always operates upward, not downward. In another words, evolution always has, positive effects. Yet, because it is supposedly totally random, half its effects would have to be negative.-p. 31.

2 - Evolution operates irreversibly. But scientists well-know that actions in nature can reverse and go in either direction. p. 31.

3 - Evolution operates only from smaller to bigger. That is another fantasy, which does not agree with nature. pp. 31-32.

4 - Evolution operates from less complex to more complex. Random actions tear down and destroy at least as often as they build.-p. 32.

5 - Evolution operates from less perfect to more perfect. How can random chance ever operate solely toward greater perfectness? -p. 32.

6 - Evolution is not repeatable. The falsity of these six points is shown by their obvious artificiality.-pp. 32-33.

MUTATIONS CLASSROOM TEST

BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO Mutations are quite commonplace; they happen all the time.
YES NO Mutations are random and never helpful.
YES NO Variations in plant varieties is not the result of mutations.
YES NO X-rays and radiation cause mutations.
YES NO it would be impossible for a creature to exist even for a moment, unless its DNA and organs were not completely in place.
YES NO Each mutation weakens the organism.
YES NO Parents with mutations produce offspring which are always weaker.
YES NO Is sickle-cell anemia a helpful mutation? (Or, to say it another way, would you like to have it?)
YES NO In 1928, Muller discovered that X-rays could not speed up mutations.
YES NO Fruit fly research has proven that X-rays can produce new species.
YES NO Mutations are 100 percent harmful. In other words, they are always damaging to the organism.
YES NO Scientific facts indicate that the hopeful monster theory is utterly fantastic.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

59 Fossils and Strata

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide fossils and strata

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

The evolutionists' problem. how to explain away the fact that what we learn from the strata points to the Genesis Flood, and the fossils themselves clearly disprove species evolution.

The evolutionists' solution. Inventing a timing sequence that is pure theory and has no relation to reality.

INTRODUCTION

Fossils and strata. Fossil remains provide evolutionists with their only real evidence that evolution might have occurred in the distant past. Yet there is an astounding amount of evidence to disprove their claims.

Fossils are the remains of living creatures, both plants and animals. These fossil remains may include shells, teeth, bones, entire skeletons, foot prints, bird tracks, tail marks, or rain drops. They are found in sedimentary rock. Sedimentary rock is composed of compacted sediments (sand, gravel, clay, etc.) laid down by flood waters, which have hardened into layers of stone piled up like a layer cake. Sedimentary rock is fossil-bearing or fossiliferous rock. pp. 13, 15.

Extremely Important. Fossils are extremely important because they ought to provide evolutionists with all the evidence needed to show that one species has evolved into another.

Fossil evidence reveals whether evolution has occurred in the past. Genetic and mutational facts reveal whether it can occur now. (Genetics was discussed in Book 8 in this series, on DNA, and mutations were discussed in Book 10.)

Evidence from genetics and mutations shows that no evolution is occurring today.

Evidence from fossils is all the evolutionists have left! And, in this present chapter, we will find that no animals have changed into others at any time in the past-pp. 15, 17.

Uniformitarianism. This, a basic theory of evolution, teaches that everything has occurred in the past just the way it occurs today. In other words, evolutionists maintain there have never been any catastrophes in the past; i.e., no great Flood which caused the strata and buried the plants and animals fossilized within it. But the evidence shown in this chapter clearly disproves that theory pp. 1718.

The Cambrian explosion. This is a key factor. At the very bottom of the strata (which is presumed to be the oldest) is the Cambrian level. Many types of fossils are suddenly found there. Many of them (including the trilobite, which is quite common on that level) are very complex. The trilobite has a very complex lens system in its eye.

Evolutionary theory requires that there only be one or two species in the bottom fossil level, yet what we find agrees instead with the Genesis Flood.-p. 18.

The Genesis Flood. The solution to the mystery of the rock strata, and the fossils in them, is to be found in the first book in the Bible: Genesis, chapters 6 to 9. A sudden, worldwide Flood occurred which laid down the mud and sediment, and buried the plants and animals in it.

First, in the lowest strata, the slow moving creatures were buried; then, in higher layers, faster moving creatures. This explains why larger, stronger creatures are in the upper levels. It also explains why remains of humans are rarely found in the strata: They were able to run to the tops of the mountains and were drowned above the laid-down sediments.-pp. 18-19.

IS ENOUGH EVIDENCE AVAILABLE?

This is a crucial question: Is enough fossil and strata evidence available to enable us to definitively arrive at answers.

Yes there is! According to *Kier, there are over 100 million fossils housed in museums and other collections! Geologists have been digging them out of the ground since the early 19th century.

If the evidence supporting evolutionary claims existed, it ought to have been discovered by now!

By the present time, the transitional forms (the halfway species between one species and the other it evolved into) ought to have been found. But such evidence does not exist.

Gish says that evolutionists maintain that it takes 100 million years to evolve a fish. Therefore, there ought to be thousands of transitional forms, halfway between the fish and what it evolved from.

For example, evolutionists teach that a land animal, such as a cow, went into the ocean and changed into a whale. (Don't laugh; that is what they believe.) But that would mean we ought to have thousands of halfway species between the two-but such creatures are not to be found in the fossil record or in the oceans today. pp. 19, 20.

DATING THE STRATA AND FOSSILS

How are the rocks and fossils dated? Read anything on the subject by evolutionists, and you will quickly learn that the one obvious proof that the strata and fossils must be so ancient is the fact that the strata all have dates going back into the multimillions of years!

Okay, but now let us go deeper into the matter: Exactly how are the strata and fossils dated?

Let me tell you in just one sentence: Evolutionary scientists dated the rocks from the fossils, and then dated the fossils from their theories! And they decided on nearly all those dates over a century ago-when only a few fossils had been found!

That may seem astounding, but it is true. p. 20.

Real history. Real history only goes back about 4,500 years. Everything before that is guesswork. We know that to be true because the various ancient dating methods (C14, radiodating, etc.) have severe inherent dating flaws. See Book 6: Dating of Time in Evolution and Book 24: The Truth about Archaeological Dating, both in this series. p. 20.

Not dated by appearance. The strata are not dated by appearance, for various types of rocks, of all levels and "ages," may be found in strata. They are not dated by their mineral, metallic, or petroleum content. p. 20.

Not dated by location. The strata are not dated by where they are found or by their structure, breaks, faults, or folds. p. 20.

Not dated by vertical location. The rocks are not dated by their sequence in the strata, for "younger" strata may be below "older" strata. pp. 20-21.

Not dated by radioactivity. To anyone familiar with the fact that radiodating dates are wildly incoherent, it should come as no surprise that strata dates are not obtained by radiodating. (See Book 6: Dating of Time in Evolution for more on that.)-p. 21.

Are the rocks dated by fossils? That is about all that is left,-yet the same fossils are found in many different strata! A full 99.8 percent of the fossils are useless for dating, because they are in so many different strata.

How then are the rocks dated? pp. 21-23.

Rocks are dated by index fossils. It may seem incredible that all evolutionary geology is keyed to a few fossils, but it is true. In every strata, there are a few fossils which are mainly found in that one strata. The strata is then dated according to those index fossils.

That may seem like going out on the limb quite a bit, but it does seem sort of scientific. Ok, everything is dated by a certain few fossils.

But, what a minute! How did the evolutionists decide what dates to apply to those index fossils?

They are dated by a theory! p. 21.

Fossils dated by a theory. There is no way to tell the age of a certain fossil-any fossil. No possible way. The evolutionists do not even try to do so. Instead, they date the fossils by their theory of how old they think the fossils and those strata should be!

The whole idea of "index fossils" is a charade to hide the fact that each strata, and everything in it, is assigned an arbitrary date--according to what men imagine it ought to be!

(It is revealing that every few years, another "index fossil" is found to be alive today! Then it must be removed from the "index fossil" list, since index fossils are supposed to have died out at a certain ancient date. Many of the index fossils are trilobites, tiny ancient sea creatures, generally less than an inch in length.)-pp. 21, 23.

Circular reasoning. Although it is called "fossil evidence," circular reasoning is the basis of the evidence used to prove evolution to be true.

Every thinking person knows that fossil evidence is supposed to be the primary basis for evolution. Yet we find that it is based on circular reasoning: They use their theory of rock strata to date the fossils, and then use their theory of fossils to date the strata!

Although it is called "survival of the fittest," circular reasoning is also the basis of the means, or mechanism, by which evolution is supposed to occur.

The fittest survive because they are fittest; or, to say it another way, the survivors survive because they survive; therefore they are the fittest. But all they do is survive; they do not evolve into something different! pp. 23, 25.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS

1 - Lowest levels are just as complex. It is an astounding fact that the lowest strata, the Cambrian, contains a variety of creatures from every phylum, and they have complicated internal structures.

The mathematics needed to work out the lens structure of trilobites was not invented until the 19th century. p. 25.

2 - Sudden appearance of life. The lowest strata containing fossils is the Cambrian. (Below that is the Precambrian, with no fossils other than an occasional algae.) Called the "Cambrian explosion" by scientists, it is a sudden appearance of billions of fossils of over a thousand different life forms.

Yet they are all distinct species, with nothing leading up to them. Every major life group (phyla) has been found in the Cambrian strata.

This situation is contrary to evolutionary theory, but quite nicely agrees with what happened during the Genesis Flood. For example, plants would have been washed into higher levels, but their seeds could be found in the lower levels. p. 27.

3 - No life below the Cambrian. Below the Cambrian, in the Precambrian, essentially nothing living is to be found.

But above it, in the Cambrian, are over 1,500 different species, including one which is two-feet long. pp. 28, 30.

4 - No transitional species. This is one of the most significant findings of over a century of digs. Only distinct species have been found; no half-species. This now amounts to over 100 million fossils in thousands of museums and collections.

In order for evolutionary theory to be correct, transitional species partway between one true species and another which it is supposed to have evolved into-should have been found in massive numbers. But none have been found.

Scientists are well-aware of this problem, and have a name for it. They call it "fossil gaps."

An example would be the squid and the octopus. They are the most complex of the invertebrates (animals without backbones). Yet they are found in most of the strata levels. Careful research has disclosed no transitional species leading to or from them. Regardless of the strata, the specimens are identical to those living today.

Another name for this problem is "missing links." The transitional species linking the species together are missing. They are not found; they never will be found. pp. 30-31.

5 - Abrupt appearance. Not only do the smaller, slower moving creatures, in the Cambrian, suddenly appear in the fossil record,-the larger creatures appear just as suddenly! And when they appear-they do so by the millions! Tigers, salmon, lions, pine trees, hawks, squirrels, horses, and on and on! And always with no transitional species leading to or away from them. p. 33.

6 - Stasis. "Stasis" means to retain a certain form, to remain unchanged. Each creature first appears in the fossil record with a certain shape and structure; it then continues on "for millions of years" through several strata, and then either becomes extinct or continues on to the present. Sometimes evolutionists declare it to have "become extinct millions of years ago,"-but then it is found alive today! Whichever of the three occurs, the creature does not--change its shape or structure ! pp. 33-34.

7 - Not enough species. According to evolutionary theory, there ought to have been a massive number of species changes in ancient times, yet we do not find any of them in the fossil record. We just do not find the intermediary species that link the species we have. pp. 34-35.

8 - Larger anciently than today. This is an odd fact, and it also opposes evolutionary theory. Ancient plants and animals tended to be larger often much larger-than they are now. Many examples of this could be cited. But extinction and reduction in size run counter to evolutionary theory. pp. 35, 37.

9 - No family tree. We are often shown a sketch of the evolutionary family tree, yet no such tree exists. The tips of the branches represent the various species, but the branches and trunk are missing.-p. 37.

10 - No geologic column. The rock strata is supposed to represent evolved species, but it is not a column.

Strata are missing and fossils are mixed together through many strata, and this includes index fossils. It is all one big confusion. pp. 37-38.

11 - Immense numbers of fossils. Why are there so many fossils? Immense numbers are to be found. Only an immense, worldwide catastrophe could have produced such a situation. All the evidence points to the fact that vast fossil beds of plants and animals were buried by the Flood. pp. 40-41.

12 - Not made now. It is impossible to make a fossil now. Researchers have tried to do it on dry ground and in swamps. But the plants or animals rot; they do not turn to fossils. Rapid burial and immense pressure is needed to make a fossil. p. 41.

13 - Rapid burial. It is clear that the fossils were buried with extreme rapidity. There are many examples of one fish eating another just as both were buried. Quick, high compression occurred. Sharks have been found flattened to 1/4 inch in thickness, from one side to the other, but with their tail fully erect. They were not sick, but in the prime of health. pp. 41-42.

14 - Fossil footprints. Many instances of fossil footprints have been found. This evidence points to a worldwide flood. Birds were buried on or about the same levels as their footprints. But non-dinosaur reptiles and dinosaurs left tracks well below the levels where the bulk of their bodies were found. They were walking around earlier in the Flood, and then later buried by it.--p. 42.

15 - Plants and animals not together. Evolutionary theory teaches that plants and animals drop to the ground, die, and make fossils. Yet the evidence reveals that plants and animals are generally piled up separately. This would be the case if they were washed into place by a gigantic flood. pp. 42-43.

16 - Living fossils. A number of the creatures found in the fossil record no longer exist. This is proclaimed as a proof of evolution, but it is only evidence of extinction. Extinction is not evolution.

Many of the extinct creatures are said to have died out millions of years ago, for their bones are not found in "younger" strata.

Yet some of them have been found to be alive today! They are called "living fossils." One was the coelacanth fish, which has been "extinct" since the Cretaceous period, supposedly 70 million years ago. It was classified as an "index fossil" until 1938, when it was known to be alive and well in deep water, off the coast of South Africa.

If long ages elapsed between each strata, it would be impossible for the coelacanth to disappear for all that time. (Each species must either remain alive or become extinct. If a species becomes extinct, it cannot come back to life.)

But if the strata was caused by the worldwide Flood, which only occurred a few thousand years ago, there would be no problem. The strata were all laid down over a fairly short period of time. pp. 44-45.

17 - Extinct dinosaurs. Evolutionists point to the dinosaurs as outstanding evidence of evolution. Yet they only show that creatures died out in earlier times. Extinction is not evolution.

In order for the dinosaur to prove evolution, there would have to be transitional forms leading up to them. But, like everything else, the dinosaurs are distinct species. pp. 45-46.

18 - None of the fossils or strata are ancient. Fossils from every level have been analyzed by carbon 14 dating. Scientists have been shocked to find traces of amino acids in all strata levels! This means that all the fossil-bearing strata were laid down fairly recently and at about the same time.

For example, seashells from the Jurassic strata ("135-180 million years ago"), have amino acids and protein residue still within them. So they cannot be more than a few thousand years old. pp. 46-47.

19 - Human remains in ancient deposits. Modern men and women are only supposed to have existed on earth for the past 2 million years, and therefore should only be found in Quaternary strata.

Yet human fossils have been found In many different levels, and human footprints have been found in the Cambrian level. These facts totally violate evolutionary theory p. 47.

COAL

Where did coal come from? Coal comes from anciently buried plants, and petroleum is from animals. Yet neither are made in significant quantities today.

Rapidly buried plant and animal life, at some earlier time, produced both coal and petroleum. p. 47.

Evidences that coal was laid down during the Flood. Coal can be made, and it is produced when plant remains are compressed and heated by the weight of overlying sediments.

Some coal seams are up to 30 or 40 feet thick and 300 to 400 feet wide. Enormous forests must have been rapidly buried in order to produce coal. There are no modern conditions which could duplicate such coal production.

Yet the evolutionary theory runs counter to these facts: Evolution requires that plants died, fell to the ground, and a little here and a little there were covered by dirt for millions of years. Then they turned into coal. But geologists know that the truth is far different: Great coal beds were produced by massive amounts of forests swept into place by flood waters, and then quickly buried and compacted.

In addition, marine fossils, such as fish, mollusks, and brachiopods are commonly found in coal.

Many instances have been discovered of upright fossil trees in the rock strata. Evolutionary theory cannot explain this.

The hollow trunks of trees in coal seams will be filled with material not native to the coal-showing it was washed in at the time of burial.

Coal is found in layers. Between each layer will be material washed in from elsewhere (sandstone, shale, clay, etc.)

Under and over the coal will be found clays which are not natural to forest soils. The clay was washed in, then the trees, and then more clay.

Large rocks, not native to the area, are frequently found in coal beds.

Coal and petroleum are only found in sedimentary strata-the only place fossils are found. All the evidence points to a rising worldwide Flood as the event which laid down these strata.

Research scientists have discovered that coal and oil can be made fairly rapidly through quick burial and compression-p. 47-49.

PROBLEMS WITH THE STRATA

As if the problems with fossils were not bad enough, we now turn our attention to the strata itself.

1 - Fossils in wrong places. Fossils are frequently found far below the strata where they are first supposed to have "evolved" into existence.

The experts deal with this in one of three ways: Either ignore the evidence, state that the fossils "downwashed" through solid rock to lower levels, or say they "reworked" themselves to lower strata. That is, they slipped, slid, or fell through the solid rock.

How could a fragile fossil imprint, even half a foot long, "wash down" through rock to a lower level?-pp. 49-50.

2 - Missing strata. This is one of the big secrets of evolutionary geologists. You are about to discover another fact the evolutionists do not want the public to learn:

Evolution teaches there is a "geologic column" of 12 major strata (Pleistocene, Pliocene, Miocene. etc.). Each one lasted millions of years; one came after the other, and all the fossils within each was laid down during that time.

But now for the secret: Anywhere in the world you wish to go, most of the strata are missing! Most of the time, only two to eight of the 12 theoretical strata can be found. The classic of them all, the Grand Canyon, only has a little under half of the 12 major periods and epochs.

If the evolutionary theory were true, those strata would have to be there! How could millions of years of strata vanish?

Yet if the strata were laid down at the time of the Flood, then the situation would be exactly as we would expect to find it. Materials were washed in here and there. The result is strata which starts, covers an area, and then stops.

The scientists' name for this problem is "unconformities"; they dare not call them "missing strata."

There are not only "fossil gaps," there are "strata gaps" also! pp. 50-52.

3 - Geosynclines. Evolution teaches "uniformitarianism," the theory that everything has always been as it is now. But instead, we find evidences in the earth that a major catastrophe occurred. It was a worldwide Flood, which not only laid down strata, but then twisted and turned the strata. The name for those tortured layers are "geosynclines."

In many places, layers of sedimentary rocks have been buckled into folds. Some of these folded strata are small, others are massive and cover miles in area (folded mountains). In other places, the strata angles itself downward into the earth, or upward. Breaking off as the sharp edge of high mountains (fault block mountains). At times, rocks are bent into right angles by such buckling. p. 52.

4 - Megabreccias. These are gigantic boulders which were moved by an Immense flood. They are surrounded by rock strata. How could that happen?

Mud and sediment were washed into place, then the boulder was pushed there; then more mud and sediment were washed in around and over it.

The evidence in the earth agrees with Flood geology, but not with evolutionary geology p. 52.

5 - Overthrusts. This is probably the strangest problem the evolutionists face as they try desperately to defend their theory. Overthrusts are the most shocking of the many evidences disproving evolutionary geology.

If the theory was correct, the strata, which the theory classifies as ages "older," would always be below the more recent strata. But if the theory was Incorrect, the strata would often be confused--and that is the way it actually is.

In every mountainous region on every continent on the globe, there are numerous examples of supposedly "older" strata superimposed on top of "younger" strata! This just cannot be if each strata is millions of years younger than the one it rests upon!

Evolutionists call these situations "overthrusts," and they have devised a fantastic solution to the problem! They say that the giant masses of "younger" strata, which are on top of "older" strata,--slid sideways for 50, 100, or more miles and got there! Sometimes they had to "slide" uphill.

Many of these immense overthrust areas are hundreds and even thousands of square miles in size!

We are not talking about taking a bulldozer and shoveling a mountain from here to there. We are speaking of an immense layer of rock that has to be moved without disturbing it!

Evolutionists have to make up these myths, in order to defend their theory about fossils. If they lose their fossil theory; they really have little left.

Heart Mountain is 30 miles wide by 60 miles long, and is next to the northeast corner of Yellowstone Park. Within this area are 50 separate blocks of "younger" strata on top of strata which is supposed to be 250 million years older.

Geologists are unable to locate where the blocks came from! But they say they slid in from someplace, probably hundreds of miles away.

Yet the "younger strata" which "slid in" is high above the surrounding area! It had to slide up from wherever it came from!

Lewis Overthrust is another example. It is 135 miles long and 3 miles thick, and includes all of Glacier National Park in western Canada.

Did you know that, according to the evolutionists, the famous Matterhorn in the Swiss Alps, hopped over there from somewhere else? It is all "younger" rock, which is on top of "older" rock.

Then there is the Mythen Peak In Switzerland. The evolutionary geologists tell us It ran there--all the way from Africa!

Also keep in mind the entire Appalachians. This is an enormous mountain range, stretching from eastern Canada to central Alabama. Did you know that it climbed up out of the Atlantic Ocean basin and up onto "older" strata below it?

The truth is that the overthrust theory is foolishness. The strata would crumble if any attempt were made to move it from one place to another. We are here dealing with fragile rock, massively weighted down. So many fractures would be produced that it would crumble. Yet scientists have analyzed it--and found that it is not fractured any more than other strata above or below it.--pp. 52-57.

SUMMARY

What is really there? What we find in the strata agrees with Flood geology. Consider these facts:

We find pockets of certain animals and plants here and there, washed into place.

We find mixed up and missing strata everywhere we look.

We find geosynclines: twisted and folded mountains.

We find megabreccias: giant boulders washed into place. with strata washed in around it.

We find overthrusts and upside-down strata.

We find vertical tree trunks washed into place.

We find the slowest sea creatures in the bottom strata.

We find the slowest land animals higher up.

We find few birds, since they could fly to the highest points.

We find few apes and humans, since they could run to the highest places.

We find complex forms suddenly appearing in great confusion at the very bottom.

We find only separate, distinct species.

We find species which have become extinct.

That is what we find, and it all agrees with Flood geology. And none of it agrees with evolutionary geology. p. 52.

Survival of the weakest

What does it take in order for evolutionary theory to survive?

(1) The public must not be told the true facts.

(2) Many conscientious researchers dare not speak up, lest they be fired.

(3) Most scientists are working in very narrow fields; they do not see the overall picture, and assume, even though their field does not prove evolution, that perhaps other areas of science probably vindicate it. The biologists and geneticists know their facts and research do not prove evolution, but assume that geology does. The geologists know their field does not prove evolution, but hope that the biologists and geneticists have proven it. -p. 40.

For the lack of evolutionary evidence in biology, see Books 7, 8, and 9 in this series.

For the failure of evolution in genetics, see Book 10.

For the miserable showing of evolution in geology--you are reading it right now (Books 11 and 12).

FOSSILS AND STRATA: BOOK 1 CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO The Cambrian explosion happened in the top-most (the youngest) strata
- YES NO Only a few hundred fossils have been found.
- YES NO The rocks are dated by the fossils, which are dated by a theory.
- YES NO The Precambrian level has almost no fossils.
- YES NO Evolution from one species to another requires transitional (partway) species, but none have ever been found today or in the fossils.
- YES NO Stasis means that there is never any change in structure or shape in a given species, whenever it is found.
- YES NO Fossils are being made all the time, as the animals and birds die and fall to the ground.
- YES NO Human fossil footprints have been found in the lowest strata.
- YES NO Buried plants produced the coal; and buried animals, the petroleum.
- YES NO Fossils are frequently found far below the strata where they first were supposed to have "evolved" into existence.
- YES NO Wherever you go in the world, most of the strata are missing.

YES NO Megabreccias are large braces holding strata in place.
 YES NO According to evolutionists, overthrusts are massive rock strata which moved, often great distances and sometimes uphill to their present locations.
 YES NO The Appalachian Mountains are said to have climbed out of the Atlantic Ocean and gotten on top of the hills.

SCORE NAME DATE

66 Ancient Man

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide

ancient man

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

Cave men and ape men. From grade school on up, the school books tell us about furry "cave men." We are told that we are descended from a line of apes, monkeys, and smaller creatures.

We are also told that bones have been found which were half-ape and half-human.

What is the truth about all this? p. 13.

INTERESTING FACTS

Stopped evolving. No evidence is available about human remains from earlier times-that supports evolutionary theory.

Because of that glaring fact, evolutionists try to sidestep this by decreeing that man stopped "evolving" about 100,000 years ago! This is just an attempt to explain away the evidence.

Actually, none need be surprised that there is no evidence of human descent from other species; for, as we learned in earlier books in this series, there is no evidence that evolution has occurred among plants and animals either. pp. 13-14.

Why less than five millenniums? If man has been the same for the past 100,000 years, why has he not produced 100, 000 years of writings, technology, cities, and all the rest?

Why does human history only go back less than 5,000 years? p. 14.

Totally different than the apes. If man descended from apelike creatures, then we should be like them. Yet we have very different DNA. The number of vertebrae in our backbone is different. Our cranial (brain) capacity is totally different. Many other differences could be cited. pp. 1415.

Primitive peoples. In some areas, ancient humans moved into difficult climatic areas and, for a time, lived in "stone-age cultures," until they had opportunity to build cities, plant, and engage in animal husbandry. In some localities (such as New Guinea), conditions have been so difficult that stone-age living has continued down to the present

time. Yet a New Guinea child can be raised in a modern culture, go to college, graduate, and enter the modern business world.

Sometimes people lived in caves for a time, until they could become settled in homes. There is evidence that anciently, as now, people lived in homes at the same time that others were living under trees or in caves.--p. 15.

Neanderthals. These were humans who lived in Europe several thousand years ago. They lived in caves for a time, and had skulls decidedly larger than ours. That means they were much smarter than we are today! That fact, of course, does not agree with evolutionary theory.

However, the Neanderthals did have rickets and arthritis, due to poor diet and the damp, cold climate they lived in. Scientists have said this was what caused their curved thighbones and larger eyebrow ridges.

The Neanderthals lived at a time when there was not much sunlight. In the next book in this series (Book 14: Effects of the Flood), we will learn that there is abundant evidence that many volcanoes blew their tops just after the Flood, reducing temperatures and darkening the atmosphere for over a century.

Evidence also indicates that Neanderthals have also lived in more recent centuries. One Neanderthal was buried in a suit of medieval chain armor. pp. 15-17.

Cro-Magnon Man. These were also clearly humans. Some were over six feet tall, with a cranial capacity somewhat larger than our own. They were normal people, not monkeys, and they provide no evidence of transition from ape to man. p. 17.

BASIC QUESTIONS

But what about the ape-men we hear about in the newspapers-these creatures over a million years old, which are half-man and half-ape?

We will now turn our attention to part of a lengthy line of fakes. As we consider them, ask yourself these questions:

Why is it that, each time, only one specimen is found? Why not hundreds or thousands? If these are our ancestors, there ought to be millions of our forebears. p. 17.

Why are only little pieces of bone found for each specimen-never, never a complete skeleton? The less that is found, the more theories can be made for it. In our more complete study on this, diagrams of the Java Man and Piltdown Man bones are shown, which clearly reveal how easy it is to fabricate an ape skull into a human one, when only part of the bones are used. p. 17.

Why is it that these special bones do not decay, even though they are supposed to be "a million years old"? The truth is that bones rot away within a century or so. Do not confuse actual bones with fossil imprints in rocks; they are different. There are lots of fossils, formed under compression in shale, gravel, and clays at the time of the Flood. But, within a couple centuries, actual bones usually disappear.

How could "million-year-old bones" be found in damp earth in Indonesia, China, and England, as claimed by the evolutionists? It cannot happen. Bones rot even quicker in damp climates.-pp. 17-18.

HOMINIDS

Working with a few pieces of bone, and making great claims for them, men become famous, are heaped with honors, and receive nice salaries.

Yet all the bones they have brought forward, would not fill the top of a kitchen table. Here they are:

Java Man. In 1891, in a damp place by a river in Java, Eugene Dubois found a skull cap, fifty feet away a femur, and, later in another location, three teeth.

Dubois decided that they all were from the same individual and that they were about a million years old! Dubois spent many years promoting his discovery, although many experts questioned it.

In 1907, a German expedition went to Java to examine the place where Dubois found the bones, and discovered they were taken from the flowage of a nearby volcano, which had overflowed in the recent past and buried a number of people.

Before his death, Dubois said the bones belonged to a gibbon. pp. 18-19.

So much for Java Man.

Pitldown Man. Of all the hoaxes of evolution, this was the classic. Several men planned it very carefully, carving selected pieces of an ape bone and treating it with chemicals to give it an aged appearance.

Eventually, several leading evolutionary scientists were drawn into the plot. Only those parts of the skull and jaw were included, from which it could not be determined the actual shape, size, or cranial capacity of the creature to which it originally belonged.

Then the bones were placed in a plaster cast in a halfway position between ape and man. Evolutionists all over the world were excited, and this figment of much imagination was named *Eoanthropus Dawsoni* ("Dawson's Dawn Man"). With a name like that, this had to be scientific!

Eventually the perpetrators of the hoax "found" several more bone pieces, including teeth which had been whittled halfway between ape and human teeth.

Although two men reported that they had found Dawson in his office staining old bones, few listened to them. So a whole generation grew up believing in Pitldown Man as the great proof that man came from the apes.

Then, in 1953, two British scientists managed to get their hands on the original bones (which had for decades been carefully stored away in the British Museum). Using a new fluorine test, the bones were shown to be quite recent. It was also discovered that they had been carefully carved and stained with bichromate.

Three years before the discovery of the hoax, British Parliament had spent a large amount of money in making the Pitldown gravel pit into a national monument to the wonders of evolution. pp. 19-20,55-58.

Rhodesian Man. In 1921, some bones were found in an African cave, and the sensational news went everywhere. But later a competent anatomist declared the bones to be merely those of a normal human being. In addition, the "million-year-old man" was found to have dental caries, from a modern diet, and a bullet or crossbow hole in his scalp. Not so old after all. p. 20.

Taung African Man. Found, in 1924, in a cave in South Africa, this skull was proclaimed to be the missing link. However, later experts found it to be the skull of a young ape.-p. 20.

Nebraska Man. A single molar tooth was found in the Midwest in 1922, and became a key evidence at the Scopes trial in July 25 at Dayton, Tennessee. One of the discoverers was knighted by the King of England for his monumental discovery.

In 1928, it was found to be the tooth of an extinct pig. In 1972, living specimens of the same pig were found in Paraguay. p. 20.

Peking Man. All we have of this 1920 discovery, in China, are plaster casts. The original bones were later lost. They were found in a cave of thousands of bones, mostly animals and only a few human bones. The place appeared to be a garbage dump, for even the human bones appeared to have the flesh eaten off them before being discarded. There was no evidence anything had evolved from anything else, pp. 20-21.

Australopithecines. Certain ape bones in Africa are called the "southern ape." Experts tell us they were all apes, but most evolutionists are firm in their claims that these were our ancestors. One of the most famous of them is called "Lucy."

It was said that these apes had larger than usual cranial capacities, but when checked by other experts, they were found to be nearly normal in size. pp. 21, 23.

Nutcracker Man. This 1959 African set of bones appears to be another case of mismatched bones. The skull is ape-like, the jaw was much larger (hence the name, "nutcracker"), and some other bones nearby were human.

Later, *Louis Leakey, its discoverer, conceded it was just an ape skull. pp. 23-24.

Skull 1470. In 1973, *Richard Leakey announced a skull which he said was 2.8 million years old. But the lower jaw was not found; this would have told a lot. pp. 24-25.

It appears to be the skull of a modern small brained person. (Cranial size of people today varies between 1,000 and 2,000cc. with an occasional low of 750cc, and an average of 1,500-1,600cc. So the find of a small-cranium skull is no evidence of evolution. Pardon me for saying so, but an early teen student and a microcephalic has a cranial capacity of 775 cc, the size of Skull 1470.)pp. 24-25.

Bone Inventory. Time-Life published a book in 1972, listing all the bone finds up to the end of the preceding year. Although over 1,400 specimens are given, most are little more than scraps of bone or isolated teeth. Not one complete skeleton of one individual exists. There are just scraps and pieces, nothing more. p. 25.

Baby apes and giant monkeys. It is wellknown among scientists, but not printed for you to read, that the skulls of both baby apes and giant monkeys can look like the skulls of immature humans. So "half-ape/half-human" skulls can be found! It is not that difficult to do. pp. 26-27.

Mass spectrometer breakthrough. Using a new technology, eleven human skeletons, the earliest known in the western hemisphere, were tested--and they all dated less than 5,000 radiocarbon years.

It was an oversight that such an investigation was permitted. You can be sure it will not happen again. If it had been applied to the celebrated African bones, found by the Leakeys and others, all those ancient "hominid bones" would be shown to be only a few thousand years old. They will never be radiodated. p. 27.

EARLY MAN

After more than a century spent trying to figure out people, the experts still declare that all the races of man belong to only one species.

Regarding the dates concerning mankind, evolutionists speculate that humans have lived here for one to three million years--and then, suddenly, stopped evolving 100,000 years ago.

Yet actual historical dates go back less than 5,000 years. Using historical, archaeological, and astronomical data, dates for early mankind extend to about 2250 B.C.

But using results of the notoriously inaccurate carbon 14 dating system, the earliest dates for mankind extend back about 15,000 years.

Let us now consider some actual evidence of early people on our planet.

We will find they were real human beings. And where they were located disproves evolutionary theories.-p. 27.

The Guadeloupe woman. In 1812 on the Caribbean island of Guadeloupe, a fully human skeleton was found, lacking only the head and feet. It was found inside extremely hard, very old limestone, which was part of a formation over a mile in length.

In accordance with their theory, evolutionists date that rock at 25 million years! You will not find the Guadeloupe woman mentioned in the textbooks, books, since this find would disprove evolutionary strata dating. p. 29.

The Caveras skull. In 1876, 130 feet below ground, a skull was found in the "2 million-year old" Pliocene strata. It was certified as completely mineralized, yet totally human. Dozens of stone mortars, bowls, and other man-made artifacts were found near this skull. p. 29.

The Castinedolo skull. A group of perfectly human ancient skulls were found in Castinedolo, Italy and, with the Caveras Skull, are considered among the most ancient skulls. Yet they are perfectly human. p. 29.

The Moab Skeletons. Two skeletons were found in Cretaceous rock (supposedly dated at 100 million years) in Moab, Utah, about 15 feet below the surface.

Both skeletons were definitely human and ancient. They had been undisturbed till they were found. When tested for age, they were only a few thousand years old. pp. 29-30.

HUMAN FOOTPRINTS

Evolutionists theorize that man did not evolve until the late Tertiary Period, and cannot be over one to three million years old.

But human footprints have been found in very old rock strata. These are human footprints, not ape prints. (Apes have very different footprints and styles of walking.)

These prints disprove evolutionary theories about rock strata-and reveal it is quite young, and place dinosaurs as living at the same time when people did. The prints also reveal that giants once lived on our planet. p. 30.

Laetoli tracks. At a site in Kenya, called Laetoli, 30 miles south of Olduvai Gorge. Mary Leakey discovered human footprints in 1977. Although some evolutionists reject them as human, other scientists recognize them to be clearly human-and therefore date those who made the tracks to be 3.75 million years ago. But evolutionists teach that no people lived back then.

At about the same time, Mary Leakey and Dr. Johanson found human teeth and jawbones from around the same 3.75 million-year period. pp. 30-31.

The Gediz track. A footprint found in volcanic ash, near Demirkopru, Turkey, was found in 1970. The track of a running man was found in strata dated by evolutionists at 250,000 years in the past. p. 31.

The Glen Rose tracks. A remarkable number of human tracks have been found in a Cretaceous limestone formation near Glen Rose, Texas. Many are of giant men. The prints have been found in the bed of Pulaxy River, when it is dry in the summer. Some are next to, on top of, or under dinosaur tracks.

The Glen Rose tracks are 15 inches long [38.1 cm], and were probably made by people 8.3 feet [25.38 dm] tall. Some, 21 ½ inches [54.6 cm] long, would have been made by people 11.8 feet [25.38 dm] tall.

*R.T. Bird, a paleontologist with the American Museum of Natural History also found a trail of Brontosaurus tracks, which were shipped to the museum. That means people were alive when the dinosaurs were! Some human tracks overlaid the dinosaur tracks, and some were found in layers below the dinosaurs. pp. 31-32.

The Pulaxy Branch. In August 1978, Fred Belerie spent the afternoon searching for tracks in the Pulaxy riverbed. He found a tree branch encased in Cretaceous stone, with only the upper part showing. So it was as old as the tracks.

Belerie sent a sample of the wood to *Reisner Berg of UCLA, who tested it by radiodating at 12,800 years. Corrected, it would yield a date agreeing with the Flood. (Carbon 14 dating tends to skew toward greater age on older dates, because of atmospheric differences back then. See Book 6: Dating of Time in Evolution for details.)

That would date both the giants and the dinosaurs as being recent. p. 32.

Antelope Springs tracks. In June 1968, *William J. Meister, Sr., an evolutionist, was searching for trilobite fossils in the mountains of Utah. Splitting a piece of rock in two, he found inside a human footprint stepping on trilobites. The human was wearing a sandal!

Thoroughly shaken, he took other men back who confirmed it and found still more, including some with sandals stepping on trilobites.

As a result, Meister became a Christian. The strata was primarily Cambrian, which is supposed to be the oldest on the planet.-pp. 32-33.

The Alamogordo tracks. Near Alamogordo, New Mexico, 13 giant tracks, each about 22 inches [55.8 cm] long were found. The stride is from four to five feet [121.9-152.4 cm]. p. 33.

The Arizona tracks. Tracks of a barefoot human child were found, in the late 1960s, alongside some dinosaur tracks. The location was the Moenkopi Wash, near the little Colorado River in northern Arizona.

In 1984, similar tracks were found not far from the Moenkopi site. Many human tracks, dinosaur tracks, and a handprint of a child that had fallen.

More adult tracks were found in 1986.

The Arizona tracks are located in the Glen Canyon geological Group, which is part of late Triassic to early Jurassic strata, and supposedly 175 to 100 million years old.

In addition to 300 tridactyle dinosaur tracks, sheep tracks, bivalve prints, large amphibian and lungfish marks have been found. Over 60 human tracks have been mapped and photographed. pp. 33-34.

Other human prints. Many other human footprints have been found, which we will not mention here. p. 34.

Other giant people. The skeletal remains of giants have also been found. Giants, twice the size of gorillas, were found in Java.

The petrified remains of a giant were found in South Africa. A well-known anthropologist declared that these remains showed that man's ancestors must have been giants. p. 33.

REMAINS IN COAL, ROCK, ETC.

Human remains and man-made objects have been found in coal and rock-where they should not be found. The evidence disproves evolutionary theories about the age of rock strata. As far back as we can trace, people were people. They were not apes.

Human remains in coal. A fossilized human skull was found in coal that was sold in Germany (mid-1800s). A jawbone of a child was found in coal in Tscany (1958). Two giant human molars were found in Montana (1926). A human leg was found by a West Virginia coal miner. It had changed into coal.--pp. 34-35.

Man-made objects in coal. A lady, in Illinois, found a gold chain in a chunk of coal which broke open (1891). A small steel cube was found in a block of coal in Austria (1885). An iron pot was found in coal in Oklahoma (1912). A woman found a child's spoon in coal (1937).p. 35.

Man-made objects in rock. An iron nail was found in a Cretaceous block from the Mesozoic era (mid- 1800s). A gold thread was found in stone in England (1844). An iron nail was found in quartz in California (1851). A silver vessel was found in solid rock in Massachusetts (1851). The mold of a metal screw was found in a chunk of feldspar (1851). An intricately carved and inlaid metal bowl was found in solid rock (1852). An iron nail was found in rock in a Peruvian mine by Spanish conquistadores (1572).--pp. 35-36.

Man-made objects found in the ground. A doll was found near Nampa, Idaho (1889). A bronze coin was found 114 feet below the surface near Chillicothe, Illinois (1871). This means there were coins in ancient times in America! A paving tile was found in a "25 million-year-old" Miocene formation in Platteau City, Colorado (1936).

Several discoveries were made during the California gold rush (1849-1850s). A prehistoric mining shaft, 210 feet [640 dm] below the surface in solid rock was found. A mortar for grinding gold ore was found at a depth of 300 feet [914 dm] in a mining tunnel. A human skull was also found at a depth of 130 feet [396 dm] under five beds of lava and tufa. Bones of camels, rhinoceroses, hippopotamuses, horses, and other animals were also found in California. The findings are almost always in gold-bearing rock or gravel.

Man-made markings on petrified wood. Evolutionists declare that petrified wood is millions of year old, yet humans have worked with it.

Hand-worked petrified wood was found in India. It was shaped prior to fossilization.

Prior to mineralization, several petrified pieces of wood had been hacked with a cutting tool. The wood was dated to the Pliocene Epoch, before humans were supposed to have lived.-p. 36.

Man-made markings on bones. At a site near Paris, France, fossilized rhinoceros bones had human cutting marks on them. No rhinos have been in Europe in recorded history. Another rhino bone, cut by a sharp tool, was found in Ireland.

Two saurian bones were found in a Jurassic deposit.-pp. 36-37.

MORE ABOUT PEOPLE

The intelligence of man. The mind of man is far too advanced for evolutionary theory, which teaches that creatures developed only enough to provide for their basic needs.

*Alfred Russel Wallace was a close friend of 'Charles Darwin. After deep thought, he came to the conclusion that evolutionary theory was untrue--because man's mind was far too powerful and advanced to be produced by evolution.

In contrast, apes have been studied for several decades, and we now know that they really are not very intelligent. pp. 37-38.

The languages of man. The languages of man are as amazing as the mind of man. We can speak and we can write.

Language marks an unbridgeable gulf between man and all other life-forms on our planet. There is no possible way that we could have evolved from lower forms of life.

As far back as we can go, human language is totally developed) Indeed, upon investigation we learn that ancient languages were far more complicated than those we now have.

Ancient Sanskrit, in India, was extremely complicated. Two words would combine into a third word; and there were many such possible changes. Ancient Greek was written in capital letters, with no word separations or punctuation. One line would be written from right to left, and the next from left to right) pp. 38-40.

Monkey talk. It has been widely reported that apes can use symbolic language, but more recent studies have revealed this is not true. The apes only do what they think their trainers want them to do. pp. 40-41.

Ancient cultures. Mankind appears to have migrated from a central point, located somewhere in the Near East or Asia Minor. This would agree with the conditions following the Flood and the fact that the Ark came to rest in Eastern Turkey (see Genesis 8-9).

In the Near East we find the earliest pottery, domestication of plants and animals, metalworking, towns and cities, and the earliest writing.

The earliest authentic dates only go back to about 5,000 years ago. If man developed a "modern brain" 500,000 to 100,000 years ago (as the evolutionists tell us), then why did mankind wait till 5,000 years ago to begin using it?

Evolutionists say the first man came from central Africa, yet all the earliest human cultural activities began in the Near East p. 41.

The earliest crops and domestic animals. The earliest maize, beans, lima beans, barley, and corn existed only a few thousand years ago.

The first known dogs and sheep were from about the same time in the Near East. At about the same time, goats, pigs, cats, and cattle first appeared.

The earliest dates for these and other animals only goes back to 7000 B.C. When those carbon 14 dates are corrected, they become 3000 B.C. dates.

What about the hundreds of thousands of years before then, when humans were supposed to be fully developed, fully active? But all we find is silence; no records; no indication of anything happening.

Everything agrees with the Genesis record; nothing agrees with evolutionary theory. However, in an effort to offset Bible chronology, a spurious method of Egyptian

dating has been devised. But, for several reasons, it is flawed. (See Book 20: The Truth about Archaeological Dating for more on this.)

From the best we can tell, ancient man was more intelligent than are men today. The outstanding advantage we have today is lots of written records, paper, accumulated writings, books, rapid communications, and transportation.--pp. 41-45.

**ANCIENT MAN
CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO Human records and history only go back a few thousand years.
YES NO Humans have the same DNA that apes have.
YES NO Neanderthals were regular humans, but with larger brains.
YES NO Cro-Magnon men had larger brains than people today.
YES NO All these "hominid bones," which were supposed to belong to half-ape, half-human ancestors-amount to nothing more than Immature ape skulls, doctored up and stained ape bones, mismatched bones, or pig teeth.
YES NO Human footprints have been found next to, on top of, and under dinosaur tracks.
YES NO A man, In Utah, found sandaled human prints In the very "oldest" strata, the Cambrian.
YES NO Skeletons of giant humans have been found.
YES. NO Apes have been found which are as smart as people.
YES NO Ancient languages are far more complicated than modern ones.
YES NO The earliest cultures usually began in the Near East.
YES NO The earliest dates of human activity generally go back only a few thousand years.
YES NO From the best we can tell, ancient man was smarter than us today, but we have an advantage in having more written materials.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

44 Effects of the Flood

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide
effects of the flood

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

The evolutionists' problem. how to explain away the fact that the Genesis Flood occurred. The Flood took place because the sins of men had become so great. That event reveals there is a God in heaven, and He will punish sin.

THE GREATEST PHYSICAL EVENT

The greatest physical event in the past history of our world was the Genesis Flood. It matters not where you live or where you go, you will see evidences all around you of that immense deluge. You may travel to the seashore, the mountains, or the rivers; there you will witness its results. That cataclysm produced the oceans, resulted in upheavals that made the mountains, and channeled the rivers.

It is impossible to properly understand past geologic history without learning about the worldwide Flood and its effects.

The oldest historical record which mankind has, is the book of Genesis, the first book in the Bible. It provides us with a historical account from about 4000 B.C., on down to about 1900 B.C.

In the first two chapters of that book we learn about Creation Week, when our world and everything in it was made. In chapters 6 through 9 we are told about the worldwide Flood which occurred about 2348 B.C. (1656 A.M. [anno mundi], or about 1,656 years after Creation).

In this present book, we will consider not only the direct, but indirect, effects of the Flood. Some of those effects did not occur until the Flood waters were subsiding. p. 13.

Uniformitarianism. This long word is the name for the evolutionary answer to the Flood. It is the dogma that the past has always been just

like the present. No dramatic changes have ever occurred. But, in reality, there are many remarkable evidences that a worldwide Flood did occur. pp. 13-14.

Catastrophism. This is the position, held by many thoughtful scientists, that a great water catastrophe occurred at some earlier time, which devastated the earth and produced our present geologic, geographic, and climatic conditions.-p. 14.

FOSSILS, STRATA, AND THE FLOOD

Sedimentary strata. Take a drive through the mountains, and you will see, beside the road, slanted, twisted rock strata where the road builders have cut into it.

Looking much like a layer cake, that strata was produced by sediments (gravel, sand, clay, etc.) laid down by the Flood. About three fourths of the land area of the earth (about 55 million square miles) consists of such sedimentary strata!--pp. 14-15.

Fossils. Within that strata is to be found billions of fossils. These are the remains (or the casts) of plants and animals which suddenly died, were rapidly buried, and then compacted under tons of additional sediments.

It is of interest that most of the carbon in our world is locked within the fossils in the sedimentary strata. Another interesting fact is that most species which have ever existed-are now extinct. Yet extinction is not evolution. Evolution is the process by which one species changes into another species. There is no evidence that such transformations have ever occurred; for there are no transitional forms, only separate, distinct species. p. 15.

Placement. Because there are no transitional species, evolutionists declare that it is the location of the species-high or low in the strata which tells which are the oldest.

Yet the truth is that the Flood, as it rose, first covered and buried the slowest moving species, later the slower mammals, and finally the quicker ones. It all happened within a fairly short time. It is noteworthy that some species, able to go to the highest mountains (birds and people, for example), are rarely found in the strata at all. p. 15, 17.

Lowest level. Yet even the smallest creatures in the lowest strata are extremely complex. This is a terrible blow to the evolutionists, who cannot explain it.

Another serious problem is, what is known as, the "Cambrian explosion." In the lowest strata, the Cambrian, there are over a thousand different species, and below that there are next to none.

Yet, if evolutionary theory were true, the lowest level would have had a few simple creatures, not hundreds of complicated ones, numbered in the billions upon billions of specimens. pp. 15, 17.

Fossil trees. "Polystrate" is the name given to these trees, which are upright (vertical) and frequently pierce through several strata. Yet such a fact would be impossible if evolutionary theory about strata were true. p. 18.

The evolutionary strata theory. Plants and animals, die fall to the ground, and turn into fossils. Trees fall flat and turn to fossils. Gradually, over the centuries, dirt covers over them and millions of years pass, followed by millions more! Then new strata are laid down on top of the old.

That is the theory. The truth is that fossils do not form when plants and animals die. Rapid burial and immense compaction pressures from above are necessary. The strata were all laid down rather quickly at the time of the Flood. pp. 17-18.

More on polystrate trees. For example, consider the polystrate fossil trees. There is no possible way that these trees could have remained upright for millions of years while the strata formed around them.

When Mount St. Helens blew its top several years ago, large numbers of polystrate trees were afterward found floating upright in Spirit Lake. This was because the root stock was heavy and part of the trunk had been broken off. The Flood would have caused such polystrate trees, some of which were then buried while still in a vertical position.-p. 118.

Coal and Petroleum. Plants produced coal, and animals produced petroleum. Both were rapidly buried and compacted. Evolutionists cannot explain the fact that they are rarely found together. Thick, large seams of coal will be by themselves, and immense seams of petroleum will be by themselves. According to the theory, both should be evenly distributed everywhere in the strata.

What happened was that the flood waters would wash floating mats of vegetation into an area and bury it, and then wash in gravel, seashells, etc., over it. Elsewhere, dead animals would be washed into another place and quickly covered.

And that is exactly what we find in the strata. Rock strata is not even throughout the earth, as the theoretical "geologic column of strata" indicates. Instead, everything is in confusion. One strata runs a few or many miles, and then stops. In no place is there to be found, from top to bottom, all twelve of the major strata or all 21 of the minor ones. Immense coal seams are found here and there. Pools of oil are to be found elsewhere.-pp. 18-20.

Graded bedding. This is another problem for evolutionists. Instead of evenly distributed dirt from bottom to top, we find "graded bedding," obviously caused by a

deluge: a layer of coarse pebbles and small stones, with smaller pebbles above them, grading off above to still finer materials such as sand. Below this will be another series of graded bedding. p. 20.

Unity of the strata. All the strata are an integral unit, obviously all laid down at about the same time. There are several factors supporting this position, maintained by thoughtful geologists. pp. 20-21.

Overthrusts. This is an immense problem to evolutionary geologists, but no problem to Flood geology.

In many locations throughout the world, "younger" strata is located well below "older" strata. Yet this could not possibly occur, if the evolutionary strata theory were true.

In order to explain it away, evolutionists declare that the immense, thick strata (often miles in length)-traveled sideways, often for hundreds of miles, and then placed itself into its present position under "older" strata. Often it had to go uphill to do this! p. 20.

Much, much more information on sedimentary strata will be found in Eds 11 and 12: Fossils and Strata-Part One and Two.

RECORDS ABOUT THE FLOOD

We have 330 million cubic miles [531 million cubic km] of water on our planet. At the present time, there is 70 billion gallons [26,822 liters] of water for every person alive. If the earth's surface was absolutely level, everything would be covered by 8,800 feet of water. p. 22.

Flood stories. The Genesis Flood was the most terrific physical event our planet has ever experienced. As a result, there are Flood stories among tribes and races all over the world. For example, one survey of 120 tribal groups in North, Central, and South America, disclosed flood traditions among each of them.

Another survey of ancient Flood literature of 41 different tribal and national groups was made.

Here are the twelve points most often included in their stories:

Destruction by a flood. Some humans were saved. A boat saved them. The flood caused universal destruction. One family was protected. The flood was caused by man's transgressions. The flood came as a result of a divine decree. Birds were sent out first. Animals were saved in the boat.

Survivors worshiped God after leaving the boat. The boat landed in a high mountainous area. After leaving the boat, God pronounced His favor on those who were saved. pp. 22, 24.

Chinese characters. Because Chinese is picture writing, and extremely ancient, we can learn from it. The word for "boat" is composed of three signs: "vessel," "eight," and "mouth" [person]. According to Genesis 6-9, there were eight people in the Ark.

The word for flood" is made up of three signs ("eight," "united," and "earth"), plus two ("total" and "water"). pp. 23, 24-25.

Noah's name. Not only was the story of the Flood and the Ark told and retold by later generations, but also the man who led out in building that giant boat was mentioned. --So much so, that his name is found in writings and stories all over the world. For example, in ancient Egypt, the god Nu was the god of waters and rain who

sent a flood to destroy mankind. The Sumerians taught that Anu was the god of the atmosphere, and called the rainbow the "great bow of Anu." p. 24.

The size of Noah's Ark. Evolutionists scoff at the possibility of the Ark being able to hold enough animals. Here are some facts about this:

Based on the Hebrew cubit, if that great boat was only one-half the size stated in Genesis 6:14-16, and omitting water creatures, it could still have held two or seven of each basic kind of animal and bird. The remainder of the ship could be used for food storage.

However, the earlier cubit in use at the time when Moses wrote down the story of the Flood was the Egyptian cubit (20.65 inches [629.12 cm]), which is longer than the Hebrew cubit (17.5 inches [533.4 cm]). Based on the Egyptian cubit, the Ark was the largest ship ever built until 1854, when a ship was built with a longer length (the *Eturia*, a Cunard liner built in England). However, the Ark was a barge, not a ship, and was very wide.

Most ancient ships were no greater than 200 feet in length. No ship surpassed the volume and cubic tonnage of the Ark until ocean-going supertankers were built in the latter part of the 20th century.-p. 25.

Flood chronology. According to conservative Biblical chronology, Creation occurred at approximately 4004 B.C. The Flood began 1,656 years later, which would be approximately 2348 B.C.

During the Flood, water burst out of underground channels and also fell from the skies. The rain from above fell for 40 days, and the water may have reached its greatest height in about 150 days. From the time that the rain first began falling, until the Ark was vacated, would be a total of 371 days. p. 26.

CONDITIONS BEFORE THE FLOOD

Warmer climate. Fossil-bearing rocks, from all strata levels, reveal that a worldwide warm climate once existed everywhere on the planet, even in, what is now, Arctic and Antarctic areas.

For example, because of widespread coal and petrified wood deposits, we know the Antarctic once had an abundance of vegetation and large trees. It also had palm trees and other tropical plant life.-pp. 26, 28.

Water vapor. There is no doubt that a remarkable change in climate occurred, resulting in our present cold climates. It was probably caused by the loss of water vapor in the earth's atmosphere. Scientists estimate that a worldwide water-vapor blanket must have covered our planet in ancient times. This deflected the sun's rays, so the entire globe was evenly warm. But, at the time of the Flood, water poured out of the skies and burst forth from the earth. As a result, the vapor cover was in great measure lost, and the underground watering system closed down. p. 28.

Lower sea levels. Before the Flood there were probably only broad rivers, with possibly a few seas. The enormous concave ocean basins we now have were not needed. But, as we will learn later in this chapter, because of the immense amount of water on the earth's surface, it was necessary for the sea basins to sink and the continents to rise-otherwise there would be no dry ground anywhere 1 pp. 28-29.

Seamounts. During World War II, seamounts were discovered by a ship captain, using the newly invented echo sounder. Seamounts are extinct volcanoes hundreds of feet beneath the sea-with their tops flattened.

Volcanic activity began early in the Flood. But later, as the sea arose, the tops of the volcanoes were flattened out by storm and wave action. Then the Flood went higher, and left the tops of some volcanoes (those which had become extinct) far below.

Seamounts point both to the fact that there once was lowered sea levels, but also to the extensive volcanic activity early in the Flood. p. 29.

Continental shelves. Another evidence of the lowered sea levels, which gradually rose, are the continental shelves. These shelves surround all the continents. pp. 29, 31.

Seamount corals. Corals can only live in shallow water, just below the oceans surface. Yet corals are to be found deep in the ocean. At some earlier time, corals were growing on those deeply submerged seamounts. Yet corals cannot live at a depth below 200 feet [609 dm). This also points to lower sea levels at an earlier time.-p. 31.

Submarine canyons. As the rivers emptied into the oceans, canyons flowed down the sides of continents. Later, the oceans filled and these canyons, of which there are several hundred, are now as much as 1,500 feet below sea level. For example, you will find a canyon dropping down deeply off the outlet of the Columbia River. If the seas had not earlier been at a lower level, that canyon would not be there.-pp. 31-32.

Origin of the oceans. There once were no oceans (but perhaps a few smaller seas). Fossil landforms have been found at the bottom of the oceans.

Immense upheavals, as well as sinkings of land, must have taken place in order to provide a place to hold the oceans.-p. 31.

Higher Lakes. At some earlier time, the lakes were higher than they now are. If you have ever driven through the Salt Lake City area, you can see the high-water marks on the surrounding mountains. Such raised beaches and terraces are to be found all over the world.-p. 32.

Larger rivers. At some earlier time, there was a far greater volume of water flowing in the rivers. Much of the time, you find small streams flowing in the middle of canyons. Gigantic waterways once flowed there.-p. 32.

Immense erosion and sedimentation. Tremendous quantities of water flowed, and carried massive amounts of soil and sediments with-it. There are places in the world where fossil-bearing sedimentary rock is several miles deep. It points to a gigantic catastrophe at an earlier time.-p. 32.

Wave erosion. Terrible storms raged during the Flood, and immense quantities of water tore at, and wore away, surfaces. Massive wave action also took its toll. All this resulted in an astonishing amount of rapid erosion. pp. 32-33.

Rock strata. The fossils and strata indicate rapid deposition due to a worldwide Flood, rather than being slowly laid down by the work of ages.

The strata are confused and often crushed and twisted. This would not have occurred if they had been slowly laid down. p. 33.

Meandering streams. Rivers only cut through rock when they are rushing extremely fast. Such downhill rivers run fairly straight. In contrast, slow, meandering (serpentine-shaped) rivers flow through flat land. Meandering rivers should not be able to cut their way through rock.

An example of this is the Colorado River, as it went through Grand Canyon. Here we find a serpentine river, yet it is supposed to have cut through half a mile of rock!

Obviously, that never happened. The truth is that the Grand Canyon strata had only recently been laid down by the Flood; and then, as a result of upheavals, the immense lake in Utah (which scientists call "Lake Bonneville") emptied out, during the uplift, through the Grand Canyon-and cut through all those relatively soft layers. If they had been hardened, they could never have been sliced through as they were. p. 33.

Mountain building. Water covers 72 percent of our planet's surface. If the earth had an absolutely level crust, the sea would cover it over 8,800 feet [26,822 dm].

Yet according to Genesis 7:20, the world did not originally have high mountains, for that passage indicates that only low mountains were covered.

Shortly after the Flood, mountain building began on an even larger scale (Psalm 104:6-9). If it had not occurred, oceans would forever have covered the entire world. Not only did the ocean basins greatly deepen, but the continents and mountains also rose. The highest mountain (Everest) is 5.5 miles [8,850 ml above sea level, and the deepest part of the ocean (the Mariana Trench near Guam) is 6.78 miles 110,914 ml below it. The immense variation occurred at the conclusion of the Flood; it did not exist beforehand.

The scientific name for this mountain building is "orogeny." Geologists say this mountain building primarily occurred during the Pleistocene or late Pliocene eras. This would be correct, for both of these occurred shortly after the Flood. By "mountain building," we mean both the raising of our present mountains and ranges and the uplifting of the continental masses.

Mountains rose and basins sank. As water flowed into them, they sank even more. Rock strata buckled, folded, went up or sideways. Out of all this came our present non-volcanic great mountain ranges. Scientists call these "folded mountains."

But the immense pressures also caused cracks (fissures) in the earth, and volcanoes began exploding. Volcanic mountains arose. pp. 35-36.

Subterranean streams. According to Genesis 7:11, not only did water pour out of the sky, but it also burst out of the ground.

This upheaval of water, from the ground, caused violent shifts on and beneath the surface of the earth. The ground crunched, folded, and twisted, as water emptied out from below--and immense quantities of water pressed down upon it from above. Add to this the rising of continents, ranges, and sinking of sea floors.--p. 36.

Volcanism. The release of so much underground water, combined with the pressure of so much surface water, caused immense high and low pressures within the earth. Gigantic cracks opened, and water, pouring down these cracks, hit the molten rock beneath. Steam was produced, which widened the cracks. Exploding jets of lava poured out at the earth's surface, producing thousands of volcanoes.

There are thousands of extinct volcanoes in the Pleistocene and even post Pleistocene levels around the world. That means they were active near the end of the Flood and for a time thereafter.

Never are old lava beds found below the Cambrian levels. Therefore, there were no volcanoes before the Flood began.

Volcanic action took place throughout the Flood, and culminated before and after it ended. pp. 36-37.

Magnetic reversals. So intense were these volcanic explosions, that a number of reversals in earth's magnetic core occurred. (See Book 16: Laws of Nature vs. Evolution for much more information on this.) p. 37.

Volcanic pollutants. Airborne pollutants do not remain in the atmosphere very long. But when shot from a volcano, they enter the upper atmosphere (the stratosphere) and can remain there for several years.-p. 37.

Rapid cooling. All these thousands of exploding volcanoes produced so much dust in the upper atmosphere, that rapid cooling occurred throughout the world.

When Krakatoa blew its top in 1883, over a square mile [.62 sq km] of dirt was blown into the skies. It took three years for the dust to settle to earth again. For about two years, the Krakatoa dust caused a definite lowering of worldwide temperatures.

But Krakatoa was only one volcano. What must it have been like, just after the Flood, when thousands were exploding? p. 37.

Freezing of the poles. It is estimated that 10,000 volcanoes were exploding. As a result, the poles froze, and many animals were frozen. From time to time, we find them encased in ice.

The lack of sunlight, from the volcanic dust overhead, brought on intense cold, in northern latitudes, and violent storms farther south. pp. 37, 39.

Glaciation. Vast quantities of water were gradually locked into the polar regions, and ice sheets were sent sliding southward from the Arctic. Popularly known as the "ice age," the scientific name for it is the "period of glaciation." There was an ice age!

There is abundant evidence that northern Asia, all of Canada, and about a fourth of the United States was once covered by glacial ice. At their greatest extent, the ice sheets covered about 30 percent of the earth's present land surface. (Today they cover about 10 percent).

At the height of the ice age, so much water was locked up, that it was 400 feet below the present sea level. (In contrast, if all our present ice were melted, sea level would rise to the 20th floor of the Empire State Building. pp. 39-40.

Increased tropical rainfall. There was much more rainfall in the lower latitudes for a time after the Flood. This produced abundant vegetation, even in the deserts. Rivers and lakes throughout the world were higher for a time. p. 40.

Sudden warming. The explosion of Krakatoa, in 1883, produced cold for two years,-and then rather suddenly, everything warmed up. When the thousands of volcanoes stopped, the world warmed up again rather quickly. There is evidence, from several sources, supporting this sudden warming trend which occurred back then. pp. 40-41.

Whereas, before the Flood, there were palm trees and tropical plants and animals in the polar regions (geologists have found their fossils), so also evidences of abundant vegetation have been found in the Saharas, where it grew for a time after the Flood.

A FLOOD MODEL

Here is a very brief overview of what conditions were like before, during, and after the Flood:

Before the Flood. The climate was warm everywhere. There were broad rivers and small seas, and no high mountains. Dinosaurs were alive, but most of them were

vegetarians. The carnivore dinosaurs may have preyed only upon the vegetarian ones. p. 41.

During the Flood. It began suddenly, as rain fell in torrents and underground reservoirs burst forth. Emptied underground water cavities collapsed. The first cracks opened, and water poured down into hot magma (molten rock) below.

Slight lowering of certain basins and rising of other areas began. Some volcanic action was occurring.

Terrific storms occurred and water level continued to rise. Marine creatures were buried. As the waters rose, more creatures were buried. Gigantic mats of vegetation were washed into place.

Increasing violence of storms caused animal life to be thrown together in pockets and buried. Eventually, the last of the dinosaurs were buried.

Through it all, the birds, apes, and humans were able to fight their way to the highest points, and few were buried by washed-in sediments.

As the lowest basins filled, the weight of water pushed them down farther. Corresponding rising occurred in other areas, which became continental masses. More cracks developed, and still more volcanoes erupted.

Soon there was a worldwide sea, and immense storms and worldwide tidal action produced Immense waves and lateral movement.

As the Flood receded, geostasy (the balancing of the continents and the oceans) intensified. Once or twice there was a pause in the rising waters, which resulted in our continental shelves.

Massive vertical and lateral pressures caused twisted strata. Folded mountains were twisted into place. Volcanoes were increasing in number, and volcanic ranges arose. pp. 41-42.

After the Flood. Glacial sheets advanced outward from the poles. For centuries, few civilizations would exist in the latitudes nearer the pole (upper Europe, Asia, and North America, South Africa, and southern South America).

Abundant rainfall, warm climate, and ideal agricultural conditions existed throughout North Africa, the Near East, and India.

In later centuries, the regions closer to the poles warmed up, and the tropics became excessively hot and dry. p. 42.

EFFECTS OF THE FLOOD CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO "Uniformitarianism" is the evolutionary teaching that there once was a terrible flood.
- YES NO "Polystrate" trees are always upside down.
- YES NO Coal was made from large amounts of rapidly buried, compressed plants.
- YES NO Graded bedding in the strata must have been laid down by flood waters.
- YES NO Peoples all over the world, ancient and modern, have stories about the worldwide Flood.

- YES NO Many ancient ships were larger than the Ark.
 YES NO Seamounts is another name for sea horses.
 YES NO Only half the continents have continental shelves.
 YES NO Submarine canyons are found In the ocean below every _major river outlet In the world.
 YES NO Lakes and rivers were higher at some ancient time.
 YES NO A stream is meandering when it flows through fairly flat land.
 YES NO As the Flood neared Its end, mountain building began on an even larger scale.
 YES NO If the ocean basins had not sunk, and continents and mountains had not lifted, there would be no dry place, today, on which to stand.
 YES NO There were thousands of volcanoes during, and just after, the Flood.
 YES NO Glaciers once covered the tropical areas by the equator.
 YES NO Glaciers were caused by dust blown into the atmosphere by the volcanoes.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

80 Similarities

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide

similarities

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

The Evolutionists' problem. The evolutionists carry on a desperate ongoing search for evidences supporting evolution. The problem is they really cannot find any.

In this chapter, you will learn some of the extremes they go to, in an effort to convince people that evolution must be correct.

There are three peculiar "evidences of evolution" which we will discuss in this chapter: Similarities, vestiges, and recapitulation. The first is empty, the second is ridiculous, and the third is a hoax.

Sound like strong words? Read on:

SIMILARITIES

Similar structures. Evolutionists try to find likenesses between various types of creatures. Those similarities are then used as "evidence" that one creature evolved from another or that both evolved from a common ancestor.

For example, both you and the spider have legs, therefore either you descended from the spider or from some other creature which the spider also evolved from or there is the possibility the spider descended from you.

Yes, there are similarities. But, because of the DNA code, evolution cannot happen. That code is a barrier stopping one species from changing into another. So

similarities can only point to the fact that each species was made by a single Master Designer who had immense intelligence, power, and ability.

Similarities also reveal that the Designer used the best method for making many different creatures. For example, regarding those legs: It works far better for living creatures on land to walk and run, rather than to crawl or roll over and over. So most land creatures have legs of one type or another.

Yet the mechanics of making legs is quite complicated; no creature could make his own, but that is where the evolutionists say they originated.

It is simplistic to suggest that legs prove evolution, when we all know that the extremely complicated DNA coding for each true species is quite different. Evolution teaches the nonsensical idea that, because a creature needed legs, therefore it grew them! Yet such a concept violates a number of solid biological facts. pp. 11, 13.

Different structures. Animals not only have similar structures, they have different ones also. Considering these differences, the idea of common ancestry fades out. Yes, a man, a bunny rabbit, and a spider have legs,--but the legs surely are different from one another! And everything else about them is different also. p. 13.

Similar factors which could not be related. The octopus has an eye quite similar to man's. Yet we are not even slightly related!

The bubonic plague only attacks Norway rats and humans, but that does not mean we are descended from rats.

In proportion to the body, the weight of a dwarf monkey is greater than that of a human--but that does not mean the dwarf monkey is descended from us.

Studying Cytochrome C (an amino acid sequence), it was found that turtles are more like people than like rattlesnakes. Are we then closely related to turtles? Of course not. Similarities only reveal that we all have the same Originator.

Then there is convergence and divergence. Evolutionists claim that both prove evolution yet they are the opposite of one another! pp. 13-14.

Convergence. Convergence occurs when different creatures have similar organs. For example, the eye of the human and the eye of the octopus.

Convergence actually disproves evolutionary theory, for it reveals that a Master Planner made both us and the octopus. We both are very similar in one little respect, and very different in every other.-p. 14.

Divergence. Divergence occurs when there are very different (diverse) features-in plants or animals which ought to be "closely related." Evolutionists call this "divergent evolution," yet it obviously disproves evolution!

There are creatures which look alike in many ways, yet have certain organs which are remarkably different. For example, consider the shrimps. Some have compound eyes which are structured totally different from one another! There is a shrimp with "lens cylinders"; each of the cylinders bends the light smoothly to focus on a single point. Another shrimp has a "mirror system" within its eyes!

How did the shrimp figure that out? pp. 14, 15.

Mimicry. This is the scientific name for the theory that one almost-mindless creature had been carefully watching others for a time--and then decided to change its body to look like theirs! This is utterly ridiculous, yet you have heard and read it repeatedly in scientific literature.

For example, the Monarch butterfly tastes terrible because its body cells contain poisonous milkweed juice (absorbed while it ate the leaves as a caterpillar). So the Viceroy butterfly got to thinking one day: "If I change my colors to closely match those of the Monarch, enemies will leave me alone also." That sounds like a fairy tale; that IS a fairy tale! Yet it is the evolutionary concept of "mimicry."

There is no doubt that intelligent planning is responsible for these fantastic copycat arrangements. Someone thought it through, but it was not the butterfly!

For example, there are insects which look exactly like leaves and moths which have all the sprinkled markings of certain tree bark. Then there are the bottom-dwelling fish which change colors to exactly match the grain and color of the sand they are resting on!

Butterflies, insects, and fish did not devise such miracles. God did it. p. 15.

The pentadactyl limb. The most common similarity, pointed to by evolutionists, has the awesome name, "pentadactyl limb." Surely, with a name like that, this must be scientific. ("Penta" means five, and "dactyl" means finger.)

This is said to be the "five-boned" arm and leg found on all land vertebrates (one bone each, in the arm, wrist, and hand, and two in the lower arm). In reality, there are many, many bones in the wrist and hand, but we are supposed to ignore that in making this comparison.

Why would all vertebrate arms and legs have those five principle divisions? The answer is obvious: It is a design factor, enabling arms and legs to have the widest possible, useful movement.

What then does this prove? It proves that God made arms and legs. It surely does not prove that the creatures made themselves, copied one another, or that, because mice have the "five bones" in their arms and hands, we descended from them.-pp. 17, 19.

The gene barrier. In spite of efforts to use surface similarities in features to prove that one species came from another, the truth is that the DNA code in our genes forbids the possibility that any true species could come from any other one!

Many more examples could be cited to show that apparent similarities point, not to evolution, but to a single Master Draftsman/Mechanic who made us. p. 21.

VESTIGES

This theory is far more foolish than the idea that similarities demonstrate evolution.

In the 19th century, certain enthusiastic evolutionists were horrified when they realized that our bodies are so perfectly made.

They recognized the truth that, if the human body evolved from lower forms of life by random chance, then there ought to be organs which do not function and organs which functioned in lower forms of life but are inoperable within us.

So a search was made for all these "useless organs,"--and over 200 of them were supposedly found.

Vestigial organs are these useless organs. However, there is a problem: No evolutionists has offered to let a surgeon take out his 200 useless organs. He does not dare.

Did you know that your thyroid and pituitary glands are useless? Biologists will tell you that they and the hormones they produce are vital to health and life. But evolutionists will tell you they are useless.

The truth is that, today, all organs formerly classified as vestigial are known to have a function during the life of that organism.

It is true that a few organs functioned primarily when you were a child, but that still makes them useful and even vital to your existence. p. 31.

The appendix. This is the special organ pointed to as a classic illustration of a totally useless, vestigial organ.

Is it useless? No, for it helps protect you from gastrointestinal problems in the lower ascending colon. It fights Infection.

However, evolutionists maintain that it must be useless-and declare that we humans, because we have appendixes, must have evolved from animals which also have appendixes; and they, in turn, from other animals which have appendixes.

Well, some enterprising scientist took the time to ascertain which species we therefore evolved from! And his discovery comes as a surprise! You and I would assume that all animals would have appendixes; yet, aside from ourselves, there are only four!

Here are the four: the ape, the rabbit, the wombat, and the opossum? Take your pick; each one is totally different from the others.

And then there is this question: Which one did that one evolve from?-p. 33.

Proof of degeneration. There are two lessons to learn from the controversy over supposed "vestigial organs":

First, we have remarkably perfect bodies, and every organ is needed. We have no vestigial organs.

Second, a vestigial organ would be evidence of degeneration, not evolution. The more useless organs there were in a creature, the quicker it would become extinct. p. 35.

RECAPITULATION

This theory is not merely foolish; it is the result of an outright hoax, initially developed by *Ernst Haeckel in 1866.

The theory is based on the fact that there are similarities between embryos of various different creatures-whether they be humans, animals, reptiles, birds, or fish.

The reason for this similarity is simple enough: Even though they will look different when they are adults, creatures which are extremely tiny, will have similar shapes-since certain basic shapes are the best for tiny individuals with only a few cells, which are about to develop thousands of different structures and organs. When creatures are very, very small, there is only one ideal way for them to develop.

So what do these embryonic similarities prove? Only that a single Master Hand made all these creatures. God designed and made all of us.-pp. 3536.

There are three special similarities among embryos that Haeckel especially pointed to, as proof that we descended from a bird, a tailed animal, and a fish:

1 - The chicken sac. This is the so-called "yolk sac" in your body. But it is not a yolk sac (such as baby chicks have); instead it is a blood-making organ.

The mother provides nourishment to the child, but does not provide blood. The embryo must make its own. Yet its bones are not developed enough to make blood (that is where its blood is made later on), so this special sac is present, for a time, as a blood-making organ.

That is all there to it, and it has nothing to do with evolution from chickens.--pp. 36-37.

2 - The lizard tail. The embryo appears to have a tail; therefore, *Haeckel said, we must have descended from a lizard-like creature.

The truth is that extension of the embryo's back will later develop into the lower spine. For a time, the body of the embryo is smaller in length than its very important spine. Yet the spine is so complex and crucial that it must not wait until later to begin normal development. So we have here not a "tail," but the bottom of the spine.

These evolutionary theories point, not to evolution, but to the ignorance of the evolutionists. p. 37.

3 - Fish gills. There are, for a time, three rounded folds in the front of the neck of the embryo. *Haeckel triumphantly declared these to be "fish gills" which we inherited from the fish we evolved from.

But the truth is that these pharyngeal pouches are three separate developing organs. The top one will later become the thymus gland, the middle will become the parathyroid gland, and the lower one will become the middle ear canals.

In contrast, the gill slits of a fish are merely openings for oxygen to pass through, nothing more. The embryonic folds are openings.

Yes, It is true that once we all were extremely small but even when so small, each species had far different DNA coding. p. 37.

***Ernst Haeckel.** Before concluding this study on recapitulation, we should consider *Haeckel himself.

*Haeckel invented the word, "recapitulation," also calling it the "biogenetic law." He said that embryos repeat (recapitulate) the shapes of their evolutionary forebears.

But he needed proof for his theories, first proclaimed in 1866; so, since he had drafting ability, he doctored sketches of embryos, to make them appear alike! In 1874, he published his fraudulent charts, and fooled many people, in Germany, into believing that evolution must be true.

Later, a leading German embryologist, *Wilhelm His, Sr., exposed the hoax for what it was. He printed sketches of what those embryos really looked like, and declared *Haeckel to be a liar and a fraud.

But the facts about the fraudulent aspect of *Haeckel's work has never been widely published in English. Instead, you will find the recapitulation theory in standard schoolbooks, along with similarities, mimicry, and vestiges.--pp. 38-39, 41.

The human heart. Some lower level creatures have a single chamber in their heart, others have two or three. So, if we-who have four chambers in our hearts="recapitulate" lower creatures, while we were embryos, we should have first one, then two, then three, and then four chambers in our hearts, as we progress through our embryonic development.

But the truth is that, when you were conceived, you first had two chambers in your heart. They later fused into a single chamber. Eventually, before birth, they

developed into four chambers. So, instead of the evolutionary 1-2-3-4, humans have 2-1-4.-p. 41.

Basic flaw. There is a basic flaw in *Haeckel's theory. It is this:

Man is supposed have descended from a bird. And an animal, whose ancestor was a fish, which got tired of swimming around, came out of the water and spent the rest of its life on land, while giving birth to nonfish.

But, aside from the oddity of such a yarn, why do fish embryos also have--not only their own fish gills,--but also the bird yoke sac and the animal tail? Did the fish descend from the bird? It is clear that *Haeckel's theory does not even agree with itself.- p. 41.

**SIMILARITIES
CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO Evolution teaches that, long ago, because a creature needed legs, it grew them.
- YES NO The fact that a man, a bunny rabbit, and a spider all have legs--does not prove evolution.
- YES NO The fact they have legs shows that Someone, very Intelligent, made those legs; they did not make themselves.
- YES NO Convergence occurs when different creatures have similar organs.
- YES NO Divergence occurs when there are very different features on similar creatures.
- YES NO The Viceroy butterfly looks like the Monarch, because it decided to do so.
- YES NO There are seven bones in the "pentadactyl limb."
- YES NO Because of the DNA code, it is quite easy for one species to change into a different one.
- YES NO Evolutionists said there were 200 useless organs, but the truth is that none of them are useless.
- YES NO We have wonderful bodies, and every organ is needed.
- YES NO A vestigial organ would be evidence of degeneration, not evolution.
- YES NO Ernst Haeckel used fraudulent charts to promote his recapitulation theory.
- YES NO Before you were born, you had a chicken sac, lizard tail, and fish gills in your body.
- YES NO The chambers of the human heart develop on a 3-1-4 plan.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

- SECTION ONE - EVOLUTION VS. LAW

The evolutionists' problem. The problem is that the theory of evolution does not agree with basic laws of the universe. Because of this, in desperation, men try to declare that, although those laws apply to everything else throughout the vast reaches of space, they do not apply to evolutionary processes!

After reading this information on the first and second laws of thermodynamics, you will say that none of the other books in this Evolution Disproved Series need to have been written. For the foundation laws discussed here totally wipe out the possibility of natural evolutionary progression!

Evolution teaches that matter, the basic stuff of which everything is composed, is (1) self-originating, (2) can arise out of nothing, and (3) increases in quantity!

The First Law of Thermodynamics totally annihilates this theory.

Evolution teaches that matter and living things are always becoming more and more complex, and continually evolving toward greater perfection and completeness. Just as inorganic matter becomes even more ordered and perfect (by the Big Bang and stellar evolution), so living creatures are always evolving into higher planes of existence (by means of species evolution).

The Second Law of Thermodynamics totally devastates this theory p. 13.

LOOKING AT LAW

Machinery and laws. Who makes the machinery and devises the laws of nations? If the result is of good quality, it is the most intelligent people who do this. Yet, because our mental attainments are limited, all our machinery and laws are flawed and need constant improvement. p. 13.

Perfect designs. However, in nature we find perfectly designed birds and animals. Fossil evidence reveals each one had the same design all the way back to its beginning. pp. 13-14.

Perfect balances. Through the telescope, we find that the planets and stars are also perfectly ordered. Stars are arranged in vast stellar systems which ought to crash into one another, yet never do.

Laws are operating with perfect precision.

Our planet should long ago have crashed into the sun or hurled itself out into darkness far from it. Instead, in perfect balance, our world keeps orbiting the sun. And it is located at exactly the right distance from that flaming ball. Just a little closer or farther away, and nothing could live on our planet.-p. 14.

No lone stars. No star in the universe is alone. All are in orbits around galactic centers, and over half are mutually circling one or two other stars. Yet none are crashing together.

Such mathematical precision is astounding! A master Mind had to carefully plan it.-p. 14.

No self-made laws. Laws do not make themselves, either in nations or in nature. p. 14.

Laws of design and manufacturing. The maker of a product has to be greater, more complicated than the product. The equipment needed to make a bolt and nut is always far more complex than the bolt and nut. The designer of a product will always be more intelligent than the product. The manufacturer will inevitably be far more intelligent than the production methods.

Man can make nuts and bolts, which really are relatively simple in design. But he cannot make a living flower, tree, or animal. A Person amazingly more intelligent than man did that.

We do not even have the wisdom to improve ourselves, devise new organs, or give ourselves the muscles and strength of the tiger. We do not even know how to grow new hair, when ours falls out!

That which we cannot do with our high level of intelligence, mindless creatures, such as bacteria and worms, are said to have done by random chance! That is the teaching of evolution) p. 14.

Many laws. There are many laws operating in the natural world. We find not only physical laws, but also health laws and moral laws. Among humans, we find the working of moral laws. When men break those laws of honesty, purity, etc., they get into trouble. Breaking the Ten Commandments is serious, just as serious as jumping from a high place. Both morality and gravity are laws to be obeyed.

We will now discuss the two laws of thermodynamics. They were given that name because, in the 19th century, they were first discovered in relation to steam engines. Later, the same principles were found to apply to about everything else. p. 15.

THE FIRST LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

Definition. This law (which, in this chapter, we will call "the first law") is also called the Law of Conservation of Mass/Energy. Here is a definition of it:

Matter/energy cannot by itself be created or destroyed. Matter/energy may be changed from one form into another, but the total amount remains unchanged.

Applications. Here is part of what this means to us:

(1) When an atomic bomb explodes, nothing is destroyed. Some matter may be changed into energy; but, in totality, the sum total of mass/energy is all still in existence.

(2) It would be absurd for a theoretical "Big Bang" to make matter out of nothing! It just cannot happen.

(3) Matter cannot increase and make either stars or living beings.

(4) Evolutionary theory requires that matter originally made itself out of nothing. If the theory is untrue, then how did matter come into existence?

Matter could come into existence in only one way: through a supernatural Creation. pp. 15,16.

THE SECOND LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS

Definitions. The law, which in this chapter we will call "the first law") is also called the Law of Increasing Entropy." This law has several applications, but here is the basic definition:

All systems will tend toward the most mathematically probable state, and eventually become totally random and disorganized.

All science bows low before the second law (even though evolutionists refuse to). Even *Albert Einstein declared it to be the one law which he believed could never be eliminated.

The downward trend, predicted by this law, is called "entropy." It is also called the Entropy Principle. Entropy is disorder. So the law is the "law of increasing disorder."

Another term used to describe it is "time's arrow." The second law says everything heads downward; no upward arrow is possible.

Applications. Here are some of the applications of this law:

(1) Left to itself, everything eventually goes to pieces. Wood rots, steel rusts, buildings fall apart, chemical compounds deteriorate.

(2) The energy available for useful work in a functioning system tends to decrease, even though the total energy remains constant. As energy levels decrease and organs wear out, people get old and die.

(3) The order of a structured system erodes and becomes disorganized and random.

(4) The information conveyed by a communicating system tends to become distorted and incomplete.

Why is it that living beings keep organizing and improving, in apparent violation of the second law? What they are actually doing is working hard to offset the effects of the second law.

A spider makes a perfect web. But then, soon, it is broken, and he must make another. According to the second law, if left to itself, the web would disintegrate. It is only the work of the spider which keeps renewing it.

A house decays, loses paint, and falls into disrepair. Pipes leak, floors rot out, and the roof eventually tumbles in. The second law is at work. It is only because of that law that people must continually maintain and repair the house. Thus we see it takes labor to withstand the second law, which is always tearing down.

Actually, given enough time, the sun would burn itself out and the galaxies would go to pieces. Apart from supernatural intervention, nothing can withstand the second law. pp. 16-17.

EVOLUTION DEFIES THE SECOND LAW

Evolution is an outlaw theory. It is a theory which is based on a fantasy. Evolution teaches an upward arrow--all the way from nothingness, in the past, to present organization and on into a glorious future when man will become god, ruling the universe.

Evolutionists freely admit that the first and second laws exist, but declare that their theory is above such laws!

They say that the first law applies to our world today, but it did not when matter first came into existence in a Big Bang.

They say that the second law applies to the rest of the universe today, but not to the universe in past ages when the stars and galaxies formed, nor to our world today!

Even though Lord Kelvin, a British scientist, developed the second law by studying our world, and even Einstein said it is the most comprehensive of laws,--yet the evolutionists are determined to do away with it. p. 17.

Open systems. Here is the evolutionary argument; it is very subtle: Energy from the sun flows to our world and makes it an open system. As long as the sun sends this energy, it will fuel evolutionary development here. Therefore sunshine negates the second law on our planet-in spite of what Einstein and the other scientists say!

This denial says too much: It says that everywhere in the universe, except in the cold of outer space, far from any star, there is no second law of thermodynamics! Evolutionists imagine that they have neatly eliminated that law!

It is the same as saying that, yes, Isaac Newton formulated the principle of gravity, and scientists agree that it governs everything; but we evolutionists tell you that it really affects nothing in our world. p. 17.

Reply to the "open systems" argument. In reality, both the sun and the earth are using up energy, in the sense that it keeps becoming more and more unavailable.

An influx of heat energy (from the sun) into a system would not decrease entropy. The entropy continues operating. Actually, the added heat energy would increase the rate at which the breakdown of systems occurred. This is because oxidation is increased, and chemical actions speed up.

But, we might ask, does not added energy ever slow down entropy? Yes, but only when carefully applied by an outside intelligence.

It takes energy to build a house out of planks, pipes out of galvanized steel, windows out of glass, and then apply paint and maintain it all. By so doing, we slow entropy for a time. An intelligence higher than the house constructed it and keeps it in good shape. Eventually, the higher being steps back and stops the endless repairs and replacements--and entropy takes over. The house falls to pieces. -pp. 17-19.

Living organisms. It is said that living organisms are different and do not deteriorate. But a living creature is like the house. It requires continual maintenance to keep it in proper shape. p. 18.

Increasing life complexity. Evolution teaches that life increases in complexity, and therefore defies the second law. But when a person is born, he has all the complexity built into him to start. It unfolds as he goes through life. Everything was in the utterly complex DNA code at the beginning of that persons existence. In addition, at birth a person is in the most physically perfect condition he will ever be in this life. The more he develops, the more blemishes and imperfections appear, until they gain the ascendancy and he dies, pp. 18-19.

Quantity vs. conversion. The "open systems" argument is the one most frequently used by evolutionists to defend their theory. Yet what they are actually doing is confusing quantity of energy (and we get plenty from the sun) with conversion of energy.

There is enough energy in sunlight to do a lot of things. But it requires directed, thoughtful application to use it to make a house. Sunlight, by itself, will never make that house.

Sunlight could never originate life. It could never produce one living cell. It could never change one species into another. p. 19.

Structured organisms. Whether it be a building, plant, or animal, entropy can be withstood only when there is an intelligent, complex blueprint covering both development and maintenance, and an intelligence carrying out that blueprint.

Yet neither you, nor I, nor a mouse--is intelligent enough to make all the highly differentiated organs and structures within our bodies--from that first cell just after conception. None of us was smart enough to make our eyes. A super Intelligence, outside of ourselves, had to do that.

When you see a computerized fuel injection system in an automobile, you know the car did not make it. When you see the delicate structure of the inner ear, you know no person devised it. An Intelligent Power outside of ourselves made us and keeps us running. Think not that eating food, sleeping at night, and exercising is enough to care for your body. Incessant decisions have to be made on the microcellular level. Millions are being made every moment.--pp. 19-20.

EVOLUTION IS CONTRARY TO LAW

Contrary to natural law. Repeatedly, thoughtful scientists have come to the conclusion that evolutionary theory runs contrary to natural law p. 21.

Contrary to moral law. But evolutionary theory also goes against moral law, as well. For the theory teaches that it is all right to violate any moral standard one might wish, for we are only animals, and not much different than the worms and mollusks we descended from.

Evolution teaches that the best way to succeed is to step on others around us, grind them down, and then move on up at their expense. Indeed, that is what the theory is based on! The name of the game is "survival of the fittest." Destroy others in order to maintain your own survival and advancement. More on this in a later book in this series: Evolution and Society (Book 19). pp. 21-22.

Summary of the evolutionary position. Here are six ways evolutionists tell us their theory is above law:

1 - Evolution is inevitable. It can neither be hindered nor stopped. Ironically, evolutionists are quick to say evolution has stopped, when it is expedient to do so. They tell us that stars stopped exploding just before the light from other stars began reaching us through telescopes. They say that humans stopped evolving, just before any records were available to prove they ever had.

2 - Everything animate and inanimate is included in this evolutionary development. This includes people, animals, plants, rocks, elements, suns, stars, and all the universe. Yet, at other times, they say that only our world is now an "open system" because of sunlight falling on it.

3 - Evolution can only move from simplicity to increasing complexity. Yet they teach that evolution is always random,--and everyone knows that any random process will, by chance action, go in various directions, but ultimately will unravel and go to pieces.

4 - Evolution never reverses itself and goes toward increasing simplicity. It always becomes more complex. Yet the second law tells us everything keeps breaking down, going to pieces, or dying.

5 - Evolution is only an upward arrow of decreasing entropy, less decay, and better organization. It is clear that evolutionary theory is a law unto itself.

6 - No experimental methods apply to evolution, for it stands above experiment and above law. It needs no evidence and no proof. This last point is crucial to the survival of evolutionary theory, because there is no laboratory or field evidence supporting it. Just as "Alice in Wonderland living" does not happen in real life, so

evolutionists find it necessary to set their theory apart from the realities of scientific evidence and experiment.-pp. 22-23.

BOTH LAWS POINT TO THE CREATOR

The first law of thermodynamics says that matter and energy cannot originate. Yet it is quite obvious that both exist in abundance.

How then did they begin? Only God can make matter and energy.

The second law says that everything in our world and in the universe is like a wound-up clock that is running down.

How did the clock first get wound? Where did the organization come from that we see in the sky, on the earth, and within our own bodies?

God got everything started, and He keeps everything going. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28). pp. 23-24.

- SECTION TWO -

PLATE TECTONICS

New words are being heard in scientific circles: plate tectonics, continental drift, seafloor spreading, magnetic reversals, and transforming faults. What does that all mean? How does it relate to the creation-evolution controversy? Does any of it prove evolution?

The evolutionists' problem. Both paleomagnetism and the gigantic fissures in the planet point to the cataclysm of the Flood as their source.

The evolutionists' solution. Invent strange, new theories in an attempt to avoid the truth.

Plate tectonics is an involved theory of shifting continents and the earth swallowing itself. Yet the evidence does not have to be interpreted in such a fantastic way.

Continental drift. Evolutionists declare that, at some earlier time in earth history, the continents were all joined together. They are said to have traveled immense distances, sideways, to reach their present locations. This theory is called "continental drift." All our present continents are said to have moved slowly into their present positions from what was just a single massive continent surrounded by ocean. That original continent has been dubbed "Pangaea, " which is Greek for "all earth." pp. 39-40.

The three evidences presented for continental drift are these:

1 - Continental match. The outstanding evidence is the manner in which the east coast of South America and the west coast of Africa appear to match. (Other continental matches have been devised, but they take much imagination.)

Flood geology can explain continental match quite well without having to resort to far-fetched ideas of continents moving sideways thousands of miles!

Before the Flood there were only broad rivers and shallow seas. The continents were close together and joined. A broad river ran between Africa and South America. Then, as the basins filled with water, they sank and the continental masses arose. This would be the cause of the apparent match.

Actually, many areas can be matched. Australia, for example, locks well into the U.S. East Coast!-pp. 40-41.

2 - Fossil match. Some fossils in Antarctica match those found in the northern and southern continents.

Yet only a few thousand years ago, we would have found similar plants and animals on all the continents, for there were no broad oceans then, and the climate worldwide was uniformly warm. p. 41.

3 - Vegetation and mineral match. Similar vegetation has been found on the east coast of South America and the west coast of Africa. It has been especially noted that there are diamond fields in South Africa and also a few in South America. This is thought to be strong evidence that the two continents were once joined.

This evidence would support the Flood, but it would not support evolution as well- for this reason: According to evolution, plants and animals have evolved and changed in the intervening millions of years. So they should not match now! p. 41.

Major faults. There are a number of major fault lines on the planet. These fault lines are the focal point of volcanoes, earthquakes, and seismic (tidal) waves (tsunamis).

Plate tectonics teach that these cracks are caused by gigantic "plates" which are sliding beneath each other!

In contrast, Flood geology suggests that, when the continents rose and ocean basins sank, the immense stress placed on the underlying foundations produced these fault lines.

The geologic term for this is "geostasy, " or the balancing of massive areas of the earth. As one part goes down, another moves up to equalize the load. This is why there are deep "trenches" in the Pacific Ocean near corresponding island chains which have pushed up as they were produced by volcanoes.

The Mid-Atlantic Ridge, which runs down the North and South Atlantic Ocean, is another example of such a crack. Lava issues from it. Plate tectonic enthusiasts claim that this small amount of lava has produced "seafloor spreading," that is, continual widening of the ocean floor! But the evidence does not match the claim. Lava is piled up there, but there is no evidence of sideways shoving-producing all the oceans, which fill 5/6 of the earth's surface! pp. 41-42.

Plate tectonics. Another new theory is called plate tectonics. This is the thinking that the earth's surface (both on the continents and under the oceans) are "plates" which are many miles in thickness. These are imagined to be pushing sideways at each other. Where one plate rubs against another, one is gently, quietly giving way, bending almost straight down, and going under the other one!

Down below, it is gobbled up by the fiery molten rock. Elsewhere in the world, other plates are said to be coming up out of the ground at nearly right angles and instantly becoming hard, horizontal rock!

Does that sound believable? Nearly all these favor of long ages.

But what would cause those reversals? The evolutionists really do not know. When we try to ascertain the true cause of the reversals, their true dates are clarified.

If you read Book 14: Effects of the Flood, you will readily understand. At the time of the Flood, over 10,000 volcanoes blew their tops, Some, of course, produced more powerful explosions than others. Cracks in the ground and underwater, caused by the immense pressures of sinking ocean basins and rising continents, permitted water to pour down to deep underground where it met molten rock. Explosions resulted and fiery lava poured out.

Some of those explosion could easily have resulted In reversals to earth's magnetic core.

At the present time, it is generally thought that there have been nine major reversals and a varying number of smaller ones.-p. 48.

Dating the reversals. What methods do the evolutionists use to date those reversals so far In the past? The researchers use potassium-argon (K-Ar) dating to date the rocks. Reading through Book 6: Dating of Time in Evolution, you will quickly recognize that they are using one of the most unreliable dating methods known to mankind!

The radioactive decay rates for potassium are not clear; there is too much variation. You cannot date by a clock that cannot keep time! As radioactive potassium decays, it produces argon. But argon is a rare gas and quickly escapes into the air. How can a rock be dated on the basis of the ratio of potassium and argon still in it? It really cannot be done.

When the useless potassium-argon dates are obtained, they are then compared with the imaginary dating method dreamed up in the 19th century: rock strata dating! (See Books 11 and 12: Fossils and Strata.) Those dates which do not agree with the strata theory are thrown out.

So, when you read that so many millions of years have elapsed since a certain magnetic reversal has occurred, you will know that it was not true science which produced that date.

One example: Volcanic rocks, produced by Hawaiian lava flows in the years 1800 and 1801, were dated by potassium-argon methods as having occurred at ages ranging from 160 million to 2.96 billion years in the past! pp. 48-49.

THE LAWS OF NATURE VS. EVOLUTION CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO "Energy cannot by itself be created." That is part of the second law of thermodynamics.
- YES NO Evolutionary theory requires that matter made itself out of nothing.
- YES NO The entropy principle applies to the second law.
- YES NO Entropy means an upward arrow.
- YES NO Lord Kelvin formulated the second law.
- YES NO Evolutionary teachings defy natural law.
- YES NO Evolution also runs contrary to moral laws.
- YES NO Our world and all the universe is like a clock that is running down.
- YES NO Continental drift refers to drift wood found on the shores of continents.
- YES NO A tsunami is a whirlpool.
- YES NO Geostasy is the balancing of massive areas of the earth.
- YES NO Earth's magnetic core is apparently fluid.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

quick study guide

the history of evolutionary theory

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

The evolutionists' problem. how to succeed in inventing a logical theory that everything made itself: stars, planets, plants, and animals-without getting laughed at.

This chapter overviews the history of how atheists set about doing just that. This is a chapter you will want to read, for it reveals many things. It is the story of how astute men took over western science.

BEFORE THE 20TH CENTURY

In earlier centuries, men sought to understand our world and the universe. These were thoughtful men of brilliant intellect. In most instances, they believed that God made everything. The facts of nature pointed directly to that great truth.

Men such as Agassiz, Babbage, Boyle, Faraday, Fleming, Herschel, Joule, Kelvin, Kepler, Linnaeus, Lister, Maxwell, Mendel, Morse, Newton, and Pasteur were the leading scientists of their time. They laid the foundations of modern science.

Back then, there were no committees which said "You cannot be a science teacher or a scientist, because you are not an evolutionist." We did not then have a tightly controlled scientific community, as we do today. (More on this in Book 19: Evolution and Society.) pp. 13-14.

William Paley (1743-1805) was an outstanding thinker of the 18th century who, in his classic book, *Natural Theology*, detailed many reasons why only God could have made the universe and everything in our world.

That which he taught was called "the argument by design"; that is, the very structure of the plants and animals, their marvelous adaptation to life, and the intelligent planning which produced them-clearly pointed to God as the Creator and Lifegiver.

Repeatedly, the brilliant men who accomplished worthwhile scientific achievements were creationists, and the men who ridiculed the idea tended to be craven, dissolute, and unable or unwilling to do in-depth research.--pp. 14-15.

***Comte de Buffon** (1707-1788) was such a man. Unable to accomplish anything useful, he occupied himself with ridiculing belief in God, speculating that species originated from one another, and that the earth was torn out of the sun. p. 15.

Carl Linnaeus (1707-1778), in contrast, spent his lifetime in study and classification of plants and animals. Large numbers were named by him. Gathering together a massive amount of information, he clearly saw that it all pointed to separate, distinct species-which had to have been created by God. p. 14.

***Jean-Baptiste Lamarck** (1744-1829) was a man of many wives and mistresses, and was poor most of his life. Science remembers him for his theory of

"Inheritance of acquired characteristics." Also known as "Lamarckism." This is the idea that if you lose a leg, your son will not have one either.--p. 16.

Baron Cuvier (1769-1832) was a French Protestant, a brilliant naturalist, and a researcher. Director of a leading Paris museum, he became the world's leading expert at identifying fossils from a single bone. As a result of years of analysis, he concluded that species did not change into one another.-p. 16.

***Erasmus Darwin** (1731-1802) wanted to become famous, yet had never accomplished anything worthwhile. So he wrote a book, *Zoonomia*, in which he favored Lamarckism and evolutionism. Liberals liked his book. He would later gain greater fame because he was the grandfather of 'Charles Darwin. p. 16.

***James Hutton** (1726-1797) was a Scotch geologist who decided that the bent and twisted layers of strata were caused, not by a cataclysmic Flood, but by millions of years of peaceful deposition of earth as the leaves fell and turned to sod. He called his theory, "uniformitarianism"; which has as its motto: "The present is the key to the past."-p. 16.

***Robert Chambers** (1802-1883), a Scot, wrote one of the first popular evolution books, *Vestiges of Natural History*. His theory was that species originated from one another.-p.16.

Among those who were strongly influenced by Chamber's book, were three spiritualists:

***Immanuel Swedenborg** who, in 1734, first developed the "nebular hypothesis." that all stars and planets swirled out of gas; 'Alfred Wallace, another spiritualist; and 'Charles Darwin, the author of *Origin of the Species*. Spiritualists hold communication with devils. p. 16.

(For more on Swedenborg, see Book 3: *Origin of the Solar System*.)

***Charles Lyell** (1797-1875) was--with 'Charles Darwin--the most influential evolutionist of the 19th century. Neither had any scientific training, but their theories appealed to many people.

Lyell speculated about the past; and, when the facts disagreed with this, he excused it by saying that they were due to "imperfections in the geologic record." He published a three-volume work, *Principles of Geology*. pp. 16-18.

***Alfred Wallace** (1823-1913) was the spiritualist mentioned earlier. While in a fever in southeast Asia, the phrase, "survival of the fittest," came to mind as the cause of evolution. He wrote back to England that the idea came as an inspiration to him, and that it must be the cause of evolution. But survival is not evolution! If you survive 70 years till you die, did you evolve? When Wallace wrote home about the idea, it was stolen by 'Charles Darwin, who published it as his own. In 1875, Wallace openly declared himself for spiritualism and Marxism. pp. 18-19.

***Charles Darwin** (1809-1882) was sent off to college by his father, and took a religion course. But he cared little about the subject; and, through wealthy connections, was assigned as "naturalist" on the ship, *Beagle*, which traveled around the world. Darwin visited many places, but it was at the Galapagos Islands that he found the "evidence" for his theory of evolution. On that island he found a dozen and a half finches. Although they were all clearly of the same species, some had longer bills than others. This convinced him that evolution was possible. But, as far as those finches were concerned, it had not occurred.

Arriving back home, Darwin married and settled in a country home, with a lifetime hereditary income. He raised pigeons and tried to make new species, but without success. He measured different things with tools you would find in a nearby store, wrote letters, and thought and thought. He told people that, according to his theory, within a century the whites would crush out all the inferior races. He was excited when he heard that a "cat had its tail cut off, at Shrewsbury, and its kittens had all short tails." This dreamy collection of hopes he wanted to put into a book; but, for years, he was too indolent to do it. Then he heard a rival might publish something similar, so he determined to put his ideas in print first.

Above all, Darwin wanted to become famous like his grandfather, *Erasmus Darwin, who had written a sceptical book.

The result was *Origin of the Species*. a volume so ridiculous that evolutionists today prefer that it not be easily available. Darwin never devised a way that the species could originate. The best he could do was wish it might have happened.

Darwin was not a professional scientist, but an amateur-and one doing poorer quality work than most in his time. He never had a day of schooling in the sciences.

It is known that Darwin was initiated into witchcraft by the South American nationals. He took part in their ceremonies and, as a result, something happened to him. When he returned to England, he lived only to deny the facts, the natural world, which point to the Creator pp. 19-23.

Gregor Mendel (1822-1884) was a creationist who lived and worked in eastern Europe. He was a science and math teacher.

After reading about the confusing speculations of Darwin and his associates, it is encouraging to read about a man who did actual scientific research. From his studies with garden peas, he developed several concepts of genetics.

He reported on his findings in 1865, but his discoveries were totally ignored. The novelties of Darwin's ideas were the talk of the public press. But, in 1900, scientists found Mendel's writings, and his experiments were recognized as the foundation of modern genetics.

His discoveries effectively destroyed the basis for species evolution, for the truths he formulated reveal that plants and animals only produce young in accordance with traits inherited from parents in the same species. pp. 23-24.

Louis Pasteur (1822-1895) was a research chemist who made major contributions in chemistry, medicine, and industry. He was also a creationist. At a time when evolution was gaining control of the scientific community, Pasteur fought it vigorously, declaring that God made everything. p. 24.

The Orgueil Meteorite. In a study of the history of evolution, we repeatedly encounter hoaxes, dreamy ideas, frauds, or coercion. An example was a meteorite, in southern France, which was doctored to give the impression that it had fallen from the skies with organic material in it. Eventually the hoax was discovered. p. 24.

***Herbert Spencer** (1820-1903), along with men like *Friedrich Nietzsche, *Karl Marx, *Sigmund Freud, and *John Dewey, introduced evolutionary teachings and morals into social fields (sociology, psychology, education, economics, etc.) See Book 19: *Evolution and Society* for more on this.

Spencer, another spiritualist, was the one who was inspired to coin the term "evolution." He was the one who gave *Wallace's phrase, "survival of the fittest," to *Darwin. He never did serious research, but only discussed theories.-p. 24.

***Thomas Huxley** (1825-1895) was the man that Darwin called his "bulldog." They were a team: *Darwin, more frail in health, dreamed up the theories; Huxley, robust and obnoxious, urged them everywhere.-p. 24.

***Ernst Haeckel** (1834-1919) was an evolutionist who had obtained scientific degrees, but he promoted evolution through fraudulent charts and deceitful claims. For additional information on him, see Book 15: Similarit(es).

Along with several other evolutionists, he championed killing off "inferior races" of people. See Book 19: Evolution and Society for more information on this. *Adolf Hitler, later, was only carrying out ideas he had read in evolutionists' books. Hitler said that *Darwin and the others had greatly affected his thinking.-pp. 24-25.

***Asa Gray** was the leading evolutionist in America during Darwin's time. As a botany teacher at Harvard, he spent his time lecturing and writing. He was the first to introduce evolution into American mainline Protestantism.--p. 25.

The X Club. Scientific organizations today regularly oversee research and dissemination of information-to make sure nothing opposing evolutionary theory is considered. The X Club, in London, was the parent organization of this trend. It met secretly and worked to advance evolutionary thought and suppress scientific opposition to it throughout England. *Huxley, who was no scientist, was in charge of this clandestine operation.-p. 225.

The Oxford Debate. In June 1860, only seven months after the publication of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, a major debate was held in London. Evolutionists and creationists argued vigorously. Although no one apparently won at the time, yet it marked a major turning point in England just as the Scopes Trial later did in America. At both events, ridicule was used by the evolutionists to gain ground. From that time onward, English science tended to be under the control of the evolutionists.-pp. 25-26.

***Henry Ward Beecher** (1813-1887) was the leading liberal preacher in America in the 1870s. He urged evolutionary teachings widely, until it was discovered that he had been caught in adulterous relations. This resulted in a court battle by the husband of the woman he had wronged.--p. 26.

The ship, Challenger. In 1872 to 1876, this ship was sent by the British government to find evidence on the ocean floor of evolution. Since there are millions of fossils in the sedimentary strata, there ought to be an abundance of fossils at the bottom of the sea.

But not one was found. This is because the fossils were caused by rapid burial and heavy compaction during the Flood. If the strata and fossils had been caused by long ages of sedimentation, vast numbers of fossils should be at the bottom of the ocean.

As you might expect, the truth of this failure was kept from the public. It was determined that none of the facts negative to evolution were to be told.--p. 26.

The Monera. This was another deception. In 1866, *Haeckel predicted that shapeless blobs would be found in the ocean, which had no nuclei, but instead were only reproduced by fission. Two years later the Challenger found such blobs, and they were named *Bathypus haeckelli*. It is very possible that such blobs had already been found in shallow bays, before Haeckel uttered his "prediction."

News of the find was published everywhere. Evolution was true! Later it was learned that the alcohol, used to preserve the jarred samples, had coagulated with the lime in the specimens, producing a type of gypsum that looked like a non nuclear amoeba. Reports of this disclosure only appeared in a couple obscure scientific journals. pp. 26-27.

***August Weismann** (1834-1914). This German biologist cut off 19 generations of rats' tails, and proved that Lamarck's notion of "inheritance of acquired characteristics" was false. This was another setback for evolution. p. 27.

1900 TO 1950

***Hugo de Vries** (1848-1935) was a Dutch botanist, and one of the three men, in 1900, who rediscovered Mendel's law of heredity.

One day, while working with primroses, he thought he had found a new species! He theorized that it had come into existence as a "mutation." This was the beginning of the "mutation" craze by evolutionists, as the cause of trans-species changes (which no evidence ever showed as occurring).

But, with the passing of decades, it was found that mutations are always harmful and cannot and do not produce new species.

De Vries, of course, did not know all that, and he reported his primrose discovery widely. But, in 1914, *Edward Jeff-ies discovered that de Vries' primrose was just a variety of primrose, and not a new species.

For much more on the failure of mutations to produce evolution, read Book 10: Mutations. pp. 27-28.

*Sutton and *Boveri independently discovered chromosomes and the linkage of genetic characters in 1902, only two years after the rediscovery of Mendel's research. This was the beginning of major research which would later result in the discovery of the DNA code, which locks each species within itself. p. 28.

***Morgan and *Muller.** *Thomas Hunt Morgan pioneered in showing that genetic determinants were present in a definite linear order in chromosomes, and could possibly be mapped. He was the first to work with fruit fly research.

Also working in America, *H.J. Muller pioneered in using X-rays to induce mutations in fruit flies.

See Book 10: Mutations, for much more on genetics, X-ray research, and mutations. p. 28.

Neo-Darwinism. "Darwinism" was the teaching that "natural selection" by itself had produced evolution. But scientists discovered that it accomplished nothing. The truth was that there were natural variations within species, but no changes across species.

Therefore many scientists switched to "neo-Darwinism, " the theory that mutations produce the cross-species changes. p. 28.

Scopes Trial. A major turning point, in America, occurred in the summer of 1925. *John Scopes, a young high school football coach, was paid by the ACLU to be the defendant in a lawsuit to test the anti-evolution law of Tennessee.

The entire story is told in detail in Book 20: Scientists Speak about Evolution.

Fraudulent evidence, personality attacks, ridicule, embarrassing press coverage, and a general carnival atmosphere were used to effectively coerce Tennessee and later

other state governments into withdrawing opposition to evolution. Yet, in reality, evolution never even began to win its case at that Dayton, Tennessee, trial. pp. 28-29.

George McCready Price (1870-1963) was the leading creationist writer of the first half of the 20th century. He eventually taught at four colleges and was president of a fifth, but still gave much time to researching and writing reports against evolution. In all he produced 38 books and numerous magazine articles. p. 29.

***Trofim Lyenko** (1893-1976), an ardent evolutionist in our day, has his name covered with infamy. Rising to power in the Soviet Union in the 1930s, he controlled all scientific research. Only that which agreed with a Marxist version of Darwinism was acceptable. Any scientist even hinting at disagreement or carrying out unapproved research was slain. Hundreds died. -p. 29.

***Austin Clark** (1880-1954) was a zealous evolutionist on the staff of the Smithsonian Institute. He authored several books and about 600 articles in five languages. A foremost spokesman for evolution, he analyzed the situation so thoroughly that he decided evolution could not possibly produce the widely different species!

So he invented a variant theory, which he named "zoogenests." In his 1930 book, *The New Evolution. Zoogenests*, he theorized that every major type of plant and animal had earlier separately sprung into being from dirt, seawater, or whatever! The impossible miracle of that first change from nonlife to a living creature, according to Clark, had happened repeatedly, not once, as taught by traditional evolutionists.

Evolutionists hardly knew how to withstand this attack on their theory, for it came from one of their own. -pp. 29-30.

American Humanist Association. In 1933, the AHA was formed, and immediately began working closely with the ACLU. "Humanism" is the 20th century name for "atheism." They have changed their name, but not their views or their objective: to blot out religion and God from everyone on earth. Many well-known people have been members of the AHA. p. 30.

***Richard Goldschmidt** (1878-1958) was unusual. Few men have so dedicated their lives to vindicating evolution, as did Goldschmidt. He spent 25 exhausting years breeding the gypsy moth, trying to induce evolutionary change. But he found himself up against a solid wall. Any changes which occurred were, within a few generations, erased either by extinction or by moving back toward the norm.

By 1940, Goldschmidt could take no more. He published a paper which constituted one of the most powerful attacks on evolution ever produced. And it came from an expert, who had tried in every way to induce cross-species change.

Goldschmidt's theory was that, once every so many millennia, a new species ("hopeful monsters") just sprang (in German, "saitated") into existence. This was the saltation theory.

According to this theory, one day a mother rhinoceros produced an elephant. Another time, an oak tree produced an acorn which grew into a pine tree.

Goldschmidt was asking for even bigger miracles than *A.H. Clark had proposed in his "zoogenesis" theory!

The scientifically accurate thrashing Goldschmidt gave to Darwinism (natural selection theory) and neo-Darwinism (mutation theory), combined with the idiotic

foolishness of his hopeful monster theory--and left evolutionists dazed. What they could they say?

For an in-depth analysis of this totally impossible theory, see Book 10: Mutations.-pp. 30-31.

1950 TO THE PRESENT

***Julian Huxley** (1887-1975) was the leading evolutionary spokesman in the mid-20th century. Grandson of Darwin's "bulldog," *Thomas Huxley, Julian was elevated to a key position in the United Nations, in an effort to make sure it adhered to evolutionary theory p. 31.

***Immanuel Velikovsky** was another rebel in the evolutionists' camp. He wrote books suggesting that moons and planets had collided in the past, resulting in catastrophes on Planet Earth.

Although untrue, his books caused people to look more closely around them and see the abundant evidence that there has been a catastrophe in early times--the Flood. p. 31.

Darwinian Centennial Celebration. For the 100th anniversary of Darwin's Origin of the Species, a grand gathering was held for a week at the University of Chicago In November 1959.

*Thomas Huxley's grandson, *Julian Huxley, gave the keynote address, focusing attention on a total repudiation of God. pp. 31-32.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study. That same year, the BSCS was formed by the American Institute of Biological Scientists, for the purpose of demanding that schools throughout the nation no longer just teach biology, but also organic evolution, sex education, population control, and making sure that textbooks dealing with these issues were produced and used. p. 32.

Revolt in France. In the early 1960s, a number of French scientists rose in revolt against evolutionary theory, declaring it to be hopelessly unable to explain the facts. p. 32.

Children's Books. New children's books began to be produced. One, entitled "The Wonderful Egg," told about a mother dinosaur who laid an egg, which hatched into a baby bird, "the first baby bird in the whole world." (No mention was made of how it found a mate.) p. 32.

DNA. The discovery of DNA, in the 1950s, shook the foundations of evolutionary theory. The truth about the DNA code buttressed the evidence available from the field and from fossil evidence that no trans-species changes were possible. p. 32.

Creation Research Society. Founded in 1963, this organization of creation scientists has produced quarterly publications, discussing evolutionary topics. pp. 32-33.

Institute for Creation Research. The work which George M. Price carried on so nobly during the first half of the 20th century, the Creation Research Society took up during its second half. Founded in 1963, it has sponsored over 70 books and over 200 major creation-evolution debates on university and college campuses and elsewhere throughout the world. p. 33.

Christian compromise deepens. Begun as a creationist organization in 1941, the American Science Affiliation was soon taken over by liberal Christians who wanted to compromise with evolutionary theorists.

A similar compromise has been made by the Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship and many Protestant denominational boards, colleges, and churches.

The teaching is generally a variation of the theme that, in the beginning, God created. After that, millions or billions of years elapsed while plants, animals, and ancient ape-man evolved. Then, more recently, Adam and Eve were created.

Although we know there was no sin or death before Adam and Eve sinned, this liberal theology would provide us with millions of years of sin and death prior to Adams creation (Rom 5:12). Although genetics, biology, and fossils reveal no possibility of cross-species changes, this compromised position fully endorses them. It is actually an acceptance of evolution by Christians.

Another compromised variation declares that God started the creation by setting off a Big Bang, which evolved into stars and planets. In this form, essentially every aspect of evolutionary teaching is accepted. p. 33.

*Stephen Jay Gould has, for over a decade, been the most outspoken leader of evolutionary thought. This very influential Harvard paleontologist (fossil expert) has adopted •Goldschmidt's hopeful monster theory and made it his own. He declares that evolution only occurs once every 50,000 years. A fish lays an egg and a "furry creature" hatches. After that, there will be no more "massive mutational changes" for another 50,000 years ('punctuated equilibrium" he calls it). So that little animal, which comes out of the fish egg, must wait 50,000 years for its mate to be born before it can reproduce! Yet the next new species may, instead, be a redwood tree or a worm.

Of course, it is obvious that, if mutations are never beneficial-but always weakening, damaging, or lethal-then Gould's million or billion of them all at one time would accomplish nothing worthwhile.

This is a very important issue, since Gould has swung many evolutionists in his direction. They mutually recognize that normal evolutionary theory cannot accomplish the task.

For more on this subject, see Book 10: Mutations.-pp. 33-34.

*Steven Stanley is another leading paleontologist, who has accepted the hopeful monster theory. He named it "quantum speciation, " and added a slight twist in the hope of correcting one of its faults. But, by so doing, he only made the situation worse.

Stanley adds the point that, instead of a one million-positive-mutation creature hatching out of the egg every 50,000 years,-several hatch out of eggs within a few miles of each other all at the same time! -And each new monster is the same type of strange new species! This all happens by chance, insuring that reproduction will occur.

The likelihood of that happening is about the same as you being able to correctly predict that tomorrow at noon a rock will fly off the moon and an hour later hit you on the head! pp. 34-35.

Special Meetings. It was not until the 1960s that evolutionists began a full-scale attack on the evolutionary theory. The Wistar Institute, an important scientific gathering, convened in Philadelphia in 1966. Scientists arose and discussed why the theory just did not work in their field. Mathematicians stood up and explained why it was mathematically impossible.

You might wonder then, is it still being taught everywhere? There are two reasons: (1) The only alternative is creation, and many are unwilling to accept it. So they remain with a burned-out, dysfunctional theory. (2) The organized evolutionary forces,

controlling the science foundations, education associations, accreditation agencies, and all the rest-tenaciously cling to their beloved theory. They too realize it is all they have, since the alternative is totally unacceptable.

Additional meetings were held in 1969, 1980, 1981, and 1984. They only added to the condemnation, but nothing lasting came of them. Evolution still reigns supreme. pp. 35-37, 39.

Panspermia. This peculiar theory, as strange as all the rest, was devised by *Francis Crick, a co-discoverer of the DNA structure. According to Crick, people on other planets sent a rocket down here with living creatures on it, in order to populate our planet! His name for it is "directed panspermia." When it comes to desperately trying to find a successful means of evolution, any wild idea will do.

This is a variant of the basic "panspermia" theory (also called "cosmozota"); that creatures were alive and well on a rock in the absolute zero of outer space, with no air to breath--ever. Then that meteor flew into our atmosphere, became redhot, crashed into the ground--and the living creatures on it survived, and changed into all our present plants and animals.-p. 39.

Lawsuits. Last but not least, on the way to evolutionary success, have been the threatened lawsuits. The ACLU has threatened state governments to give a monopoly to evolutionary teachings--or else. State after state has crumpled under this attack. p. 39.

HISTORY OF EVOLUTIONARY THEORY CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO In earlier centuries In Europe, nearly all the of the best scientists were creationists.
- YES NO Lamarck taught the Inheritance of acquired characteristics.
- YES NO Charles Darwin wrote the book, called The Origin of the Species.
- YES NO Charles Darwin never left England.
- YES NO Louis Pasteur was a creationist who strongly opposed evolution.
- YES NO Ernst Haeckel produced a very accurate set of charts.
- YES NO George McCready Price was the leading creationist writer of the first half of the 20th century.
- YES NO "Humanist" is just a new name that atheists call them selves.
- YES NO Goldschmidt and Gould taught that a single hopeful monster Is born every so many thousand years.
- YES NO Panspermia Is the theory that living creatures have come, -from outer space, on meteorites.

SCORE NAME DATE

quick study guide

scientists speak about evolution

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk () by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.*

The evolutionists' problem. how to prove evolution, when no proof exists. The evolutionists' solution: Make up fairy tales.

This book is somewhat different than all the others in this series. Instead of dealing with only a single main topic, it gathers together a number of points on a variety of topics. By placing them together here, we can give them more space than could have been done elsewhere.

In addition, the complete study (Part Two) of this book contains a remarkable wealth of very unusual statements by evolutionists. Taken all together, this book is unusual.

In addition, you will find, at the back, one of the most complete accounts of what took place at the 1925 Dayton, Tennessee, "monkey trial," when evolutionists, lacking scientific evidence, used ridicule to embarrass creationists.

FAIRY TALES FOR BIG PEOPLE

Everything about us is so wonderfully made. The stars overhead, the planets circling the sun, the moon so close yet never falling into the earth. The beautiful hills and broad plains, with trees and flowers and singing birds and fluttering butterflies.

God gave us all this. There is no other way we could have been given such beauty.

Yet evolutionists want us to disbelieve in God. They tell us that everything in the world and in the sky made itself?

But when we ask them for evidence--proof that this could have happened--they have none to offer.

But they do have fairy tales. It really is too bad when grown-up people believe in fairy stories. But evolutionists believe them.

Here are some examples:

Where the whale came from. Charles Darwin explained that, because a black bear had been seen swimming with its mouth open to catch fish, it is very possible that, after doing this for awhile, one gradually changed into a whale. p. 12.

How the elephant got its long nose. Now that story is quite a bit like this one, which was written for little children:

Once upon a time a baby elephant did not stay close enough to its mamma, and an alligator caught its nose and started pulling. The two thrashed about for a time, before the elephant got away. But it was too late: The elephant's nose was permanently stretched! That is how the elephant got its long nose.--p. 12.

How the giraffe got its long neck. Here is another story that evolutionists tell us is true. But it sounds as foolish as the story about how the elephant got its long trunk:

The giraffes used to look like cattle and other grazing animals, but then they started reaching higher and still higher to get the leaves in the trees. This stretched their necks, which kept getting longer.

-And that is how the giraffes got their long necks! Evolutionists tell us that shorter-necked giraffes and grazing animals died out because they could not as easily reach the leaves which were higher up.

But what about the horses and other grazing animals all over Africa? Why did they not die out, since they could not reach the tall trees?

And what about the female giraffe? She is 24 to 36 inches shorter than the males! There should be no females alive today!

It is known that the giraffe has a complicated blood pumping system, which enables it to reach down for water and then up for leaves-without blacking out. That special system could not be developed by stretching) pp. 12-14.

How the catfish learned to walk. Here is a fishy story by the evolutionists: One day a fish decided to jump out of the water. This was a great occasion, for it marked the beginning of land animals. The little fish sprouted legs, began to breath oxygen, and eat grass. As it grew stronger, it had baby fish which produced lizards, turtles, and birds. - pp. 14-15.

A living creature emerges from the dust. This is another long ago and far away story: Long ago and far away, nothing was alive. Then one day some seawater sloshed, and, presto, it changed itself into an animal. It is thought that perhaps a lightning bolt hit some water, and it changed into a living creature! You are supposed to believe it, because the evolutionists say it happened. p. 15.

How the phoenix bird came to life. Now here is a fairy tale which comes not from the evolutionists, but from ancient Egyptian mythology: Once, long ago, there was a great bird. Only one of these birds ever existed. Once every 500 years, the bird would make a nest, set it on fire, and then perish in the flames. Then, lo, the lifeless ashes and soil at that place--would change themselves into another phoenix bird!

You don't believe it? Well, if seawater can change itself into living creatures, and fish can turn themselves into animals,--ashes should be able to do it also. p. 15.

How the fish got its shape. The fish made its body sleek and streamlined; because, if it had not done so, it would not have been able to swim fast enough to keep from being eaten. It kept its present sleek shape because, if it did not retain it, it could not swim fast enough to survive. But, how then, did all the slow fish in the ocean survive? There are lots of them. p. 15.

When the whale got back into the water. Evolutionists took Darwin's bear-change-to-whale story and made an up-to-date evolutionary "fact"!

Remember that fish which climbed out of the water, grew legs, started eating grass and weeds, and produced a variety of hairy land animals?

But that is not the end of it. After awhile, one of those creatures (a mammal) decided to go back into the sea and live there. Life was probably rough for the first few years, but it gradually got used to it.

Perhaps it was a cow which went into the ocean. For several years it had to learn how to swim, but it eventually got used to that. Then it had to learn to adapt to fish

instead of grass, and that took awhile also. Another problem was when it bore its young. The baby calf had to immediately learn to swim-and nurse underwater at its mother's side, without breathing. But, you know, an animal in an evolutionist's story can get used to anything. It can make itself out of lightning, jump out of water and grow legs, or jump back in and change over a period of millions of years into a whale. Cows and calves had a hard time sticking through to the end of those millions of years, but it was worth it. Finally it changed into a sleek whale.

That is a really-truly story just for you from the evolutionists. It is an actual evolutionary "fact."

Oh, you are worried about that calf? You do not need to fear. It was holding its nose shut with its hoof, while it nursed. Calves have to be persistent, you know, or they do not live very long.--pp. 15-16.

DEFINITIONS OF EVOLUTION

Just what is "evolution"? Throughout this set of books, evolution has been defined as something coming from nothing, life coming from nonlife, and one species changing into another species.

We find that these are the definitions provided by evolutionists. However, they also try to broaden the concept to include real changes which actually do occur, in order to give the impression that everything is the outworking of "evolution": changes in cultures and fashions, changes in subspecies (new types of roses), changes in population sizes and locations, and changes in weather patterns. Evolutionists call it all "evolution," yet it really has nothing to do with true evolution. pp. 17-19.

EVOLUTIONISTS EXPLAIN THEIR OBJECTIVES

Why is it that the evolutionists cling so tenaciously to their theory, when it is so laughable and unprovable?

They do so because it provides them with an excuse for doing things they should not do. Statements made by avowed evolutionists are very explicit in what they say. Repeatedly they have declared that they want to be evolutionists, so they can excuse what they are doing. They do not want to be responsible for their actions. They want separation from God. They want sexual freedom. They want to dull their consciences. They want a way to hide from God. They want to hide from Him, and they want to destroy religion. pp. 19-20.

THE SCOPE OF EVOLUTION

Evolutionists Initially attempted to make evolution the key to the origin of matter and the evolution of plants and animals.

But they have expanded this, in an attempt to convince everyone that everything in the universe is evolving upward!

The second law of thermodynamics declares that everything uncared for, eventually goes to pieces. That law was affirmed by Albert Einstein as the most unchangeable of all laws. (See Book 16: The Laws of Nature us. Evolution.)

Yet evolutionists deny this and all other basic facts. They trumpet their theory that everything throughout earth and space is on an upward, improving, course. They declare that random actions, the basis of evolutionary change, always and only, improves.-p. 20.

THE BEST EVIDENCES OF EVOLUTION

Evolutionists have had over a century to find scientific evidence supporting their theory, yet they still cannot find it. Every researcher knows that, without evidence, a theory is not scientific. Yet evolutionists, desperate to say they have some kind of evidence, have made some remarkable admissions-which reveal that they have no evidence:

Evolutionists have said that evolution is true-because living things have parents! They have also said the best evidence is the fact that parents have children. What a ridiculous proof!

How can this prove evolution! Having babies is not evolution! For thousands of years, chickens have had baby chicks, but that is no evidence of evolutionary change. The chickens are still chickens.

Evolutionists have said that evolution is true-because there are perfect structures in plants and animals.

But random action could never produce such perfection. This is an evidence of creation, not evolution. Vast intelligence and immense supernatural power was required to produce the things of nature. Only God could do it. Chance activity only brings a structure to ruins.

Evolutionists have said that evolution is true-because there are imperfections in nature.

After six thousand years of sin, it is a wonder anything still works right. Yet it is intriguing that evolutionists dare cite both perfections and imperfections as evidences of evolution. Neither perfection nor imperfection shows evolutionary development.

Evolutionists have said that evolution is true because species have become extinct. But death is not evolution. -pp. 20-21.

EVOLUTIONISTS SPEAK AGAINST EVOLUTION

Many scientists, fearful for their jobs, speak in praise of evolution (pp. 21-24). But there are also many who denounce it as ruthless, worthless, and nonsensical.

Here are some of the points they make:

After more than a century, no one has yet figured out how evolution could have occurred. It is an unbelievable theory. The myth of evolution needs to be destroyed, because it keeps science from marching forward. pp. 24-30.

Evolution is choking science, and holding it back. The theory has settled so few questions. It is a tangled mishmash of guessing games and figure juggling.

Young scientists assume that evolution has been proven, when quite the opposite is true. The appeal for its acceptance is not that there is any evidence for it. -p. 25.

Scientists have no proof that life was not the result of an act of creation. The naked truth and human nature travel in different directions. There is no reliable evidence to prove the theory

Search for the cause of evolution has been abandoned. The theory is quite unsubstantiated; it is merely speculation. The number of biologists who-have expressed some degree of disillusionment is practically endless.

Evolution is not a scientific theory, but a metaphysical research program. The overriding supremacy of the myth has created a widespread illusion that the theory of evolution was all but proved one hundred years ago. p. 26.

A scientifically sound creationist' view of origins is not only possible, but is to be preferred over the evolutionary view. The evolutionary story of origins appears significantly less probable than the creationist view.

The most learned evolutionists can give neither the how nor the why of their theory. We have no reliable evidence as to the evolutionary sequence. Dissenters to the theory cannot be dismissed as cranks, for among their ranks are first-rate biologists.

The theory of evolution suffers from grave defects, which are more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge.

Where are we when presented with the mystery of life? We find ourselves facing a granite wall which we have not even chipped.-p. 27.

It seems to me that astronomy has proven that forces are at work in the world that are beyond the present power of scientific description; these are literally supernatural forces, because they are outside the body of natural law.

The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination. p. 28.

-More, many more examples could be cited, pages of them (pp. 28-37). But the above are enough to make it clear that reputable scientists around the world condemn evolutionary theory as having nothing to do with scientific facts, they are a product of foolish charlatans. They declare that it should be totally abandoned, because it hinders genuine scientific research. pp. 32-33.

In addition, they condemn Darwin's book, origin of the Species, as a ridiculous monstrosity, posing as "scientific research" pp. 33-37.

THE TWO ALTERNATIVES

Both scientists and evolutionists declare that there are only two alternatives: evolution or creation; there is no other possibility. If stars, planets, plants, animals, and men did not make themselves,-then the only alternative is that God made them!

We have seen so much of God's handiwork, as we have studied nature, that we can say, God must exist.

Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must have been created by some omnipotent intelligence.--p. 37.

The only acceptable explanation is creation. We must not reject a theory that we do not like if the experimental evidence supports it.

The story of the fossils agrees with the account given in the book of Genesis. Between every species there is a complete absence of intermediate fossils.

Darwinian theory broke man's link with God and set him adrift in a cosmos without purpose or end. Either we accept spontaneous generation or we accept a supernatural creation. There is no third position. ("Spontaneous generation" is the error that a pile of old rags will change into mice, and old fruit changes into flies.) pp. 37-38.

We will conclude our summary at this point. However, there is much more than could be said. To say more would be like piling more rocks on the great pyramid. Evolution is totally false; creation is the only answer to the mysteries of nature.

We need to accept the truth, and worship and serve the God who made us. Only then can we find true happiness.

**SCIENTISTS SPEAK ABOUT EVOLUTION
CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- YES NO The evolutionists really have a problem! Because they can not find scientific facts to support their theory, they use fairy tales.
- YES NO Evolutionists tell us the giraffe got its long neck by trying to reach for the highest leaves and shorter-necked giraffes died out from hunger.
- YES NO Evolutionists teach that birds went into the ocean and became whales.
- YES NO The second law of thermodynamics says that everything uncared for eventually goes to pieces.
- YES NO Without evidence, a theory is not scientific.
- YES NO Fairy tales are scientific evidence.
- YES NO Many scientists believe that evolution is an untrue and unworkable theory.
- YES NO There are two alternatives; one is evolution and the other is creation.
- YES NO We were either made by spontaneous generation or we were made by God.

SCORE

NAME

DATE

104 Evolution and Society

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide
evolution and society

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

The evolutionists' problem. how to remove God from people's lives and substitute viciousness, without destroying civilization or, more important, letting anyone know it was evolutionary theory which did it.

Evolution teaches savagery. It declares that only those creatures who were the most vicious have succeeded down through the ages. "Survival of the fittest" it is called, and it means that those animals and primitive man, who crushed their competitors, succeeded.

This is a horrible teaching to give to humanity. Yet it is taught in schools, lavishly illustrated in textbooks, and portrayed in motion pictures.

Charles Darwin's book, *Origin of the Species*, was subtitled *The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*. This book laid the foundation for the international violence and bloodshed which was to follow. p. 13.

This chapter is closely related to information given in Book 17: History of Evolutionary Theory.

IMPACT ON WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Evolution and Western culture. Gradually an attempt was made to extend evolutionary theory into every field of human endeavor. It is remarkable that a concept founded on confused speculations and nonexistent scientific facts would be pushed forward as the basis of a single, supposedly unified structure of knowledge. pp. 13-14.

Early warnings. Shortly after the 1859 publication of "Charles Darwin's book, Origin of the Species, several men of integrity issued written warnings of the moral holocaust that these sentiments would lead to, if accepted by scientists and the public. p. 14.

Influential status of science. In the 20th century, statements by scientists have come to be revered as wise and profound. Few people argue with scientific theories, for most are unacquainted with the subject matter. When men who hold science degrees speak, people tend to view their utterances as infallible. pp. 14-15.

Ethics and morality. The vicious principles, taught by Darwinism have loosed a flood of immorality upon the world. Declaring that man is but an animal, the theory teaches that the most successful animals are those which are first to attack and overcome others.

Evolutionary theory has entered every sphere of behavior, business, science, and government.

Education is seen as the key to the changeover. In order to make atheists of everyone, it is also recognized that the schools must be controlled by evolutionists.

The teaching that man is but a beast, and not accountable for any of his actions, is the heart of Darwin's theory. We are said to be nothing more than worms, dogs, and monkeys grown big. pp. 15-19.

LAYING THE FOUNDATION

20th century cornerstone. Large numbers of influential thought leaders in our century have been evolutionists. They have affected every phase of life.--p. 19.

Here are a few of the men who laid the foundations for 20th century attitudes:

***Karl Marx.** That which Darwin did to biology, Marx, with the help of others, did to society. Marx was fully convinced that his ideas originated with his reading of Darwin's writings. He wanted to dedicate his book, Das Kapital, to Darwin. pp. 19-20.

***Joseph Stalin.** Both Lenin and Stalin were ardent evolutionists. Stalin's biographer tells us that it was a reading of Darwin's book that caused him to become an atheist. He found the book on a shelf in a church school. p. 20.

***Ernst Haeckel.** Haeckel was an early promoter of Darwinism in Germany. He used fraudulent methods to promote Darwin's errors.

Along with Nietzsche, Haeckel helped lay the foundations for the German militarism which produced World War I.

Haeckel was the founder of the Monist League, an atheist organization which taught that all reality consists only of matter; there are no morals, right or wrong.

His efforts laid the seedbed for what became German National Socialism. pp. 20-22.

***Friedrich Nietzsche.** Darwinism transformed Nietzsche into a maniacal lover of war and bloodshed. Declaring that his theory of violence was "scientific" because it was a social outgrowth of Darwin's biological theory, he urged Germans to accept it. He declared that Germans were the "super race," and needed to eliminate competitors and fill the earth. pp. 21-22.

WARFARE

Warfare. Darwinism led to class struggle, communism, and warfare on a scale never before imagined.

The Franco-Prussian War of 1870 was the first large-scale war in which both sides used Darwinism as an excuse for their conflict.

After that war Europe began arming itself for something far bigger. It came in the Great War (World War I), which was fought between 1914 and 1917.-p. 22.

***Heinrich von Treitsche.** This was a leading Prussian militarist who strongly urged war by Germany in order to fulfill its "evolutionary destiny."-p. 23.

***Adolf Hitler.** Hitler was strongly influenced by Darwin and Nietzsche's writings.

*Adolf Hitler's famous book, *Mein Kampf* ("My Struggle"), was based on evolutionary theory. He publicly allied himself with Charles Darwin, calling him the prophet of what history was to bring. pp. 23-24.

***Benito Mussolini.** The thinking of this Fascist leader was dominated by Darwinian thinking. He used evolutionary slogans to justify his actions, and was fascinated with the violence advocated by Nietzsche. pp. 24-25.

SOCIALISM

Positivism. *Auguste Comte, one of the originators of sociology, is the founder of Positivism. This was touted as the scientific evolution of the mind. According to him, everything religious must be eradicated. p. 25.

Social Darwinians. This was the name given to those revolutionary socialists who tried to apply Nietzsche's warfare theories and Darwin's biological strife ideas to Western-style business and politics.

Their objective was to destroy competitors. Great corporations were built by ruining smaller ones.-p. 25.

***Herbert Spencer.** A pioneer in introducing Darwinism into sociological fields, Spencer was unable to accomplish little in life other than writing doubts and speculations. His writings were done in England, from whence they traveled to America. It was Spencer who coined the phrase, "survival of the fittest." He declared that poor classes should be "eliminated" because of their "unfitness." pp. 25-26.

***William Grant Sumner.** This Yale professor taught many future corporate leaders how to apply the ruthless methods of evolutionary theory to success in business. p. 26.

EVOLUTIONARY COLLECTIVISM

***Lester Frank Ward.** He was the first American leader in evolutionary collectivism (also known as evolutionary socialism). He taught that, although class struggle was the basis of animal evolution, among humans it should be the achievement of pleasure.-pp. 26-27.

PSYCHOLOGY

***Sigmund Freud.** Deeply indebted to early German evolutionary instruction, he fully accepted it, as well as *Haeckel's recapitulation theory. Freud believed that people are only animals who recapitulate the wild, uncontrollable animalism of their ancestors. p. 27.

***William James.** His view of psychology placed the study of human behavior on an evolutionary basis. Humans were only animals. He incorrectly called his theory 'pragmatism'; it was actually social evolution. p. 27.

LAW

***Oliver Wendell Holmes.** A leading justice on the U.S. Supreme Court for 30 years, he powerfully influenced its decisions. He gave it the view that law is evolving and that the court's decisions should also. p. 27.

LITERATURE

***H.G. Wells.** A thoroughgoing atheist, Wells not only wrote science fiction, but he also openly attacked religion. p. 27.

***Sir Arthur Conan Doyle.** This famous mystery writer was both a leading evolutionist and an avid spiritualist. p. 27.

***George Bernard Shaw.** One of the most influential play writers of our century, Shaw hated Christianity and urged evolutionary theory in his dramas. p. 27.

COMMUNISM

Communist Darwinism. *Karl Marx and *Friedrich Engels were the founders of modern theoretical communism. They openly declared that their theories of political revolution were directly based on the writings of *Charles Darwin.

However, communist leaders wanted a speeded-up variation of evolution. Instead of slow change, they declared that the best change always came by sudden revolution and violent bloodshed.-p. 29.

Marxists. Three leading Western promoters of evolution are said to have advocated Marxism. These are *Alexander Oparin, *J.B.S. Haldane, and *Steven Jay Gould.

At the present time, Gould is the most influential evolutionist in America. His promotion of the hopeful monster (saltation) theory has brought it into favor with thousands of scientists. (See Book 10: Mutations, for much more on this.)-pp. 2931.

Origin of saltation theory. Today, the fastest growing theory of evolutionary origins is the saltation theory. This is the view that both natural selection and mutations are inadequate to explain the changeover of one species into another.

The saltation theory declares that, every 50,000 years, millions of beneficial mutations occur all at once, and a single new creature is born into the world. Perhaps an ostrich gave birth to a crocodile or a rat gave birth to a beaver.

It is known that the saltation theory was devised in communist Russia and came to the United States in the 1930s. Evolution, communist thinkers said, came not by slow change, but suddenly both in changes from one species to another and in national upheavals. p. 31.

RACISM

Darwinian racism. *Charles Darwin's 1859 book, The Origin of the Species, had as its subhead: The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life.

Both Darwin and many of his followers were racists. They wanted to exterminate any group of people who stood in their way or were less fortunate.

Darwin, himself, openly taught that the whites would kill all the blacks, as well as other "lower races" within a century or two-and that it would be merely ongoing evolutionary development in progress.-pp. 31-33.

OTHER ASPECTS

Eugenics. *Sir Francis Galton, Darwin's cousin, coined the word, "Eugenics." He taught that the best way to improve mankind was to kill off the less-favored people.

But, of course, the practical outworking of such a theory would be that the ones deciding who should not be eliminated-would be those with the most guns--whether it be white Europeans, black Africans, or yellow Asiatics. "We are the best race" can be applied by anyone to themselves.

The fruits of this theory were carried out by *Adolf Hitler in the extermination camps of Germany and Poland. Eugenics was another gift of Darwinism to the world. The "German experiment" revealed the objectives of the evolutionists. pp. 33-34.

Care for the poor and needy. *Charles Darwin believed that the poor and needy should be left to die, unhelped by their neighbors. Apparently the only people who favored the Darwinists were the well-to-do members of the white race. p. 34.

Big business. Powerful leaders of both business and labor unions looked to Darwin as their guiding light. They saw, in his theories of biological evolution, the justification for what they wanted to do to get ahead.

Men like *John D. Rockefeller and *Andrew Carnegie were strong Social Darwinians. They justified ruthless competition as the price of evolutionary progress. p. 34.

Public education. *John Dewey, a zealous evolutionist, founded the "progressive education movement" in America. He called his philosophy "instrumentalism." Based on evolutionary concepts, it advocated strong government-controlled education.

But "progressive education" was nothing more than careful animal training. In 1933, Dewey became a charter member of the American Humanist Association and its first president. The AHA was the successor to the earlier American Association of Atheists. Atheists now call themselves "humanists."

The indoctrination of the youth into acceptance of evolutionary theory has been seen as a prime objective of the evolutionists.-pp. 34-35.

EVOLUTION AND CHRISTIANITY

It is an unfortunate fact that the great majority of mainline Christian religions have either partially or almost totally accepted evolutionary theory or treat the entire matter as a subject for little concern.

There are, today, very few denominations which officially adhere to a six day Creation and a worldwide Flood, as presented in the oldest history book in the world: the Book of Genesis.-p. 35.

Higher criticism. Atheistic Bible teachers in Germany developed "higher criticism." Their objective was to produce theories about the Bible which would agree with Darwinism. As far as they were concerned, the Bible was just a gradual development of uninspired writings by a bunch of confused people.

In the decades since then, these ideas have taken hold of many seminaries and universities throughout the world. Many conscientious men have been changed into skeptics because they attended such institutions. p. 35.

Neo-Orthodoxy. Frequently, pastors have been tempted to admire and study the writings of "ministers' theologians"--men who write in such a deep style that few can figure out their meaning. But this only adds to the aura of mystery surrounding their statements. Such men are frequently liberals who have little respect for the Bible. Evolutionary concepts are frequently interwoven into their sentiments.-pp. 35-36.

Evolution and Christianity are opposites. Many believe that evolution and Christianity can be merged. It is thought that, by compromise on the part of Christians, everyone will be in harmony and the world will prosper.

But there can be no reconciliation between the two. One view stands for fighting, warfare against the supposed weaker ones, and atheism; the other is for peace, self-sacrifice for the good of others, and belief and trust in the Creator God.

There can be no comparison between the teachings of Jesus Christ and those of *Friedrich Nietzsche!

Even evolutionists and atheists have declared that their creeds are totally different than those of Christianity.

Philosophers, historians, and scientists agree that the two sides have nothing in common. p. 36.

Theistic evolution. This is taught by many modern religionists in seminaries, Bible colleges, and churches. It is the teaching that the errors of evolutionary geology must be true; and therefore humans were living, sinning, and dying millions of years ago. There was no six-day creation and no worldwide Flood or they came after millions of years of living, evolving, killing, and dying.-pp. 38-39.

Evolution and the churches. In spite of clear-cut statements by evolutionists that "evolution IS atheism," many denominations today accept one form or another of evolutionary theory. pp. 39-41.

On which side do you take your stand? At the famous Darwinian Centennial Celebration, held in 1959 at the University of Chicago, *Julian Huxley declared that evolutionary theory outlawed God from the universe. He said we no longer needed God, and that He did not exist. This is the teaching of evolutionists.

Liberal theologians and Christian believers who want to be "modern" embrace evolution, because they do not want to appear different than the world.

But God's faithful ones are not of the world. They are on a different path. p. 41.

EVOLUTION AND CRIME

According to evolutionary theory, there is no right or wrong. There is no divinity and no devil. There is only evolution. Each creature does anything he likes-and, as he does it, he is improved and evolves upward. Everything is chance action; and, in the randomness of it all, we can forget "right" and "wrong." Everything a creature does improves his lot that is, if he is selfish enough.

Evolutionary theory teaches utter selfishness: A man's actions only help himself. If he cares first for himself and is quicker to step on others than they are to step on him. Only then can his upward evolution be more complete than the people around him, which he crushed as he ascended higher.

The increase in crime since Darwin's time has been profound. Murder, lawlessness, robbery, and every other evil activity are acceptable standards, according to evolutionary theory pp. 41-42.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF CREATIONISM

The underlying principles of creationism are these:

1 - The Creator God, a personal, all-powerful, loving God, created this world and everything in it during a literal six day Creation Week.

2 - Creation Week occurred only a few thousand years ago.

3 - The Genesis Flood occurred less than 2,000 years ago.

The basic compromising error of evolutionary theorists is to push back the date of this world's origin to millions or billions of years in the past, and then have life "evolve" through amoebas, tadpoles, and on up to monkeys and man.

Yet such a theory is in total violation of both scientific facts and Christian teachings. pp. 42-43.

Evidences of the Flood and Creation. All about us in the world and in the sedimentary strata are evidences of the Flood and the fact that there are no intermediate species. No trans-species changes have ever occurred or are occurring now.

This is solid evidence. It points to a worldwide Flood and to a divine Creation.

But there are also powerful evidences of the fact that Creation occurred over a period of six days ! p.43.

Evidences of Creation Week. Here are some of these evidences:

1 - The oldest history book in the world, the Bible, tells us that Creation took only six literal days, from start to finish (Genesis 1 and 2).

2 - In that history book, the Bible, the word, "day," meant a 24-hour time period; it did not mean "long ages." There is no reason to assume that it did.

3 - The first week--Creation Week--had seven days to it. Because of that fact, since then, all the nations of earth have had a seven-day week! This is both true and extraordinary. That fact clearly points to Creation Week as an actual occurrence at the beginning.

4 - The languages of mankind attest to this fact] In 1886, William Mead Jones published a large Chart of the Week. On it will be found the names of the week and the names of each of the seven days of the week--in 160 languages, past and present!

On that chart, the seventh day of the week is almost always called a variation of the word, "Sabbath." The knowledge of the seventh-day Sabbath in the languages of mankind, down through history, is a powerful evidence that our world was created in six days, followed by a seventh day on which God and man were to rest from labor.

5 - The weekly cycle has never been changed. Therefore, it points back through long centuries to the first week. Because the weekly cycle has never changed, we can know which day is the second day, the fourth day, or the seventh day--going all the way back.

6 - The length of the week on the calendar has never been changed, even though the length of the month and year has. We have the same weekly cycle that existed way back in the beginning of time.

7 - The weekly cycle has no other origin than God Himself. He made it when He made the world.

The month is keyed to lunar cycles and the year to solar cycles, but the week was divinely given us several thousand years ago. The seven-day cycle is totally unique and universal. It is found everywhere in the world. pp. 43-47.

"Not only is a six-literal-day creation taught in Genesis (chapters 1 and 21, but also in Exodus In the Ten Commandments [chapter 20].

"The Fourth Commandment says: 'Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God .. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day and hallowed it'" (Exodus 20:8-11).

"It is quite clear that the six working days of God are identical in duration with the six days of man's work week. The basis for this very precise commandment is trivial and vacuous otherwise." Henry Morris, Scientific Creationism, p. 225.

Here is a sampling of the seventh day of the week in nearly 40 languages of mankind:

Hebrew-shabbath / Greek-sabbaton / Latin-Sabbatum / Arabic- Assabt / Persian-Shambin / Russian-Subbota / Hindustani-Sharnba / French-Samedt / Italian- Sabaato / Spanish-Sabado / Old Egyptian-Seb / Towarek- A-hat es-sebt / Assyrian-Sa-ba-ta / Ancient Syriac-Shab-ba-tho / Pashito-Shamba / Ancient Persian-Sabatt / Kurdish-Shamba / Turkish-Yom-es-sabt / Lazen-Asabatun / Beluchistant-Shambe / Chinese-Sai-bi-tai / Georgian-Shabatt / Malayan Hart sabtu / Japanese-Saptoe / Borneo-Sabta / Swahili- As-sabt / Mandingo-Sibiti / Teda-Essebdu / Kanuri-Sibda / Fulfulde-Assebdu / Logone-Se-stbde / Wandala--Sibda / Bagrima-Sibbedt / Maba-Sab/ Norman French-Sabbedt / Ancient French-Samedi / Roman ecclesiastical-Sabbatum.

Is it not astounding that the word, "Sabbath," (which means "rest") is even found in Chinese and Japanese? Their cultures separated from the Near East, several thousand years ago. p. 44.

Why Western culture surged ahead. There is a reason why the Western nations are more advanced than the rest of the world. They have been bequeathed the standards and principles of Christianity. It was by following Christian principles and rejecting pagan ones, that the West surged forward.-pp. 47-48.

EVOLUTION AND SOCIETY CLASSROOM TEST BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE

Please circle the correct answer.

- | | |
|--------|---|
| YES NO | Karl Marx liked Charles Darwin's book. |
| YES NO | Darwinism teaches that the most successful creatures are those who are the first to attack and overcome others around them. |
| YES NO | The Franco-Prussian War of 1870 was third large-scale war in which both sides used Darwinism as an excuse for their conflict. |
| YES NO | Darwin's book led to the first world war. |
| YES NO | Adolph Hitler did not like Charles Darwin. |
| YES NO | Oliver Wendell Spencer was a U.S. Supreme Court justice. |
| YES NO | The saltation theory originated in communist Russia. |

YES NO George Bernard Shaw coined the word, "Eugenics."
 YES NO "Progressive education" is based on evolutionary theories.
 YES NO John D. Rockefeller believed in helping others.
 YES NO Atheists now call themselves "humanists."
 YES NO Compromised Christianity teaches that creatures have evolved for millions of years on our planet.
 YES NO Creation Week took only six literal days.
 YES NO In 1886, William Mead Jones published a Chart of the Week, with a total of 43 languages.
 YES NO We have the same weekly cycle that existed way back in the beginning of time.

SCORE NAME DATE

111 Archeological Dating

Book 23 - Evolution Handbook

quick study guide

archeological dating

In what you are about to read, page numbers are keyed to Part Two, which gives much more information. An asterisk (*) by a name indicates that person is not a creationist.

The evolutionists' problem. how to make it appear that the Bible is not true, and that the events in the Bible never really occurred. At the same time, devise a way to make it appear that men and civilizations have been on the earth for many thousands of years longer than they actually have.

This chapter will explain a special way that evolutionists have tried to solve that problem.

The information you will read here closely relates to Book 5: The Age of the Earth. That chapter deals with radiodating and radiocarbon dating; the present chapter focuses on archaeological dating.

ARCHAEOLOGY, PAST AND PRESENT

Importance of Archaeology. Over the years, archaeology has provided us with a clearer understanding of ancient times.

These discoveries have included the finding of the Rosetta Stone, the ancient city of Troy, the Minoan civilization on the island of Crete, the tomb of King Tutankhamen, the city of Ur, and the Dead Sea scrolls. These and many other important discoveries mark the progress of archaeological research.

However, in this chapter we will learn that, beginning in the 1940s, a systematic effort has been made to reinterpret ancient dates in order to make it appear that the Bible is not true. Evidence which applies to one time period are said to belong to a different one.

A classic example of this is the walls of Jericho. They were discovered, and were found to have not only fallen outward, but also to have been burned. At that particular

level, the materials within the city were not looted (taken), but burned. This resulted in a thick ash at that level. All this points to the incident recorded in Joshua 6.

However, fallacious dating methods have been applied, in an effort to make it appear that this level existed and was burned at a much earlier time period. More on this later pp. 13-14.

***Andrew White.** In 1896, Andrew White began, in earnest, the task of linking archaeological findings to evolutionary theories. In that year, he published a book which theorized that archaeological discoveries disproved the Bible. He tried to show that several ancient events preceded earlier than indicated in the Bible.-p. 14.

The earliest Egyptian date. Even before Andrew White's time, other men had suggested older dates for the earliest civilization known: Egypt. Yet, in spite of many efforts, the experts in that field (Egyptologists, they are called) have declared that the earliest Egyptian dates do not reach very far back.

The earliest date would be the date assigned to the reign of Menes, who was king at the beginning of the first Egyptian dynasty.

With the passing of years, experts have set lower and still lower dates for the beginning of Menes' reign. Champollion, one of the earliest scholars, set it at 5867 B.C. But more recent researchers place it as low as 2224 B.C.-p. 14.

Date of Creation and the Flood. At this point, it is needful that we should mention the date of Creation and the Flood.

The world and everything in it was made in six, literal, 24-hour days. Then God rested on the seventh day as an example for us to follow.

Later, the worldwide Flood occurred for a whole year.

Creation Week is variously estimated, by creationists, as occurring somewhere between 4000 and 8000 B.C.

As a result of the evidence presented throughout this entire series of books, the present writer places Creation Week at approximately 4000 B.C. This is almost exactly 4,000 years before the birth of Christ in 4 B.C.

The date of the Flood is variously set at 2300 to 4500 B.C.

As a result of having carefully studied the evidence in this entire series, the present writer places the date of the Flood at 2348 B.C.

Admittedly, both dates are very conservative, yet they are in harmony with Biblical records and non-Biblical evidence. The Bible is the most accurate ancient historical record known to mankind.

The year 2348 B.C. would be equivalent to 1656 A.M. (anno mundi), or about 1,656 years after Creation.

Within a century after the Flood ended, Egypt's first kingdom could have been established.

Thus we see that the lower dates for the beginning of Egypt agree with these estimations.- pp. 14-15.

In the hands of humanists. It is not widely known that modern archaeology is in the hands of secular humanists. They control the universities.

Partway through the 20th century, the entire system of archaeological dating in the Near East was switched to reliance on a few peculiar assumptions, which place all

such dates too far into the past. Those dates are now keyed to a theoretical system of Egyptian dates which, for certain reasons, cannot be correct. p. 15.

More on this later in this chapter.

Archaeologists need the Bible. Archaeologists really need the oldest historical book in the world, and they should not try to ignore it as though it were a book of myths. pp. 15-16.

Archaeological problems. In addition to not relying enough on the Bible to provide guidance in their digs, archaeologists have other problems on their hands also. So much so, that they need all the historical help they can get.

Consider this:

1 - Excavations are time-consuming. It takes years to properly excavate just one site, and there are hundreds of them. It is estimated that to properly excavate Hazor, will require 800 years.

2 - Only a very small section of a site can be excavated, and little of that is dug down to bedrock.

3 - The findings are lopsided. The most important discoveries are never made, because the materials have burned or rotted away.

4 - Even rare manuscript discoveries are often not openable or in unreadable languages.

5 - In spite of more than a century of digging, we have uncovered only an extremely small portion of what needs to be excavated. Only about one percent of the sites have been even partially dug.

6 - Sometimes archaeologists do not know where they are digging, and this adds to the misinterpretation.

7 - Preconceived opinions keep the dig directors from accepting facts which confront them.

8 - There is an immense problem in publication! Less than five percent of the excavated documents are published within five years. After a dig is completed, the archaeologists go back to their university duties, and begin planning the next year's dig.

9 - The experts spend far too much time arguing with one another about what they have discovered.

10 - Archaeologists generally accept the evolutionary concept of uniformitarianism. This is the assumption that all past time has been just like the present, and no catastrophes, such as the worldwide Flood, have occurred.

11 - Pieces of pottery, which are found in the digs, are the basis for dating the strata. But the pottery styles are keyed to an erroneous Egyptian dating system. In addition, it is assumed that each pottery style goes out of fashion within just a few years, yet that may not be true.

12 - It is the director of the dig, and those funding him, who decide what the conclusions will be. pp. 15-16.

The walls of Jericho. This is a classic example of how the humanists try to use archaeological excavations to destroy the validity of the Bible.

From 1930 to 1936, *John Garstang excavated Jericho and discovered that there had been several times when the city and its walls had been destroyed. But one level

revealed that the walls had "fallen flat outward." Farther checking revealed that this particular level had a layer of ash which was far too thick. The city had been burned, but the loot (the furnishings) had not been taken! After careful study, Garstang announced that this level, with its fallen walls and thick ash, had occurred approximately at the time when Joshua and his army invaded the land about 1400 B.C.

But, by the 1940s, the humanists were rapidly gaining control of archaeological departments in the universities. In the 1950s, *Kathleen Kenyon began her excavation at Jericho. Instead of carrying out a regular dig, she used a new method which is frequently followed today: She sliced through a small section-like cutting a pie-down to the bottom. Then, applying the speculative Egyptian dating system to it, she announced to the world that the dating of that special level did not agree with Bible chronology,--and the flattened wall and burned--over city could not have occurred during Joshua's time, but at an earlier time.

It is of interest that archaeologists everywhere lauded her conclusions as accurate; yet, to this day, the dating of the walls of Gezer continue to be regarded with confusion and controversy. Among secular archaeologists, few agree on anything except when they can unite in casting disrepute on the Bible. p. 16.

What is this special Egyptian dating system based on? The answer is Manetho's king lists and the sothic cycle:

MANETHO

At some time between 300 and 250 B.C. Manetho, an Egyptian priest, wrote a list of 31 Egyptian dynasties of kings. Greece ruled the world at the time, and Manetho wanted to prove that Egypt previously had been a great nation also. So he wrote these king lists.

But certain facts need to be kept in mind:

1 - It is well-known among historians that ancient Egyptian writers frequently exaggerated, or lied outright, when it best served their purposes. They slanted information to magnify the greatness of their rulers and nation. Egyptian stone monuments, for example, gloated over victories and never mentioned defeats.

2 - All we have from Manetho are these king lists. Fortunately, we have two copies of his lists. But having two copies only adds to the problem,--for the two lists do not agree with one another! The number of years assigned to each king, and time covered by each dynasty, is different in the two lists. --Yet ancient dating is keyed to Manetho's king lists!

3 - The lists seem to deal with two simultaneously reigning sets of kings. (It is well-known that ancient Egypt was divided into "Upper Egypt" and "Lower Egypt.") If one set of rulers was reigning when the other was, this fact alone would divide in half the total length of years in which those early Egyptian kings reigned.

4 - A number of scholars believe that Manetho fabricated names, events, numbers, and history, as did many ancient Egyptian pharaohs and historians, in order to glorify the nation and its rulers.

5 - Manetho, living about 250 B.C., prepared king lists which are unlike anything written earlier. Many of those names we cannot compare with anything! There is no indication they have every existed. All we have is Manetho's assurance that they were once alive.

6 - How could Manetho prepare such lists, when, to the best of our knowledge, he had so little to base them on? In other words, how could he be assumed to know so much and be so accurate?

7 - *James Breasted, a leading archaeologist in the 1920s, declared that Manetho's lists were ridiculous, did not agree with Egyptian history, and should be discarded.

With such a background, can Manetho be trusted to provide us with the basic keystone chronology that all modern archaeological excavation is based on? Clearly not.

Why then are Manetho's king lists treasured by humanists as the best of all ancient lists? Because those lists provide us with dates which are older than those of any other dating records anywhere in the world. Therefore the humanists treasure them.-p. 17.

VELIKOVSKY AND COURVILLE

Two men challenged the assumption that Manetho's king lists were consecutive and not overlapping.

Velikovsky's studies. Immanuel Velikovsky was a Russian who practiced psychoanalysis until the mid-1930s, at which time he devoted the rest of his life to unraveling ancient chronologies and time periods.

Turning to the oldest and largest ancient history book in the world, the Bible, he compared it with secular records of all kinds.

He found that, although the Bible recorded many contacts between Egypt and Israel, mid 20th century archaeologists said they could not correlate any of them with their findings. How could this be? Velikovsky wondered. He determined to find out.

He discovered that the problem centered on a gullible acceptance of Manetho's king lists, as a single, trustworthy time-span listing.

Eventually, Velikovsky wrote three major books: *Ages in Chaos*, 1952; *Peoples of the Sea*, 1977; and *Ramses II and His Time*, 1978, detailing his reasons.--pp. 17-18.

Courville's studies. In 1956, Donovan A. Courville, a biochemist at Loma Linda University, read *Ages in Chaos*, and began his own research in ancient history. Fifteen years of in-depth research followed.

In the main, Courville agreed with Velikovsky's conclusions regarding the Middle Kingdom. But Courville carried the dating back further than Velikovsky had--all the way to the first dynasty, and came upon a variety of reasons why many of Manetho's dynasties occurred simultaneously with one another.

According to Courville's findings, the "Old Kingdom" occurred at the same time as the "Middle Kingdom," rather than preceding it by 400-500 years.

Courville's careful analysis reduced the length of Egypt's dynasties, and placed its first double-ruler dynasty at around 2150 B.C. This would be approximately 200-350 years after the Flood, according to whichever date one wished to set for that cataclysm. (From his studies, the present writer sets the date of the Flood at c. 2348 B.C.)

In 1971, Courville wrote his monumental book, *The Exodus Problem and Its Ramifications*, in 1971.-pp. 18-19.

Let us now briefly overview events after the Flood which led to the founding of Egypt:

EVENTS AFTER THE FLOOD

Descent to Mesopotamia. The Ark carrying the eight people landed "in the mountains of Ararat" (Genesis 6-9). This would be in the region now known as eastern Turkey. Descending to the lower and warmer plains of Mesopotamia, they settled. The earliest records of human activity (farming, animal husbandry, mining, metalworking, cities, and written records) are to be found there. (See Book 14: Effects of the Flood for much, much more information on events and evidence from just after the Flood.)

Anthropologists are astounded that, suddenly and dramatically, a fully human, highly intelligent race lived there. The Flood had washed away all evidence of any humans living anywhere in the world before that time (that is, if discrepancies in radiocarbon dates are corrected; more on that later). p. 19.

The tower and the scattering. At some time after settling in Mesopotamia, the Tower of Babel was built (Genesis 11) as a single governmental center, from which the entire planet could be ruled. The world was saved from such a threat by its destruction. Immediately, a worldwide scattering followed. That dispersion may be referred to in the "division" mentioned in Genesis 10:25. If so, this would date that event about a century after the Flood.

How many people were involved in this scattering to other lands? Courville suggested there could have been two million inhabitants within two centuries. p. 19.

Migration to Egypt. It is likely that the migration into Egypt, India, and China began as soon as the tower was broken off.

Students of ancient Egypt are astounded that, suddenly, a full-blown civilization sprang up there-with next to no human activity beforehand.-pp. 19-20.

Tropical Near East. As the Flood ended, there was so much volcanic activity that dust in the air brought worldwide lowering of temperatures. This is why those leaving the Ark went southward. While northern lands were threatened by or covered with glacial ice in the Near East, an ideal climate existed: warm, sunny, abundant rain, excellent vegetative growth. (For more on this, see Book 14: Effects of the Flood.) -p. 20.

RADIOCARBON DATING

In the late 1940s, *Willard Libby developed his radiocarbon (carbon 14) dating method. It could be applied to any organic material, and an approximate age could be derived.

However, because of atmospheric conditions immediately following the Flood, carbon 14 dating, when applied to samples which died closer to the deluge, tends to give inaccurate, lengthened-out date readings which extend too far into the past.

But dates from about 600 B.C., on down to A.D. 200, are more accurate. Dates from A.D. 200, onward to our own time, are even more accurate.

Another problem has been a massive coverup which has occurred in relation to carbon 14 dating. Those C-14 test results which do not agree with modernist theories are not disclosed.-pp. 20-21.

Velikovsky's correspondence. Upon learning of Libby's new radiocarbon dating method, Velikovsky began writing letters, urging that various items be analyzed. He knew this would confirm his dating analysis. Unfortunately, he disclosed his findings that ancient dates agreed with Biblical events. Because of this, the results of the tests were not given to him.

Over a period of time, evidence of a major cover-up came to light. pp. 21-23.

ECLIPSE DATING

The proud boast is regularly made that Egyptian chronology is based on "astronomical dating." But this is not true.

Egyptian dating is based on a theory, not on astronomy. It is neither an extension of astronomical dating, nor based on it.

There are astronomically fixed Near Eastern dates, but they are not Egyptian dates. Two separate Babylonian cuneiform tablets have been found, each one filled with an entire year of data on the sun, planets, and eclipses. These dates fix two years: part of 568/567 B.C. and part of 523/522 B.C. Those are our oldest astronomically fixed dates.

There was one other older Near Eastern eclipse, which has enough partial corroboratory data to fix it at one of two years. Noted by Assyrians, it applies either to 763 B.C. or 791 B.C. But we do not know which one.

In contrast, the Egyptian "eclipses" are far different. Because of a lack of corroborative data, each eclipse mentioned in the papyruses could apply to a number of different dates, spanning over a thousand years!

What the humanists did was to arbitrarily select the date they wanted to use, and then pronounced it "astronomical dating."

To add to the problem, partial eclipses were also called "eclipses" by the ancients. They did not know the difference between an umbra and a penumbra. For all these reasons, Egyptian dates are not astronomically dated. pp. 23-24.

THE SOTHIC CYCLE

Egyptian dating is keyed both to the king lists of Manetho and to the sothic cycle.

A theory about the king lists provides a span of reigns, but a theory about the sothic cycle provides the actual dating. Yet this sothic cycle theory is so vague, that it difficult to explain.

What is this "sothic cycle"?

It is thought by some that ancient Egyptians had some kind of yearly calendar. But exactly what it was, no one really knows. So much mystery surrounds the possibility of an Egyptian calendar that the experts call it a "vague calendar."

Not really knowing what that calendar might have been, a number of speculations have been worked out. It is thought that, perhaps (perhaps), the Egyptians had a calendar of 360 days, plus five days at the end of the year. Because the true year is actually 365.25 days in length, a 365 day calendar would wander backward and not return to its original position for 365×4 , or 1,460 years.

This conjectured 1,460 years would be the "sothic cycle."

What we are dealing with here is important, for the modernist theory about this supposed cycle is the basis for all Near Eastern dating.

Now, if (if) such a calendar was actually used in Egypt, and if (if) it remained in use for a full cycle of nearly 1,500 years, it would be possible to date backward, from later known dates to earlier dates. Sounds pretty iffy. But the situation gets worse:

1 - It must be clear that such a calendar was ever used in Egypt. We do not know that.

2 - We must have definite evidence that it was used throughout a 1,460 year cycle. We do not know that.

3 -The beginning date of the 1,460 year cycle must be known with certainty. We do not know that.

4 - We must know that the extra five days were always a part of their calendar. We do not know that.

5 - Something we do know: There was at least one other type of calendar in use in Egypt during part of that time! We know it was different, because we do not know much else. (It was a lunar, not a solar calendar.) So every date on a monument would have to tell which calendar was meant-- But that was not done.

6 - The dates based on this theoretical Sothic calendar should agree with one another. But that does not happen.

7 - We do know that their year wandered through our 365.25-day year, but the speed of wandering is not known--and that is the crucial point

If just one of the above seven points is in doubt, the entire calendar is rendered unfit to be cited as an accurate dating tool.-pp. 24-25.

The rising of sothis. Now we know what the supposed "cycle" is, but how did it get the name "sothis"?

It is keyed to the phrase, "rising of sothis," which is mentioned only once in Egyptian literature. Liberals take that one passage, and make a 1,460-year cycle out of it!

Here is the statement. It is part of a papyrus inscription found at Kahun, Egypt, and was written to a priest:

"You ought to know that the rising of sothis takes place on the 16th of the 8th month. Announce it to the priests of the town of Sekhem-Usertasen and of Anubis on the mountain and of Suchos . . . And have this letter filed in the temple records."

Well, what does that mean to you? Not really anything.

What was "sothis"? No one knows. It could be the sun, moon, a planet, a star, a constellation, the Pleiades, etc. It could be the Nile or a local god.

What does the word "rising" mean? It could mean when a star, etc., comes up in the east or when it reaches a certain angle in the sky. It could mean the rise of the river or a procession in which a god was to be carried through town.

Liberals try to get a 1,460 year cycle out of that one passage, but there are problems:

1 - They assume it is when the star, Sirius, arose. But that is a conjecture. No one knows what "sothis" was.

2 - They assume the star could be seen each time it arose. But Sirius could not be seen arising at those times when the sun was in the sky. It would have to arise at least 36 minutes before the sun came up, in order to be seen.

3 - Two researchers (Poole and MacNaughton) proved over a century ago that sothis could not be Sirius, because of when that star would arise at certain times.

4 - There is no agreement on exactly when the 1,460-year cycle is supposed to have begun. Alternative theories are equally feasible. In the absence of certainty, the

liberals just latched onto one set of dates (1320 B.C. to A.D. 141) as the cycle, and proclaim it as the standard for the setting of ancient dates.

5 - A number of Egyptologists have rejected the theory entirely.

6 - The ancients did not know the correct length of the solar year. It is actually 365.2422 days in length. A true solar year would change the calculation from 1,460 to 1,507 years. That is a difference of 47 years. There is an argument as to which time span is to be used for the complete cycle.

7 -The theoretical sothic cycle does not agree with radiocarbon dating. pp. 25-26.

Did the Egyptians have a calendar? Last but not least, Egyptologists for over a century have questioned whether the Egyptians ever had a calendar. In fact, over a century ago researchers nicknamed the Egyptian calendar the "annul vagus," which is Latin for the "vague calendar." It was obvious that the Egyptians had a calendar which no one in modern times can figure out.

Actually, many experts question whether the Egyptians ever had one! They ought to have left thousands of calendars, but they left none.

To the best of our knowledge, all they had was summer, or hot season; season of waters, or Nile flood time, and winter--and nothing else.

There was only one really important yearly event for the Egyptians, and that was the annual rising of the Nile. But that date would have provided them with a fairly accurate, self-correcting year. --And, if that was true, there would be no 1,460-year cycle! pp. 26-27.

**TRUTH ABOUT ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATING
CLASSROOM TEST
BASED ON THE QUICK STUDY GUIDE**

Please circle the correct answer.

- | | |
|--------|--|
| YES NO | Evolutionists and humanists want to prove that the Bible is correct. |
| YES NO | Some researchers have placed the earliest Egyptian dates as not over 2224 B.C. |
| YES NO | It takes a long time to excavate an entire ancient city. |
| YES NO | It is the director of the dig, and those funding it, who decide how the evidence found will be interpreted. |
| YES NO | The walls of Jericho were found to have fallen flat outward. |
| YES NO | Archeological finds are wrongly dated because unproved theories about Egyptian dating are used. |
| YES NO | Manetho made a list of priests. |
| YES NO | Manetho may have listed people who never lived. |
| YES NO | Velikovsky believed the Bible was incorrect. |
| YES NO | The first major human event, after the people left the Ark and settled in Mesopotamia, was the building of the Tower of Babel. |
| YES NO | The Near East was beautiful well-water land back then. |
| YES NO | Egyptian dates are "astronomically fixed." |
| YES NO | Researchers think sothis must have been an ancient king. |

SCORE	NAME	DATE
-------	------	------

the truth ABOUT JERICHO AND its walls

There are many examples in which archaeological findings have vindicated the Bible. Earlier in this book, we discussed one example: the walls of Jericho.

Because this discovery is a good example to share with others, here is additional information on it:

On the east side of Palestine flows the Jordan River. On either side of the river are high mountains and the surrounding uplands behind them. At a place in the lower Jordan Valley where the plain widens out, the ancient city of Jericho is situated near the west bank of the river. To the east are the mountains of Moab; to the west are the Judaeen hills. Jericho lies at the base of the Wadi Qelt, the ravine running up through the mountains that the "road to Jericho" follows, as it links Jericho with Jerusalem.

Located about 5 miles west of the river, about 8 miles north of the Dead Sea and 15 miles northeast of Jerusalem in a straight line, Jericho is 820 feet below sea level, but 460 feet above the riverbed. It has an almost tropical climate, so that palms and bananas grow there.

Jericho is one of the oldest cities in the world. The first mention of Jericho in the Bible is in connection with the advance of Israel to Canaan. They "pitched in the plains of Moab, on the side of Jordan by Jericho" (Numbers 22:1). Even back then, it must have been an important city, for it is mentioned several times (Numbers 31:12; 34:15; 35:1; etc.)

The spies sent by Joshua stayed in Rahab's home, and they promised that her family would be protected if they remained in that house when the attack on the city was made (Joshua 2:1-21; 6:25). This promise was fulfilled.

The story of how the city was captured is well-known (Joshua 6:1-7:26).

Jericho was later given to the tribe of Benjamin (Joshua 18:21). After that, there is no further mention of the city for several centuries. That is understandable, since the prediction had been made that the city was to remain in ruins, and whoever rebuilt it would do so at a terrible personal loss (Joshua 6:26). That prophecy was fulfilled later in the time of Ahab, in Hiel, the Bethelite (1 Kings 16:34). This would indicate that the city remained in ruins from Joshua's time until the time of King Ahab, when it was rebuilt.

Once again, the city gradually grew into prominence. After Elijah's experiences with Ahab, he ascended to heaven in a whirlwind. His translation occurred not far from Jericho (2 Kings 2:1-22). Because one of his schools of the prophets was located there (2 Kings 2:4, 5, 15, 18), Elisha, during his travels, came to the rebuilt city of Jericho. On one occasion, Elisha healed the spring of Jericho (2 Kings 2:19-22). That artesian spring still flows today, and it is powerful. Without it, the city of Jericho could not exist.

A century later, Judaeen captives were set free there by King Pekah of Israel (2 Chronicles 28:15). In the last days of the kingdom of Judah, the Babylonian army captured King Zedekiah, who had fled to the vicinity of Jericho (2 Kings 25:5; Jeremiah 39:5; 52:8).

The population of Jericho must have been carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar, because descendants of its former inhabitants returned from the Babylonian exile with

Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:34; Nehemiah 7:36). At the time of Nehemiah, some people from Jericho helped rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 3:2).

In later centuries, Marc Antony gave the city to Cleopatra as a winter resort. When Herod the Great later received it as a gift from Augustus Caesar, he beautified it, built a palace there, and erected a fortress behind the city called Cypros (Josephus, Antiquities, xvi, 5. 2; War 1. 2, 4, 9). When he fell ill while visiting there, Herod the Great died in that city.

Jesus passed through Jericho on His way to Jerusalem, and stopped at the house of Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10). It was in this area that Jesus healed blind Bartimaeus and his companion (Matthew 20:29-34; Mark 10:46-52; Luke 18:35-43). Not far from it, the good Samaritan helped the injured man.

The modern city of Jericho was built at the time of the Crusaders a thousand years later, and is called Erikha. It is located to the east of the New Testament Jericho, and southeast of the Old Testament Jericho.

Obviously, Jericho was an important Biblical city. But, archaeologically, it had special importance for another reason: If the walls which fell flat could be located and dated,--this would date the time of the conquest of Canaan by Joshua. That, in turn, would help confirm the date of the exodus from Egypt, under Moses, 40 years earlier.

The Old Testament site has been identified as the mound, which the Arabs call Tell es-Sultan ("the hill of the Sultan").

In 1868, Charles Warren made preliminary explorations of the mound, but did not learn anything.

From 1907 to 1909, working under the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft, Ernst Sellan and Carl Watzinger excavated parts of the mound, but found its ruins confusing and disturbed by later building activities and erosion.

But, from 1930 to 1936, John Garstang worked on the mound and uncovered a mass of information.

It was learned that the site had been occupied before the people, whom Joshua laid siege to, lived there. In fact, because of the plentiful water from that spring, several cities had been there over the centuries, and had successively been conquered and destroyed.

Professor Garstang assigned alphabetic names to the successive cities. City D was the one he found to be especially important. This was the fourth layer from the bottom,

City D was constructed about 1500 B.C. A palace, which had been there earlier, had been rebuilt during that century, and a new double wall of brick had been added. The first was a 6 foot thick wall, which was built on the edge of the mound. Inside the wall, and separated from it by a 12-15-foot space, was an inner wall which was 12 feet thick. Houses were built into that wall, which originally was about 30 feet high. - So this was the wall which Joshua had to surmount!

The entire wall fortification consisted of two well-built walls next to each other, with houses built into the inner wall.

Garstang found that the walls of City D showed evidence of having been violently destroyed. The outer wall had tumbled outward, while the inner wall, with the houses built into it, remained. That inner wall was easily penetrated by Joshua's men.

Ashes, charred timbers, reddened masses of stone and brick show that a fire was set at the time of the fall of this city. We have here the evidence of the story told in Joshua 6.

Additional evidence is provided in the fact that, after this city was destroyed, no other city was rebuilt there for hundreds of years! That next city was City E, which was built at the time of King Ahab (c. 860 B.C.), when Hiel the Bethelite rebuilt the town (1 Kings 16:34).

John Garstang meticulously tried to date the destruction of City D, of Jericho, and found it occurred about the year 1400 B.C. That is exactly when Biblical evidence indicates that Jericho did indeed fall (1400 B.C., 40 years after the Exodus in 1440 B.C.)

It is true that such archaeologists as G.E. Wright and William F Albright had suggested that the Exodus occurred in 1300 B.C., but the evidence from City D, at Jericho, disproves their claim. It simply does not fit into a 1280 B.C. date.

Garstang's work was done in the 1930s, and was based on excellent research data and correlative pottery dating methods.

But, in the 1940s, the liberals gained control of the archaeology departments at the universities and research centers. They applied their new theories about the sothic cycle and Manetho's king lists to Egyptian dating, and then reset those dates, and made them the basis for all Near Eastern archaeological research dating!

From 1952 to 1957, Kathleen M. Kenyon dug at Jericho, using the new dating methods. On various levels, she found cemeteries and their funerary equipment.

Using the Egyptian dating theory she postulated that the fourth level (Garstang's "City D") had been built by the Hyksos and later destroyed by one of the Egyptian kings of the 18th dynasty in the 15th century B.C.

After that, there was nothing existing in Jericho for centuries. Kenyon declared that there were no remains from the 16th to the 9th century B.C. Thus, according to the Egyptian dating theory, there was no Jericho at the time that Joshua invaded Canaan.

Liberals everywhere rejoiced when Kenyon announced her conclusion.

But, having read this book, you now know the truth of the matter.