

Show 'n' Tell on Evolution

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

1. A Belief System Vs. A Scientific Theory
2. Age of the Earth
3. Anatomy Vs. Homology
4. Archaeopteryx: A Bird, Not a Missing Link
5. Astronomy: The Heavens Are Telling
6. Australopithecus: Lucy, Lucy, Lucy
7. Bacterial Resistance
8. Biochemistry: A Big "Whoops" for Evolutionists
9. Cambrian Explosion: 'Out of Nowhere'
10. Creationism
11. Darwin Didn't Know About . . .
12. Doubts of Evolutionism's High Priests
13. Duck-Billed Platypus, Woodpecker & Other Weirdos
14. Evidence Vs. Assumption, Interpretation, Conjecture and Wild Guess
15. Finch Beaks and What They Don't Prove
16. The Fossil Record Doesn't Support Evolution
17. Fruit Flies Don't Bother Me
18. Genetics, Orphan Genes and Other Puzzles
19. 'Geologic Column' Myth Is On the Rocks
20. Geology Won't Cooperate With Evolutionism
21. God and Evolution: Why They Don't Mix
22. Haeckel's Fudged Embryo Drawings
23. Hoaxes and Put-Ons and Frauds: Oh, My!
24. Horses: Reining In An Evolutionary 'Whoa!'
25. Intelligent Design
26. Irreducible Complexity and Specified Complexity
27. Kansas Standards: What Really Happened
28. Micro Vs. Macro?
29. Miller-Urey Experiment: Life Didn't Begin in Some Weird Soup
30. Misleading Illustrations
31. Missing Links Still Missing
32. Mt. St. Helen's and Why It's Important
33. Mutations: Impossible M.O.
34. Natural Selection
35. Nature Disproves Evolution
36. Paleontology's Dirty Little Secret
37. Peppered Moths: A Theory Not Worth Its Salt
38. Punctuated Equilibrium
39. School Science Standards
40. Science and Religion Do Mix
41. Science Class: Teaching About Evolution
42. Scopes Monkey Trial
43. Spontaneous Generation: Oh, Really?
44. Students Asking Questions
45. Teachers, Beware the Propaganda Push
46. The Top 10 Doo-Dahs in Textbooks
47. 'Tree of Life' Idea Is Chopped Down
48. Vestigial Organs
49. Why Do They Still Believe in Evolutionism?
50. Why This Battle Matters

RESOURCES & LINKS

Introduction

I'm a mild-mannered mother of four who lives outside Omaha, Nebraska. About the closest I come to scientific discovery in my day-to-day life is examining the flora and fauna in my refrigerator leftovers, and doing chemistry experiments with stain removal at the base of what I fondly call "Mount Laundry."

But I got personally involved with evolution, one of the biggest scientific issues of our time, in a wacky way. One side of my neck suddenly swelled up the size of an NFL linebacker's. I stupidly chose a doctor out of the phone book. He told me I needed immediate neck surgery to prevent cancer. He said I had "the remnants of the tissue that formed my gill during the evolutionary stages of human embryonic development." This leftover "gill" might become a repository for cancer cells! Eeeeewwww!

I remembered pictures in my old science textbooks of human embryos with gill slits, yolk sacs and tails. The illustrations implied that in the womb, we look like fish for a while, then reptiles, then other animals, and finally, ping! A Gerber baby.

The "sound bite" for all this is a mouthful: "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny." In other words, the theory says that embryos of a given species repeat the evolutionary phases that our evolutionary ancestors went through millions of years ago. At least, that's what I was taught in school. And here was "proof," right in my own body! I scheduled the surgery, bragged about my unusual "gill" to my friends, and went around making funny fish faces and stuff.

Then a physician friend heard about it, and went ballistic.

Turns out the gill-slits theory was exposed as a hoax a half-century ago. A guy named Ernst Haeckel raised hackles by doctoring up some drawings to make it LOOK like embryos recapitulate evolution. He got convicted of fraud . . . because they don't.

Human embryos do NOT go through evolutionary changes of other species. Our embryonic throat grooves may have looked like gills to scientists a century ago, when this theory got started. But high-tech microscopes, genetic research and the science of embryology have long since shown that the shape is just a coincidence.

There are no "gill cells" in the human embryo at any time, no "gill DNA" to code for gills. The grooves go on to form groovy stuff like our tonsils, middle-ear canals, and parathyroid and thymus glands. But they aren't gills, and human embryos don't have any of the other weird stuff like tails left over from our evolutionary ancestors. We don't even HAVE evolutionary ancestors. Ontogeny DOESN'T recapitulate phylogeny after all. Phooey. And I was sounding so smart at parties.

I quit making fish faces, canceled the surgery, went to a more reputable doctor, found out my “gill” was only a stuffed-up sinus that had made my lymph nodes balloon . . . and realized I’d almost been conned into some dangerous, expensive, unnecessary surgery.

Which means that, years before, I HAD been conned. I had been conned into believing in evolution based in part on this despicable hoax . . . and the people I trusted, my teachers, believed it, too.

Which means that somebody had conned THEM, either the textbooks or teacher’s colleges.

And, in turn, somebody had to have conned THEM.

Hmm. If THAT part of evolution isn’t true, what ELSE isn’t?

I investigated . . . and the result is this series of 50 introductory articles on topics related to the controversy over evolution, particularly the controversy over how it is taught in schools.

I may be just a mom with bunions and a double chin, but I can read. And like many scientists, scholars and thinkers since Darwin published his theory in 1859, I’ve concluded that the theory simply isn’t true. It isn’t really an objective, scientific theory, either; it’s a belief system based on fallible human judgment, interpretation, inference and quite a few stereotypes and assumptions that simply aren’t so. That’s why it should be called “evolutionism.” And it shouldn’t be taught in our schools, at least as fact, and at least without plenty of time for the mountain of evidence about evolution’s contradictions, inconsistencies and outright boo-boo’s to be presented to children, too.

Don’t our kids deserve the straight scoop from their schools?

Isn’t it time we all stopped arguing, and put our heads together to examine the evidence for and against evolution?

Once you take an objective look, you may find it awfully hard to continue to believe in evolution. That’s up to you, of course. But I double-dog dare you to read these articles and still believe.

What do I believe? That all of us deserve the truth about the miracle of life.

And we should all keep making funny fish faces ‘til we get it.

-- February 2003

1. A Belief System Vs. A Scientific Theory

To demonstrate gravity, you can drop an apple and show that the apple falls, every time. To demonstrate entropy, you can look inside a teenager's room one day after you've made him or her clean it, and see how order declines into chaos. But can anyone demonstrate evolution? Can anyone name just one solid piece of evidence, one "find," one study, one fossil, one experiment, that proves beyond doubt that even ONE species has evolved into another species?

No. There isn't any. Unlike regular science, evolution isn't a theory based on scientific evidence. You can't observe evolution. You can't replicate it in experiments. You're forced to make subjective judgments based on observations and interpretations. Therefore, evolution is more like a religion than science. It is a belief system based on inferences and leaps of faith. Evolutionists preach that their theory of origins is the only one that is correct. If evolution held up under scrutiny, that would be one thing. But it doesn't. As contradictory evidence mounts and people realize that evolution is simply not plausible, evolutionists don't change their minds: they get mad. Anybody who asserts an opposing viewpoint gets a lot of grief and sometimes worse: loss of jobs, grant monies and reputations.

What's ironic is that evolutionism has been shown to be shaky in everything from astronomy (no evidence that anything off the earth "evolves," either) to mathematical probability (zero likelihood that life "evolved" by random chance) to zoology (no evidence of any new species "evolving," just genetic reshuffling of existing heritable traits). In contrast, not a single word of the Bible has ever been proven to be wrong. Yet evolutionists often claim that Biblical Christianity is the belief system that is based on myths, mistakes and wishful thinking.

Oh, yeah?

See the chapter, "Science or Myth?" in the Jonathan Wells book, "Icons of Evolution," or www.trueorigin.org for more about the belief sys . . . uh, that is, theory of evolution. And see www.talkorigins.org for more on why evolutionists say they still believe in their -ism.

2. Age of the Earth

One of the biggest battles involving evolutionism is pinpointing the age of the earth. Evolutionists say it's almost five billion years old. If it's really, really, really old, their thinking goes, then maybe there has been "enough" time for the trillions of random mutations necessary to produce so many different species of living things to have happened.

But there's no way to be sure. We can't prove by radioactive dating or any other method that the world is that old, or anywhere close to it. The margin of error is just too great; one tiny error can add millions of years. And even our most high-tech methods lack the necessary precision. On the other hand, no one can prove beyond a doubt that it is only a few thousand years old, either, as some creation scientists contend. The earth didn't exactly come with a dated sales receipt.

For the foreseeable future, we're stuck with the fact that whatever age of the earth we decide to accept is based on suppositions that can't be proven. I'm among the orthodox majority who hold the universe could indeed be millions or billions of years old. Could.

Those who contend that the earth is billions of years old are on pretty solid ground scientifically. Since we can see light from stars that are so far away, it does suggest a universe of immense age. However, there's a danger of "limiting God" by insisting on naturalistic explanations for everything . . . a man-centered approach to reality.

Then again, those who claim the earth is only about 6,000 years old, in keeping with traditional interpretations of the creation account in Genesis, have strong arguments, too. Measurements of reef drill cores, limestone caves, river deltas, rock cliffs, vertical pine trees in layers of coal that supposedly took millions of years to develop, and other evidence from nature all are consistent with a young earth.

Good sources for further study are the "youth earth" creationists at www.answersingenesis.org, the "old earth" creationists at www.reasons.org and the book, "The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods" by John Woodmorappe.

3. Anatomy Vs. Homology

Darwin noticed that the same basic pattern of bones appears in the limbs of all mammals. For instance, the bones of a bat's wing and a dolphin's flipper are similar in basic structure, even though their functions are very different. Darwin theorized that these similarities show that all mammals must be descended from a common ancestor.

But modern-day genetics and embryology have disproved that. How? Different genes control the development of bone structure and organs in different types of animals in different ways. There is no ancestral link in the genetic coding of limbs and bones in different types of animals, no common descent. Although there are still many puzzles left to solve with the tremendously complex task of DNA sequencing, the overall findings tend to disprove the theory of evolution.

Darwin was a keen observer of nature, but they didn't have microscopes in Darwin's day which could help scientists study things down to the freckle on a molecule. They had to go a lot on appearances, and it is understandable that they judged wrong.

Darwin and disciples created "homology," the study of body parts that they said were related in structure because of common descent, such as the wing of a bird and the foreleg of a horse. This concept is repeated in most science textbooks today. But it's unscientific.

Not only do different genes code the same body part in different animals, but those body parts form from different areas of the embryos of those creatures. Vertebrates all have an alimentary canal, for example, but it is formed from completely different parts of the embryonic disc of the shark, frog and bird. No mutual ancestry.

Actually, the resemblance of limbs and organs from one animal to another signifies efficient forms and functions from a common Designer more than an evolutionary relationship between animals. For more on this, search "homology" on www.arn.org or read Denton's "Evolution: A Theory in Crisis."

4. Archaeopteryx: A Bird, Not a Missing Link

Another missing link that wasn't is the feathered dinosaur, Archaeopteryx (ark ee OP ta ricks). This extinct creature is shown in almost all science textbooks as the proverbial "textbook example" of evolution. The claim is that this creature was an intermediate between dinosaurs, or reptiles, and birds. That claim has persisted for more than 125 years, and that claim is false.

The trouble is, none of the skeletons found have a breastbone, which all birds have to have as anchors for the large muscles that allow them to fly.

The only specimen that has a wishbone, or furcula, also a unique feature of birds because it acts as a spring for the motion of flight, mysteriously has it upside down.

In the area where the "feathers" were detected on other specimens, there are several raised spots that look like chewing gum or rubber cement overspill, with no matching indentation on the mating face.

The skeletons were found in solid limestone, which must lie on the sea floor; it's hard to imagine how a bird got all the way down there.

And two modern birds have been found in rock strata dated by evolutionists as much older than the one in which Archaeopteryx was found. Textbooks rarely include facts like these, however.

Still, these fossils weren't proven to be forgeries until an x-ray resonance test in 1986 at the British Museum showed that the places where the feather impressions were on the fossils differed significantly from the rest of the coarser-grained slab. Also, the chemistry of the specimens differed from that of the crystalline rock in Bavaria, Germany, where it supposedly was found.

Most of the books in the RESOURCE section have more detail, or go to www.path-lights.com and find Archaeopteryx under the "Historical Evidence Against Evolution" in the Creation-Evolution Encyclopedia.

Darwin noticed that the same basic pattern of bones appears in the limbs of all mammals. For instance, the bones of a bat's wing and a dolphin's flipper are similar in basic structure, even though their functions are very different. Darwin theorized that these similarities show that all mammals must be descended from a common ancestor.

But modern-day genetics and embryology have disproved that. How? Different genes control the development of bone structure and organs in different types of animals in different ways. There is no ancestral link in the genetic coding of limbs and bones in different types of animals, no common descent. Although there are still many puzzles left to solve with the tremendously complex task of DNA sequencing, the overall findings tend to disprove the theory of evolution.

Darwin was a keen observer of nature, but they didn't have microscopes in Darwin's day which could help scientists study things down to the freckle on a molecule. They had to go a lot on appearances, and it is understandable that they judged wrong.

Darwin and disciples created "homology," the study of body parts that they said were related in structure because of common descent, such as the wing of a bird and the foreleg of a horse. This concept is repeated in most science textbooks today. But it's unscientific.

Not only do different genes code the same body part in different animals, but those body parts form from different areas of the embryos of those creatures. Vertebrates all have an alimentary canal, for example, but it is formed from completely different parts of the embryonic disc of the shark, frog and bird. No mutual ancestry.

Actually, the resemblance of limbs and organs from one animal to another signifies efficient forms and functions from a common Designer more than an evolutionary relationship between animals. For more on this, search "homology" on www.arn.org or read Denton's "Evolution: A Theory in Crisis."

5. Astronomy: The Heavens Are Telling

Did the universe evolve all by itself, by random chance? The odds against that are . . . well . . . astronomical. Astronomy is a strong source of debunking material to refute evolutionism.

Examples come from the “Astronomical and Physical Sciences” section of the Walt Brown textbook, “In the Beginning,” which you can read online at www.creation-science.com and click on the index under “S” for the first item about astronomy, “Strange Planets”. Here are some of the 98 questions this book raises about astronomy that are being raised on the “star wars” side of the evolutionism debate:

If our solar system evolved from the same cloud of gas and dust, how come three of our nine planets rotate backwards, and eight of our 72 moons rotate backwards? Why not all the same direction?

We know the Earth’s moon didn’t spin off the Earth and wasn’t pulled in by the earth, because it has a circular orbit and it isn’t made of the same stuff as the earth. How was it made, then, if not by creation?

We’ve never seen a star born, although we’ve seen lots “die” in supernovas. So how can we say stars “evolve,” since we don’t see it?

If the Earth is really billions of years old, how come studies of lead leaks and helium content on zircon crystals indicate the Earth’s crust is less than 10,000 years old?

Galaxies keep their shape, so doesn’t that show they don’t evolve?

The author of that textbook is a young-earth creationist, but there also are many old-earth creationists to consult. See the book, “Creation and Evolution: Rethinking the Evidence from Science and the Bible,” by Alan Hayward. Another good source is “Astronomy and the Bible” by Donald B. DeYoung. And another good website on the connections between astronomy and creation, versus the contradictions between astronomy and evolutionism, is: www.trueorigin.com

6. Australopithecus: Lucy, Lucy, Lucy

People still believe that “Lucy,” the skeleton unearthed in Ethiopia in 1974, was the missing link between apes and humans. With that find, Don Johanson made Page One news.

But australopithecus was shown to be an ape a few years after the initial media circus. Computer studies of body proportions, CAT scans of bones affecting balance, details of the inner-ear bone, down-curved fingers and toes, and other evidence indicates they swung from trees and had a gait close to knuckle-walking.

There had to have been five million “mutational events” in three million years for us to be Lucy’s kin. No way. But the news item retracting the claim most likely was buried on p. 103. Most lay people continue to believe that “Lucy” was an ape-girl missing link who proves evolution is true.

How is this hoax perpetuated? It’s probably not intentional, but pictures have been worth 1,000 words to evolutionists:

Australopithecines had long, curved toes, but when museums display artist’s renderings of them, there are human footprints.

Lucy is shown in illustrations walking upright, which her body wouldn’t have done for lack of bipedal locomotion structure.

Very few intact skeletons have ever been found. Generally, skulls alone are used to imagine what the body would have looked like. Without “neck-down” bones, it’s a guess.

Instead of “Lucy,” scientific attention should be paid to “Mitochondrial Eve.” A team of University of California at Berkeley scientists studied the mitochondria of 147 people from around the world, and concluded that all 147 had the same female ancestor. They figured she could have been from Africa, Asia or Europe. And they figured she lived, not millions of years ago, but 6,000 to 7,000 years ago.

For more, see “In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood,” www.creationscience.com and either of the two books entitled “Bones of Contention” by Lewin or Lubenow.

7. Bacterial Resistance

Anyone with teenagers knows that resistance is a fact of life. One day, they're nice, obedient children . . . the next, they've developed that telltale resistance: they resist getting up on time, they resist cleaning up after themselves, they resist doing their homework. . . .

But did they suddenly "evolve" that resistance, or was it already there in latent form? We all know about teenage mutants: it was there.

So why does the same natural ebb and flow of traits in a population of other organisms, specifically bacteria, make people mistake natural changes for evolutionary ones?

The ability of certain bacteria to resist pesticides and antibiotics is often used as an example of evolution in action. But it isn't. Bacteria do not mutate into tiny little SuperBacteria, complete with capes, in response to pesticides and antibiotics. All that happens is that nature takes its course and the population is changed by its environment.

The bacteria don't "evolve." Existing genes that are able to resist the chemicals brought into their environment are simply brought into play because of the changing conditions. Think of a bacteria's genes as a deck of playing cards. New traits emerge because of a reshuffling of the existing deck, not the introduction of a whole new card.

Bacterial resistance may appear to develop quickly in a population, but all that has happened is that those individual bacteria that don't have the genetic makeup to resist a particular pesticide or drug all get killed. Then the individuals who are left are those with the genetic protection, and they reproduce and proliferate. To the observer, it may appear that the population has evolved, but all that has happened is that natural selection has taken its course. Bacteria that were frozen years ago and recently thawed were found to have resistance to chemicals invented in the interim. It was already there.

For more, see Alan Gillen's book "Body By Design" or search "bacterial resistance" on www.answersingenesis.org

8. Biochemistry: A Big ‘Whoops’ for Evolutionists

If evolution were true, molecular biochemistry would be able to provide a “smoking gun,” proof at the level of an organism’s DNA that it evolved from some other organism, like humans from apes.

But the proof isn’t there. In fact, today’s advancing understanding of life’s smallest parts is raising more questions than it is answering about how random evolution could have produced nucleic acids, proteins, genes and the other amazing, complex structures of life.

Molecular biochemistry actually refutes evolution. There is nothing in the large amount of gene mapping that has already taken place to establish the gradual transitions that most evolutionists would expect to see in the genes of fish, amphibians, reptiles and mammals. In contrast, the DNA of each species appears to be distinctly different from all other species. If evolution were true, that couldn’t be.

Example: most organisms have the protein cytochrome C, which plays a role in cell metabolism. Each organism has a slightly different sequence of amino acids within its cytochrome C because of each organism’s specific chemistry. The cytochrome C of a gerbil won’t work in a kangaroo, for example.

If evolution were true, then the DNA that codes for cytochrome C should be nearly identical between two organisms considered closely-related by evolution’s scheme. But genetic mapping shows us the exact opposite. For instance, the cytochrome C of a bacterium called “*Rhodospirillum rubrum*” differs by 64% from a horse . . . but it also differs 69% from yeast. If evolution were true, the bacterium’s sequence would be pretty close to the yeast and vastly different from the horse. In contrast, each kind of organism seems to be equally or nearly equally different from every other kind of organism in this area.

For more on the biochemical challenges to evolution, see “Darwin’s Black Box” by Michael Behe. On cytochrome C protein sequences, see the textbook, “Exploring Creation With Biology” by Dr. Jay L. Wile and Marilyn F. Durnell, 1998, www.high-schoolscience.com

9. Cambrian Explosion: 'Out of Nowhere'

The Cambrian Explosion, called "Biology's Big Bang," is significant because not a single indisputed multicellular fossil has ever been found in Precambrian rocks. But suddenly, in abundant numbers in Cambrian sedimentary deposits, we have found billions of fossils of highly advanced, complex and developed lifeforms and plenty of evidence of highly-developed, woody land plants.

Life, it seems, was an overnight sensation many years ago.

The diversity and complexity of these animal body plans has been estimated by evolutionists to have required at least 1.5 billion years to evolve. But there's not a shred of evidence that they had any evolutionary ancestors or intermediates. Creationists would say that's because they DIDN'T.

Meanwhile, the same rocks contain many fossils of plants and animals that are the same as those found today, cutting the legs off the theory of evolution since the fossil record actually shows permanence of species, not constant change.

The Cambrian Explosion also shows us that in the past there was more diversity of life forms, not less. Evolutionists have it backwards: if evolution is responsible for adding more and more complex traits and genes, then we should have more diversity now and less then. But the opposite is true.

These facts refute the gradual evolution hypothesized by Darwin better than any other anti-evolution facts. The Cambrian Explosion fossils would have made most reasonable people realize that evolutionism is a "whoopsie daisy." In response, though, ardent evolutionists developed the theory of "punctuated equilibrium." That theory has been vigorously criticized, mainly for lack of evidence.

To learn more about these marvelous, meaningful fossil finds, search for "Cambrian Explosion" on www.trueorigin.org or see "The Cambrian Explosion: Biology's Big Bang" on www.idurc.org

10. Creationism

People who believe in Biblical Creation sometimes are portrayed as being ignorant Bible-thumpers in wide-lapel suits with big hair. That caricature is untrue and unfair, as you see when you start learning what creation scientists are saying, and how top-quality their work is.

Maybe it really did happen the way God said it did in Genesis. Scientific geniuses such as Bacon, Copernicus and Galileo believed in supernatural creation. Most of the world's foundational scientists believed it: Johann Kepler (celestial mechanics), Blaise Pascal (hydrostatics), Robert Boyle (chemistry), Nicholas Steno (stratigraphy), Isaac Newton (calculus), Charles Babbage (computer science), Louis Agassiz (glacial geology), Gregor Mendel (genetics), Louis Pasteur (bacteriology), William Kelvin (energetics), Joseph Lister (antiseptic surgery), and many more.

Did they know something modern-day evolutionists don't? Could be. There's far more historical validity for creation science than in the Johnny-come-lately, evolution. The fact that our greatest scientific minds believed in creation is powerful evidence and shouldn't be discounted, although evolutionists try to. What if modern musicians started saying Mozart, Bach and Beethoven misunderstood music? Or that Michelangelo and Monet just didn't understand art?

According to the Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics (Norman L. Geisler, 1999) belief in Biblical Creation is not only scientifically sound, it is important for theological understanding, to promote human dignity, to give meaning to morality, to unify humanity, to define sexual equality, to give grounding to human roles and authority, and most of all, to help us understand God's plan that links back to Adam in His love for us as our Creator, the redemption of sin, and the incarnation, resurrection and return of Jesus Christ.

Among the many other places to turn for more information on creation science listed in RESOURCES, don't miss:

www.answersingenesis.org and www.biblicalcreation.org

11. Darwin Didn't Know About . . .

Several influences on Darwin's theory were discredited and disproved after Darwin formulated and published the theory of evolution in 1859. His conclusions might have been different had he known:

French naturalist Jean Baptiste de Lamarck (1744-1829) theorized that life has a "tendency to progression," or to automatically become more complex. Lamarck thought "inheritance of acquired characteristics" causes efforts by animals in one generation to produce different traits in the next generation. For example, he thought giraffes gradually got longer necks by stretching up to eat the leaves of trees, and wading birds got longer legs by straining upward out of shallow water to keep themselves dry. Darwin thought that was behind the gradual transformation of one species into another. But the theory has been thoroughly discredited and we now know that species don't change into other species.

French bacteriologist Louis Pasteur (1822-95) proved in 1860 that life cannot come from nonlife and even microorganisms cannot spontaneously generate. The idea that the first life came together by random chance is the foundation of evolutionism, but Pasteur's findings weren't known when Darwin worked.

The father of the science of genetics, Austrian Gregor Mendel (1822-84) showed that the traits of an organism are determined by its genes. In Darwin's time, scientists had no idea how traits were passed on from one generation to the next. Darwin observed that the skeletal limbs of many species looked so similar that they must have had a common ancestor and that formed the framework for his "descent with modification" theory. However, modern-day genetics and DNA sequencing has shown that the genetic codes for the same body parts in different species are different. So common descent is false.

More information: "Darwin on Trial" by Philip E. Johnson or search for "Darwin" on www.answersingenesis.org

12. Doubts of Evolutionism's High Priests

Evolutionist scientists can see the contradictions and problems with evolution, but they promote it anyway. Why? Apparently, out of simple human pride, the inability to acknowledge that God is God. It's a form of idolatry, the substitution of human will for God's. One of their champions, Richard Dawkins, is unabashed in saying he uses evolutionism to promote his religious beliefs. He said, "Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist" and that evolution's opponents are "ignorant, stupid, insane or wicked."

Ironically, even Dawkins concedes that the Cambrian Explosion is a pickle because of the complete lack of evolutionary ancestors. "It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history." ("Darwin on Trial," Phillip Johnson, p. 54). No kidding!?!

Another big problem acknowledged by a high priest of evolution, Michael Denton, is the fact that genetics has busted huge holes in the claim that structural homology, the study of similar bones and organs in different species, shows common ancestry. You know: all those science book illustrations with forearm comparisons of frogs to bats to birds to porpoises to Andre Agassi. (A little "humerus" forearm humor there.) Denton wrote: "The evolutionary basis of homology is perhaps even more severely damaged by the discovery that apparently homologous structures are specified by quite different genes in different species. . . . With the demise of any sort of straightforward explanation for homology one of the major pillars of evolution theory has become so weakened that its value as evidence for evolution is greatly diminished." (Evolution: A Theory in Crisis, 1985, pp. 149-51).

Doubts about evolution by many of the world's eminent scientists, including Nobel Prize winners, are included in books such as "Creation and Evolution: Rethinking the Evidence from Science and the Bible," by British physicist Dr. Alan Hayward. To see how 40 Ph.D. scientists reconcile religion with science, see "On the Seventh Day," edited by John F. Ashton. See also "Changing Opinions Among Scientists" in "Boyd's Handbook of Practical Apologetics" by Robert T. Boyd or "Evolutionism 101" on www.creationism.org

13. Duck-Billed Platypus, Woodpecker & Other Weirdos That Disprove Evolution

The Australian duck-billed platypus looks like it was designed by a committee. The babies hatch from eggs like reptiles but are nursed with mother's milk like other mammals. The platypus has fur, a flat, duck-like bill and webbed feet. It even uses echolocation like a dolphin. No wonder evolutionists claimed the platypus as an intermediate form between birds and mammals. But fossils show the platypus hasn't changed through time, and no transitions between the platypus and other animals exist. In addition, more conventional mammals are found lower down in the fossil beds than the platypus. It's not a missing link: it's just a weird, fascinating animal.

Another wonderful weirdo: when you learn about the complexity of the woodpecker, it is difficult to continue to believe in purposeless, random evolution. Woody Woodpecker would have said to the evolutionists: "Ha ha ha HA ha! Ha ha ha HA ha! Hahahahaha."

The woodpecker has a really strong beak with which to pound at trees fast and hard, like a pneumatic drill. To support that action, its neck has to be like shock absorber, different from all other bird necks. After it has made a hole in a tree, to get the bugs that live inside, the woodpecker's tongue has to be really long. So that the bird's mouth doesn't have to be huge to hold such a long tongue, the tongue curls all 'round inside the bird's mouth like a New Year's Eve paper whistle. When the woodpecker is ready, it uncurls that tongue really fast and shoots it into the hole, curves around the bug, and carries it back into its mouth. That takes complex musculature.

If any ONE of those complex traits weren't in place or were only partially developed, then the entire system wouldn't work and the woodpecker couldn't get its food: weak beak, bouncy neck, wussie tongue, and Woody couldn't eat and we'd have no Woody. Weawwy.

Other amazing animals: "The Collapse of Evolution" by Scott Huse or search "The Wonders of Nature" on www.evolution-facts.org

14. Evidence Vs. Assumption, Interpretation, Conjecture & Wild Guess

There is no direct evidence or proof for the theory of evolution. There are no eyewitnesses, no photos, no diaries and no way to duplicate it. All we have is circumstantial evidence: the product, not the process.

Circumstantial evidence can point to the truth. But it also is subject to the biases of the people doing the interpretation. Some say scientists have inferred things correctly about life's origins and the evolution of so many diverse creatures. Others say they have inferred incorrectly.

Evolution is a scientific presumption, not a fact. The theory is science's best guess of how life began and changed into so many different forms and species. Evolution is presumed by many scientists to be true, but that presumption is based heavily on scientific interpretation and inference, which may be wrong. A presumption also can reflect a desire for a certain result. That can distort the big picture and distracts people from contradictory facts and evidence.

For example, manmade experiments using chemicals and radiation can change genes, and other chemicals upset the arrangement of chromosomes. Evolutionists point to that as "proof" that their theory is correct. But do the same things happen in the lab as in nature? Nope.

Similarly, evolutionists point to certain "index fossils" found in certain kinds of rock layers, which they say "dates" the age of the rocks. But if you ask geologists how they know how old the rocks are, they say it's based on what kinds of fossils are found in them. That's circular reasoning: too many presumptions leave you chasing your tail.

Mathematics tells us that the random creation of a single protein is mathematically impossible, yet evolutionists insist that everything has evolved by trillions of those random changes. That's quite a stretch.

For more on evidence: see "Darwin on Trial" by Phillip E. Johnson or the IDEA Center, <http://www-ac.s.ucsd.edu/~idea/>

15. Finch Beaks and What They Really Prove

When Darwin visited the Galapagos Islands west of South America in the 1830s, he noticed great similarities in the dozen or so varieties of finches that he observed. The main difference was their beaks. Some had small beaks. Some had short, stout ones. Some had curved ones for probing flowers. Some had straight, thin ones for boring into wood.

Darwin didn't include his theories about finch beaks in his book. But he used them to develop the theory that an animal's environment can influence traits of that species through offspring to the point where whole new species can evolve. Darwin's finches thus came to symbolize evolution by natural selection.

But he was wrong. Now, everyone agrees with Darwin that the birds must all descend from one or more common ancestors, perhaps a bird or a few birds blown to the islands in a storm from the mainland.

As time passed, it was thought, different food sources on different islands created birds with different sizes and shapes of beaks to be more successful at food-gathering, and they proliferated. Their beaks were thought to prove evolution by natural selection.

But guess what? It didn't happen. Scientists now know that those finch beaks can get larger and smaller significantly in just a few generations of birds, and this "evolution" in their beak size can "oscillate" within a species with every shift in climate. Variation within species by recombination of existing genes, yes. But "evolutionary speciation" from one species into another with new traits? No.

In the last few decades, scientists are finding that at least half of the finch species on the Galapagos are interbreeding, and thriving. It is possible that they all could fuse into one. So maybe they aren't separate species after all. The different beak sizes may be no more significant than differences in human noses.

For more information on the finches, please see Jonathan Wells' book, "Icons of Evolution," www.iconsofevolution.com

16. The Fossil Record Doesn't Support Evolution

Over the years, people have collected millions and millions of impressions of plants and animals that were made in rocks long ago.

There are a lot of, pardon the pun, mis-impressions about the fossil record that contribute to people's mistaken belief in evolutionism. For example, people think there are tons of fossils that show organisms evolving gradually from one species into another. But not a single undisputed transitional, or intermediate, fossil series has ever been found, despite millions of fossils collected.

Another mis-impression is that there are all kinds of organisms found in fossil form available for study, especially lots of unusual insects, reptiles, mammals and ape-human combinations.

Again, wrong. The diversity in the fossil record has been vastly mischaracterized. By far and away, the most fossils found were of underwater creatures like snails and clams. They had calcareous shells, with mineral formations that make the strongest, most lasting fossils. These marine fossils are found every region of the earth in nearly every layer of rock, even on mountaintops. However, they are not shown in textbooks or museums in proportion to their numbers found. Instead of showing over 95% marine creatures and plants, the "fossil record" is usually taught with a lot of vertebrates, which is simply not a true representation. Darwin knew this, and did not cite a single fossil in support of his belief in human evolution from apes . . . because there wasn't any such fossil then, and there isn't now.

And so what the kiddies "learn" in school about the "geological column" and all those different critters in all the different "periods" is based on less than 5% of the actual fossil record. That's deceptive. Where the numbers are the largest — relatively simple marine creatures — the evidence for evolution is nonexistent.

See p. 60, "Defeating Darwinism By Opening Minds," Phillip E. Johnson, "Shattering the Myths of Darwinism" by Richard Milton, or "Evolutionism 101" on www.creationism.org

17. Fruit Flies Don't Bother Me

What's the buzz among evolutionists about fruit flies? They've been experimenting on them in the laboratory for more than 1,000 generations, zapping them with radiation and creating all kinds of mutational deformities on purpose. Guess there must not be a People for the Ethical Treatment of Fruit Flies to stage protests.

Evolutionists such as Douglas Futuyma ("Science on Trial: The Case for Evolution," 1983) proclaim that we can change the number of wings or bristles on their legs. Evolutionists say they have produced genetic mutations with the things they are doing to poor little old *Drosophila*, the fruit fly, and so genetic mutations in the wild must be taking place like wild, and must be the driver for evolutionary change.

Except . . . except . . . all that experimentation and all those extreme measures have never, not once, produced a new species. Mutant strains have produced four-winged fruit flies instead of the standard two-winger. But the extra wings don't have flight muscles. So the poor little mutant can't fly very well and has trouble mating, too. Basically, experimentation either hurts the species or produces more or less of the same old fruit-fly body parts. They're still fruit flies, although their genetic structure may have been assaulted by the experimentation.

Evolutionism, in other words, doesn't bear fruit, even on the fly.

All that is happening with the experimentation is the manipulation of the contents of what's in their genetic "buckets." No new contents are added; there's just a reshuffling of the existing variation within the fruit fly's genes. There are limits to that variation, though, that prevents the development of anything other than a slightly different fruit fly.

The truth is, just as natural selection doesn't "create" new genetic information that can "create" a new kind of creature from an existing kind, laboratory-manipulated selection doesn't work that way, either.

See "Icons of Evolution" by Jonathan Wells or search "fruitflies" on the Creation-Evolution Encyclopedia at www.pathlights.com

18. Genetics, Orphan Genes and Other Puzzles

Yes, we share the vast majority of our genes with chimps. But we're still entirely different from chimps, except for a few really dogmatic evolutionists who act like them sometimes. But tricks with numbers don't prove we evolved from chimps or share an ancestor. Our genes are really close to the genes of the SPONGE, too. Remind you of relatives who try to sponge off you? Or are they more like chimps?

We have three billion base pairs of DNA in our genome. If we differ from chimps by "only" 3%, that's still 90 million base pairs different, enough coding to fill a long library shelf full of books. To disperse just one "favorable" mutation of one gene through a population would take hundreds of thousands of years; species-to-species change would require millions of favorable mutations, while geneticists aren't really sure that favorable mutations happen in nature. Evolution: busted.

If we're biochemically close to other creatures, including apes, it's because our energy conversion systems are similar, and so is the food we eat. It has to be Biochemically Correct to be digestible.

More anti-evolution evidence from genetics: there's enough DNA in your body to stretch to the moon more than a half-million times. It takes 75 proteins to form DNA but those proteins are made only by DNA. Each of the hundred trillion cells in your body got a distinct, seven-foot strand of DNA coded just right. All by chance? No way.

It goes on: evolutionists say large amounts of non-coding "junk" DNA in humans are leftovers from earlier species, but we know now they are crucial for providing structure and function. About one-fourth of the gene sequences identified for any given species are defined as "orphan" because that species is the ONLY one in which they are found, disproving evolution. The father of genetics, Gregor Mendel, was a devout Christian, who saw God, not chance, in his life's work.

For more, see "Not By Chance!" by Dr. Lee Spetner; IDEA Center, <http://www.acs.ucsd.edu/~idea/> or www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c018.html

19. 'Geologic Column' Myth Is On the Rocks

You know that “Geologic Column” illustration they always have in textbooks and schoolrooms, showing the layers of the Earth, like the mattresses all piled on top of each other in the Princess and the Pea?

In all those rock layers, the illustration shows the “march of progress” from litsy, bitsy, simple creatures down deep in the bottom layer, all the way up to big bodacious vertebrates up top. You got your little junior and senior amoebas down in the Cambrian layer, your “Little Mermaid” critters in the Devonian, your Sinclair dinosaurs in the Jurassic, on up to the Cornhusker football player lookalikes in the, excuse the expression, upper crust.

Anyway . . . that “column” doesn't exist anywhere in the world. Because of erosion and other factors, we can only find part of it here and part of it there. As a concept, it dates back to the work of a Darwin colleague in the 1800s, geologist Charles Lyell, who developed the theory of “uniformitarianism.” That's the idea that the whole Earth is like a layer cake, and rock layers were laid down all over the world gradually, inch by inch, over millions of years.

It was because of the “Geologic Column” that many people believed in evolutionism. They thought those clearly-defined, orderly rock layers were what geologists were finding in the field. The gradual, uniform theory of geology fit nicely with Darwin's theory of gradualism: species evolving into new ones over eons of time.

But geology has since disproven uniformitarianism. They know that catastrophes and other factors have made rock formation extremely variable, not uniform. The earth is not like a layer cake; it's more like what you get when you set off underwater fire-crackers.

Learn about this and other problems fitting evolutionary theory into geological truth with “The Answers Book” edited by Don Batten, search “geologic column” on www.grisda.org or see “Certain Fossils, Geological Features and Phenomena” on www.trueorigin.org/camplist.asp

20. Geology Won't Cooperate With Evolutionism

It's bad enough that the life sciences point away from evolution, not toward it. The other sciences do, too.

Take geology. It just won't cooperate with evolutionism. For evolutionism to "work," the earth must be really, really old so that there has been "enough" time for all that random chance and mutation to have evolved everything to a T. Up until Darwin's time, scientists thought the earth was relatively young and its different and distinct formations mostly came from a big hydraulic catastrophe, like a worldwide flood. The way fossils are found, jumbled together in thick deposits, seems to bear that out.

But in the mid-1800s, Charles Lyell and the theory of "uniformitarianism" came along, that the earth's layers formed gradually and uniformly, over a long period of time, all over the world, like a big, fat, slow-growing layer cake. That theory dovetailed nicely with evolutionism because strata of rocks contained gradually more complex organisms, with relatively simple marine creatures down in the "old" layers and complex vertebrates in the higher layers.

But golly, geology: earth sciences just don't bear that out. Some are coming back around to believing that a worldwide flood, yes, maybe Noah's, is responsible for many of the world's rock formations and other structures, not a uniform, gradual deposition of rocks.

Their laboratories include the Grand Canyon, evidence of the ice ages, coal formations, fossils that inexplicably pierce through different rock strata, ocean trenches, underwater fountains, frozen mammoths found all over the world with silt and gravel in digestive and respiratory tracts indicating death by drowning, and weird mysteries such as the 350-mile long block of Precambrian limestone supposedly 1 billion years old on top of a Cretaceous shale formation, supposedly only 100 million years old.

For more about geology, see "The Collapse of Evolution" by Scott M. Huse or www.answersingenesis.org

21. God and Evolution: Why They Don't Mix

Some people say that God used evolution to complete His creation. God set the wheels in motion with evolutionary processes, they say, but it took millions of years of trial and error to get things just the way He wanted them. This philosophy is called “theistic evolution.”

And it's balderdash.

For the same reasons that Godless evolution can't be true, God-involved evolution can't be true. Just attaching God's name to the theory doesn't erase all the problems involved with evolution. Evolution itself contradicts God's nature, since it is mindless, heartless and purposeless. Those who know God know better.

Theistic evolution compromises the Bible, suggesting that God didn't make the world the way He said He did, getting it right the first time with His supernatural power and perfect love. It turns Adam and Eve into a whimsical myth and Original Sin into a fairy tale. Since the whole point of Jesus' incarnation is the redemption of Adam's line and the forgiveness of sin, evolution undermines Christianity on its face. Just because we can't interpret the words of Genesis doesn't mean they're false: it just means we have more learning to do.

If people are taught that they can disregard God's Word and interpret it any way that suits them in the important area of life's beginning, what's to stop them from disregarding the rest of God's Word, whatever seems unfashionable and inconvenient? If Genesis has to have “spin” put on its plain and simple words to make them acceptable to a world increasingly hostile to God's truth, what else in the Bible can be twisted around to fit a human-centered agenda? The Ten Commandments? The Cross? Isn't that already happening?

For 75 reasons that theistic evolution violates both science and religion, see pp. 276-280 in Walt Brown's textbook, “In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood.” For insight on a God-centered view: www.creationists.org/sword.html For a quick review, see Ralph O. Muncaster's booklet, “Creation Vs. Evolution.”

22. Haeckel's Fudged Embryonic Drawings

Darwin wrote that the strongest proof for evolution in the mid-1800s was the “fact” that embryos of creatures that he thought were descended from a common ancestor all looked very similar and went through much the same developmental phases, repeating the cycles of evolution. This was dubbed “embryonic recapitulation.”

Darwin based his conception on a series of drawings of embryos from different vertebrate species. The drawings were done by German biologist Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919). They became so wildly popular, they were reprinted in just about every science textbook ever published, including many still in use today.

But guess what? Haeckel faked those drawings and we've known it for more than a century. In fact, he was convicted of fraud by a local university for the distortions in his illustrations.

Vertebrate embryos never look as similar as he made them look. Haeckel covered up the fact that the embryos of lizards, birds and mammals can be distinguished from each other at an early stage. He concealed the fact that fish and amphibian embryos look markedly different from the first three at the same stage. Haeckel ignored the fact that vertebrates look distinctly different in the very early stages of cleavage and gastrulation; that difference alone should be enough to have disproved a common ancestor. But Haeckel left that out.

When confronted about this hoax and why it's still in textbooks, evolutionists often blame textbook writers, who “dumb down” technical scientific content for the student audience.

The thing is, who knows how many people's ideas about evolution are influenced or even based on this hoax? Even some scientists aren't aware of the hoax. Guess you'd have to say that honesty, in evolutionary biology, is sometimes still in the embryonic stage.

For more: see “Icons of Evolution” by Jonathan Wells or search “Haeckel's embryos” on www.icr.org or www.trueorigin.org

23. Hoaxes and Put-Ons and Frauds: Oh, My!

In our world, for every major fraud that's uncovered, there are thousands of smaller ones that stay secret. Outright hoaxes, deliberate misinterpretations and small twists of fact can add up to big lies. The self-serving manipulation of data goes on in the world of science in general and evolution in particular:

- Piltown Man was acclaimed as the “missing link” between apes and men for 40 years until it was discovered that the fragments of ape-like lower jaw “discovered” near the human skull were actually bones chemically treated to look like fossils with teeth filed down to look human.

- Ramapithecus was a handful of teeth and jaw fragments, pieced together by Louis Leakey in the same shape as human teeth and touted as an ape-man missing link. Since then it has been reassembled properly in the U-shaped jaw of the extinct relative of the orangutan that Ramapithecus was.

- Nebraska Man fossil finds turned up as cave man illustrations in newspapers and at the Scopes Monkey Trial. But Nebraska Man turned out to be merely an artist's rendering based on a single tooth, not a whole skeleton. To top it off, the tooth turned out to have been from an extinct pig. Oink-credible!

- Peking Man: monkey skulls were found with tools and human bones. It turned out not to be a missing link, but dinner. In China, then and now, people eat monkey brains. Ew! Ew! Ew!

- Java Man: In Java in the 1890s, Dutch anatomist Eugene Dubois found two bones 39 feet apart, a skullcap and a femur. Evolutionists claimed an ape-human intermediate until Dubois admitted he'd deliberately not reported the presence of other bones that debunked the “missing link” theory.

- Neanderthal Man, based on stooped-over “cave man” bones discovered in 1856, turned out to be human bones deformed by disease, not an “example” of ape-man evolutionary linkage.

- Australopithecus, or “Lucy,” was no lady: she knuckle-walked.

For more examples, see either of the “Bones of Contention” books in RESOURCES, review www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-323.htm or search the index at www.creation-science.com

24. Horses: Reining In An Evolutionary “Whoa”

If somebody tries to tell you that Eohippus and all those other fossil horses prove that evolution really happened, here’s what to say:

“Neigh.”

You’ve seen the textbook drawings of skulls from the tiny little Eohippus with its toes up through three or four intermediate horses to the final animal Equus with its broad, flat hooves. But this is another subjective evolutionary theory whose horsepower peters out once the facts are exposed. Extinct horses have been mischaracterized as evolutionary ancestors of the horse that were somehow like horses, but not horses. We’ve known since the 1920s that horses don’t evolve, and, as they say: “A horse is a horse.” Here’s how we know:

- There is no single place in the world where these successive “horse” body plans are found. Instead, the fossils have been collected from several different continents and lumped together for the illustrations as if they were sequential. How can you be in sequence if you’re half a world away from your “ancestor”?
- Eohippus fossils have been found close to Equus fossil, showing that they lived at the same time and one couldn’t have evolved from the other. Now, that’s a horse of a different color.
- The illustrations usually show just the leg bones and skulls of the links in this “horse evolution chain.” That’s deceptive. What’s left out is the fact that the number of ribs and backbone segments they have varies randomly, not following an evolutionary sequence. You have to look at the big picture first, before you scrutinize details and make judgments based on them, or else you’re just . . . putting the cart before the horse.

For more on ways that evolutionists are horsing around with the facts with fossil horses and in other areas, see “Icons of Evolution” by Jonathan Wells, www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4117.asp or search “Eohippus” on www.bible.ca/tracks/

25. Intelligent Design

Intelligent Design is, too, science that belongs in our public-school classrooms and is, not, religion wrapped up in scientific-sounding terms. It's more scientific than evolution because it's falsifiable.

Intelligent Design is a scientific theory of life's origins and development that is based on cold, hard scientific fact just like other branches of science are. It incorporates biology, biochemistry, anatomy, physiology, mathematics, physics, and many more scientific disciplines. It has empirical tests, while evolution is a lot of inference.

The theory dates to 1802, when British theologian William Paley wrote that when you see a watch, you assume there has been a watchmaker; it didn't just come together by accident. The same thing goes with the amazing creation we see all around us, and the assumption that it had to have been designed by God.

Intelligent Design went dormant for many decades after Darwin published his work in the mid-1800s, but in recent years, as scientific advancements reveal the sheer complexity of life and the befuddling problems, paradoxes and puzzles of evolutionism, Intelligent Design has come to the fore as an accurate, logical way to detect and describe the precise order of the complex structures of life.

There is a wealth of background information available, but don't miss the books on the subject by William Dembski, and these sites:

www.discovery.org

www.intelligentdesignnetwork.org

www.idurc.org

http://arn.org/id_faq.htm

<http://www.acs.ucsd.edu/~idea>

Finally, here is a good resource to share with school officials and elected school-board members on the local and statewide levels:

www.arn.org/docs/dewolf/guidebook.htm

("Intelligent Design in Public School Science Curricula: A Legal Guidebook" by David K. DeWolf, Stephen C. Meyer and Mark E. DeForrest, Foundation for Thought and Ethics)

25. Irreducible Complexity & Specified Complexity

Evolution is most clearly disproved when one understands the reality of “irreducible complexity” of life.

Everything that is alive has many interacting parts. Each part contributes to some function of the organism. Some of those functions are relatively simple, but most are incredibly complex. Without one individual part, the whole function could not work.

Think of a mousetrap: platform, spring, hammer, catcher and holding bar. Would it work at all, if any one of those interacting parts were missing or not the right size, shape, made of the right materials, compatibly matched with adjoining parts, and so on and so forth? No. A mousetrap is irreducibly complex.

Now think how much more complex than a mousetrap anything that is alive is. In fact, life is irreducibly complex down to the molecular level. Think how incredibly complex the eye is, and the brain, and blood-clotting and breastfeeding. Random chance? No way.

Once you begin to see how complex a feather is, you realize that there's no way enough of that extremely rare phenomenon, positive random mutations, could have happened in the right sequence, by the hundreds or even thousands, to have produced a feather. Yet without lots of feathers, a bird can't fly, stay warm or swim buoyantly.

See www.discovery.org and don't miss the writings of these three scientists, who are key leaders in the intelligent design movement and explain irreducible complexity with irresistible clarity:

- Michael J. Behe, “Darwin's Black Box,” with a fascinating description of the irreducible complexities of a bacterial flagellum.
- William A. Dembski, “Intelligent Design: The Bridge Between Science and Theology,” with great information about DNA.
- Michael Denton, “Evolution: A Theory in Crisis,” who makes a strong case against evolution with a biological marvel: the feather.

27. Kansas Standards: What Really Happened

In August 1999 the Kansas State Board of Education voted to take evolution out of the statewide learning standards and assessments.

The elected board voted to reject statewide testing standards that would have forced students to regurgitate Darwin's theory, positioning it as fact. The education board felt that was unfair, since all the contradictions, hoaxes, misinterpretations and puzzles involved in the theory of evolutionism were not required to be taught. The board thought true science ought to be subjected to logical questioning and criticism, and if it didn't hold up, it wasn't true science.

The board was trying to put the issue of how to teach evolution back into the hands of local schools. The idea was to let teachers who wanted to teach contradictory evidence, of which there is plenty, to be able to do so. No teacher would be restricted from teaching evolution theory, either. The students merely wouldn't be tested on the intricacies of that theory on statewide tests. They still could be tested locally, of course. The ed board reasoned that that the pro-evolution standards gave the appearance of governmental endorsement of evolution, so removing state enforcement of the standards via statewide tests would give schools academic freedom.

Somehow, this got distorted into "Kansas banned evolution."

International ridicule, political smear campaigns and widespread propaganda forced a few changes on the ed board. Voters were told that Kansas high school graduates wouldn't be able to get into good colleges and land good jobs because their views on science wouldn't be "competitive." Translation: they wouldn't be "up to state specs."

Sure enough, on Feb. 14, 2001, the newly-formed board voted again and this time, put the evolution standards back into the state governmental requirements. It was an unfortunate win for censorship.

The same fight is going on all over the country. To learn how to win it, see the book "Kansas Tornado" by Paul Ackerman and Bob Williams.

28. Micro Vs. Macro?

Change happens within a given species, down the generations, due to genetic reshuffling of existing genetic information. No question about it. Mama has freckles? One or more of her offspring might have them, too. Or maybe not. Depends on how the genes shake out.

Scientists have taken to calling this process “microevolution.” Although that’s a misleading term, no one disputes that the genetic reproductive process creates variation in generations of offspring. It has caused a gigantic misunderstanding because of imprecise terms.

Now things have gotten more mixed up. There has been an unfortunate endorsement of “macroevolution,” or change between species, because of the universal acceptance of “microevolution,” change within species. We should be discussing and critiquing the “theory of macroevolution.” The prefix “macro” implies a large scale. Then the term would be more accurate and the public wouldn’t get confused over what evolutionists are claiming vs. nonevolutionists.

As an example of the confusing these terms cause, teachers may use an example of microevolution going on — such as squash bugs and potato beetles developing insecticide resistance — but from that example, students (and, often, teachers) infer that macroevolution is going on all the time, too. But when bugs develop insecticide resistance, they stay bugs. They don’t “evolve.” They remain the same species. They just reshuffle from the genetic deck they’ve been dealt. No new cards are added! The fact that bugs have “evolved” resistance to insecticides is like equatorial humans “evolving” dark brown skin . . . but they stayed human, they didn’t “evolve” into squash bugs or potato beetles. Boy, would evolutionists have the NAACP on their case if they claimed THAT!

For more, see “Darwin on Trial” by Phillip E. Johnson. For an interesting look at how the micro- and macro- confusion is hurting the dissemination of scientific truth in the mass media, see:

www.ccase.org/alda.htm

29. Miller-Urey Experiment: Life Didn't Begin in Some Weird Soup

I've made soup with some funky ingredients in my time, but the "primordial soup" in which evolutionists claim life began was so funky, it couldn't even have existed. Now, THAT'S some unusual soup!

Why do the science textbooks still tell kids that experimenters in the 1950s produced "the building blocks of life" in an experiment that replicated the "primordial soup" of the Earth's early environment with ammonia, water, hydrogen and methane, transforming molecules into life with simulated lightning? That's not soup. That's nuts.

Almost all scientists today agree that the early atmosphere was substantially different from what the famous experimenters, graduate student Stanley Miller and his Ph.D. advisor, Harold Urey, used in 1953 at the University of Chicago.

Geochemists and geophysicists know the experiment wasn't accurate because it didn't have any oxygen in that "soup." There are "red beds" of iron among the oldest rocks ever excavated that show oxidation, proving that plenty of oxygen was present. They think it came up when the volcanoes burped, or, as the scientists put it so elegantly, "outgassed." Geologists have rocks dated at 3.7 billion years that show Earth had an oxygenic atmosphere.

The key is this: Miller-Urey relied on glassed-in laboratory beakers in their experiment, for their own safety. That's because if any oxygen sneaked in to their manmade "soup," there would have been . . . issues. If there had been any oxygen in the primordial soup that evolutionists want us to believe existed, then a little spark, like a lightning strike, wouldn't have made a living cell. It would have made the whole shebang go "KABLOOEY!" But it's taught as fact anyway.

There are many more reasons evolutionists aren't being "soup-er" honest with this one. See Jonathan Wells' www.iconsofevolution.com or "Hasn't Life Been Created in the Lab?" on www.icr.org

30. Misleading Illustrations

There's an illustration that purports to show the progressive evolution that supposedly happened to transform apes into humans. It once was in all the textbooks and up on school walls as a poster. Over to the far left we have a knuckle-walking chimp, then a taller knuckle-walker, then a "Planet of the Apes" guy, then a person who still believes in evolu . . . I mean, a Neanderthal, then a Fred Flintstone type, and finally, the pinnacle of development, a University of Nebraska Cornhusker football player.

Just kidding. But you're probably familiar with the "March of Progress" illustration or poster. It was intended to show that humans and animals are linked closely together in the evolutionary chain gang.

That illustration has made countless millions of people think evolution was a done deal. If evolution hadn't been proved and if those intermediate skeletons shown in the illustrations hadn't really been found and studied and well-established as intermediate links, why would "they" publish that illustration, and keep publishing it?

Because it's a propaganda poster, like the ones they have in those "planned spontaneous" demonstrations in communist countries. The "March of Life" poster vastly overstates the evidence. It gives people the impression that human origins have been directly traced to ape-like creatures. In fact, the "hominids" touted by the evolutionists as possible ape-human links are for the most part just a few bone fragments from extinct gorillas. There is not a shred of evidence that humans and apes ever were anything but what they are today: two completely distinct species.

Evolutionists say the "March of Life" poster is helpful for children because it simplifies evolutionary concepts for them. In the same way, the "geological column" illustration mischaracterizes the fossil record and shouldn't be shown to children, but it simplifies things for teachers. Deceptive art, it seems, is a political tool. Sigh.

For more on propaganda art: "Icons of Evolution" by Jonathan Wells.

31. Missing Links Still Missing

Evolutionists used to describe evolutionary ancestry as being like a linked chain. But then they couldn't find any "links," or intermediates, between species. The links they turned up didn't hold up to scientific scrutiny: Archaeopteryx, the bird-dinosaur "link," was just a bird. Coelacanth, the fish-reptile, was 100 percent fish.

No links? No chain! Under fire, evolutionists changed their metaphor into a branching bush. But still, whole sections of each branch are missing. It would be as if there were clusters of leaves hovering up in the trees not connected to the trunk by branches. But, the way evolutionists see things, just because there's no evidence of any branches doesn't mean there weren't any branches." Say what?

The fossil record's distinct lack of intermediate species, or "missing links," is very strong evidence AGAINST macroevolution. If it were true, then we should be finding more fossils of intermediates than fossils of final forms. Since we aren't, it must not be true.

As for missing links, consider these excerpts from "Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics," by Norman L. Geisler:

"In the century and a half since Darwin wrote (1859), millions of fossils have been unearthed. But the 'missing links' needed to confirm his theory have not been found. In fact, some species thought to be transitional have been found not to be real transitional fossils after all, so that the record is actually more bleak today than in Darwin's time! Harvard paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould has confessed that 'The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however, reasonable, not the evidence of fossils.'" (Gould, "Evolution's Erratic Pace," Natural History, 1972)

For more, see "Bones of Contention" by Marvin Lubenow or www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c029.html

32. Mt. St. Helen's and Why It's Important

The theory of evolution requires the passage of millions and millions of years to allow enough time for lots of little changes to add up to lots of big changes. When science suggests that the impressive structures of the earth might have formed a lot more recently than that, it renders their theory impossible. But we now know that rock strata, canyons and fossils are not necessarily formed over a long time. Geology is showing us that they can form virtually overnight with natural catastrophes, as we see with the eruption of the volcano at Mount St. Helens in Washington State in 1982 gave us a good example of how quickly natural forces can change the landscape.

The explosion blew off the top 1,300 feet of the mountain, yet this was a tiny volcano without even any lava. The mud and debris from the volcano sloshed into Spirit Lake, sending a wave 900 feet up the slope, shearing off trees and making an immense jumbled mess.

Mt. St. Helens is important because it shows us the incredible power of the magma, the rock-forming molten material beneath the earth's surface. It makes even the atom bomb seem puny. Mt. St. Helens looks like a mini-Grand Canyon. But it only took five days to develop.

Indeed, when you learn about the Grand Canyon, you see that it had to have been caused by a lot of water, most of it coming from the magma, BELOW. That's what tilted the rock up and aside, sheared off the sides, moved titanic boulders miles away . . . all processes that couldn't have happened slowly and gradually. The "cake layers" of the sediments are laid down nice and flat, almost perfectly horizontally. Wind erosion alone over millions of years would have left far more irregular surfaces. The Grand Canyon's had to have formed underwater, and with very little time break between layers. The Grand Canyon's walls had to have been caused by a cataclysm, and by studying Mt. St. Helens, underwater landslides and other modern-day mini-equivalents, we can see that.

For more, see "Creation: Facts of Life" by Gary Parker, or search "Mt. St. Helens" on www.answersingenesis.org

33. Mutations: Impossible M.O.

Police detectives like to know a crook's method of operation, or *modus operandi*, M.O. for short. Evolutionists would like you to believe that genetic mutation, defined as sudden and relatively permanent chromosomal change, was the M.O. of evolution. But they should be under arrest. That couldn't have happened.

Mutations reduce genetic information. They are "mistakes" that result in net losses to the organism, not net gains. If mutations really were the method of evolution, then they would add to genetic information and provide the structure for creative, complex changes. But the vast majority of mutations don't improve things. They mess things up.

Mutations aren't creative. They're pathological . . . literally.

How did so many people swallow the idea that mutations caused evolution between species? Did they watch too many sci-fi flicks with weird-looking mutants or something? No. And we shouldn't blame Darwin, whose theory was developed more than 150 years ago before so many scientific advancements showed the limitations of mutation. The truth is, we have only ourselves to blame for weak and dubious science textbooks and class discussions that uncritically present mutation as evolution's method.

This should be the mantra of every biology students: mutations can produce variation, but not evolution. There are lines that mutations can never cross. Mutations are the result of slightly altered genes but never have and never will produce new genes. Mutations merely reflect fluctuations within the structural frame of a given species . . . not creative change providing previously non-existent functions, and never large-scale change to a new species altogether.

For more information, see Michael Behe's book "Darwin's Black Box," or "In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood," by Walt Brown, Ph.D., Center for Scientific Creation, www.creationscience.com or www.creationists.org

34. Natural Selection

The term “natural selection,” as used by an evolutionist, refers to the idea that individuals in a group of like organisms who have certain characteristics that are more valuable to a species will tend to survive and produce more offspring than those individuals who lack them.

The idea is that certain variations have more “survival value.” Those with those variations will tend to survive and reproduce more than others, thus changing the composition of the whole group. No argument there: this hypothesis actually was first stated by creationist Edward Blyth a quarter-century before Darwin published his book.

However, “natural selection” as the mechanism for evolution implies a power to choose one thing over another and the power to give an advantage. But if natural selection were truly the driver of differences between species, conferring unique advantages to allow them survival, why would any species still have weaknesses? Why, for instance, would deer have scent glands that allow them to keep track of one another, but give them away to their predators, too?

Natural selection could not have been the creative force that “made” anything at all. Consider the panda’s thumb, a bony stick-like appendage unique to the panda. It allows a panda to strip off the hard bark from its one food, bamboo, so that the delicious, chewy interior can be ingested. While everyone can agree that the panda’s thumb is a good adaptation to the environment, there are diverging opinions as to how that thumb might have gotten there. The evolutionists say it “evolved” out of necessity. The Intelligent Design and creation science communities say that mutation and natural selection are incapable of generating specific new information in the DNA, targeted toward a goal or purpose, to create an adaptation like that thumb. Its existence “proves” design, to the latter scientists.

Good explanations of how natural selection works are found in the textbook “Exploring Creation With Biology” by Jay L. Wile and Marilyn F. Durnell, or for more scholarly treatments, search for “Natural Selection” on www.arn.org

35. Nature Disproves Evolution

Nature's finest specimens debunk evolution because it's impossible to believe that things like these just evolved out of nowhere:

1. Blood will clot when exposed to air, and if it didn't, animals and people would bleed to death over a small scratch. If blood clotting evolved gradually, step by step, over time, wouldn't we all be dead before it could keep us alive?
2. The ant lion digs a two-inch pit in sandy soil and waits at the bottom for ants to fall in. The pit has a security alarm system that's sensitive to the slightest vibration. The ant lion has horn-like anchors to gran onto the soil while it grabs the trapped prey with its big mandibles, and to pierce the ant with its tube-like mouth inject a paralyzing drug and then a digestive drug to "drink" up the innards of the prey. There's no water around the sand pits and it's hot, but the ant lion has an impermeable skin that keeps his body moisture in and he even recycles his urine, like an astronaut.
3. Mammalian breastfeeding is a wonder, all orchestrated by perfectly-timed hormone releases throughout pregnancy and in the early post-partum, with skin, tissue and other structures of both mother and infant in perfect coordination.
4. Symbiotic relationships debunk evolutionism because of the amazing interplay of compound, complex traits between two organisms. For example, the remora fish, or sharksucker has a dorsal fin modified in the shape of a suction disk that the fish uses to attach to a larger fish, sea-turtles, or ships. Remora's suction power is so strong that, in some parts of the world, lines are attached to their tails and lowered into the water to fish for sea turtles. Remora eat scraps from the fish they attach to. But they don't just get a free ride and free food in this way. It's a truly symbiotic relationship as they, in turn, remove parasites from their bigger buddies.

For more examples to show that the theory of gradual evolution is impossible, see the "Nature" section at www.evolution-facts.org

36. Paleontology's Dirty Little Secret

Paleontology — the study of the fossilized remains of people, plants and animals — hinges on the ages assigned to what's found. The older a date, the more valuable the fossil becomes and the more prestige, publications and power flow to the finder and patrons.

Like dating between people, the fossil-dating process is subjective. Dates for one fossil may be based on assumed dates for others nearby, as with the recent Toumai find in Chad. Testing labs routinely ask how old the sample is expected to be. Think about it: when someone who makes his living digging up fossils takes one that obviously looks special to a laboratory where he is a key customer, are they going to tell him the "find" he has been seeking for 25 years is only a few thousand years old? Or are they going to throw out results that aren't "appropriate," blame "contamination" of those samples, and keep "testing" until they come up with a favorable date? Reportedly, thousands of "bad" dates are routinely thrown out. "Lab-shopping" is common. And confounding discrepancies between tests point to credibility problems: lava rocks from volcanoes less than 200 years old, for example, have been dated as old as 3.5 million years.

Suggestion to defeat evolutionary stereotypes: double-blind tests, where the labs don't know who a sample's from or how old it's supposed to be, and it comes to them in the form of anonymous powder instead of the fossil itself. Blind dates may be best after all! Solutions are still sought for other problems with dating methods: Radioactive materials may have decayed a lot faster in the past, so things might "test" a lot older than they really are. No one can be sure how much of the radioactive substance was in the fossil's body when it died, so results aren't certain. No one can be sure if contamination was a factor.

See the booklet, "Does Carbon Dating Disprove the Bible?" on www.answersingenesis.com, the book "The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods" by John Woodmorappe, or search for "dating methods" on www.reasons.org for review of the old-earth perspectives and www.trueorigin.org/camplist.asp for young-earth points of view.

37. Peppered Moths: A Theory Not Worth Its Salt

Years ago, a Nebraska photographer named John Savage won a Pulitzer Prize for his adorable picture of a leaping spring lamb. The story BEHIND the story is that to get the picture with the lamb's legs curled under just so, he had a friend THROW the lamb off the end of a truck. Don't worry, animal-rights activists: the lamb was unharmed.

Sometimes, staging photographs is OK. But when it comes to matters of establishing scientific truth, it is absolutely not.

This happened with the famous photos of British biologist Bernard Kettlewell's peppered moths on tree trunks in the 1950s. Evolutionists claim these moths "evolved" from mostly light gray to mostly dark as the trees were darkened by industrial smoke in England. The experiments were fixed and the photos were staged fakes. And yet they are frequently used as "proof" of evolution.

Peppered moths normally don't rest on tree trunks. They rest up higher, under horizontal branches, hidden from sight. They are night-fliers and day-sleepers. But they were released during the day in these experiments, making them sitting ducks for predatory birds.

What's worse, in many cases DEAD moths were GLUED or PINNED to tree trunks, or placed on the trunks manually during the day when they are torpid, like most people who still believe in evolutionism (a little moth humor there) to get those textbook pictures. No wonder the birds picked off the ones with less camouflage. It was staged.

The peppered moth tall tale is still in many biology textbooks in use in today's high school and college classrooms. In fact, in a review of 10 recent biology textbooks, dated 1998 or later, eight published the pictures and repeated the story with little or no acknowledgement of the flaws, one told the story without the pictures, and one ignored it ("Icons of Evolution" by Jonathan Wells).

For more on how natural genetic reshuffling of moth color was misinterpreted as "survival of the fittest" and evolutionary change, search "peppered moths" on www.icr.org

38. Punctuated Equilibrium

Darwin's theory of long, gradual, uniform evolution was discarded by many scientists in the last century because the millions of transitional fossils needed to prove it was true never turned up. Instead, scientists found a lot of complex creatures such as trilobites in what's called "biology's big bang," or the Cambrian Explosion, without a trace of evolutionary ancestry. Instead of admitting that this points toward creation the way the Big Bang theory of astronomy does, a few evolutionists led by the late Stephen Jay Gould came up with:

Punctuated equilibrium.

It goes something like this: Species evolve from one to another really, really quickly – poof! – in fact, so quickly that there isn't time for any evidence of these massive species-to-species changes to pile up.

The "equilibrium," or amount of time a species remains the same, is really, really long, and the "punctuated" amount of time during which change takes place is relatively brief. But it happens so fast, there isn't enough time for any fossils of these quickly-changing transitional varieties to have formed. So we know it's true but we can't prove it.

The public asks: Oh. Evolution happened so fast, if fossil collectors blink, they miss it? There's no evidence or documentation of it because nobody thought to bring a camera the day that punctuated equilibrium evolved different species?

Evolutionists answer: Cameras hadn't evolved yet. (A little evolutionism humor there.) No, even though we don't have any evidence for punctuated equilibrium, it must have happened.

Why?

The only other explanation is creation, and that can't have happened.

Oh, yeah? For more on this topic, see books by Dembski, Behe or Denton listed in RESOURCES.

39. School Science Standards

Isn't school supposed to be objective? Isn't it supposed to expose students to all sides of the issues? Isn't it supposed to equip them to be wise citizens and critical thinkers by teaching them about people who weren't wise, and ideas that didn't hold up to impartial criticism?

Isn't it fair to ask our schools to teach the puzzles, mysteries and holes in any scientific topic or issue? So shouldn't our standards on how schools should teach one of the controversies of our time, the theory of evolution, require that?

Likewise, shouldn't kids be taught the solid science behind intelligent design and creationism, because there's plenty of it, along with those theories' particular implausibilities or things we don't yet understand? Who could be against that?

Unfortunately, the science standards in most states constitute viewpoint discrimination, the censoring of dissent, in the way they favor the theory of evolution at the expense of the alternative theories. Public opinion is clearly on the side of those who wish the full range of scientific viewpoints to be taught, as the 2002 Zogby poll showed (71% of Americans want biology teachers to teach the evidence against evolution, too). Evolutionists appear to be the only ones who want to censor the anti-evolution information.

On a level playing field, evolutionism would be exposed for what it is, and evolutionists would evolve a big, red "L" on their foreheads. They must know that. That's why they oppose fair and square standards.

There has been action in Washington to try to encourage better science standards, especially by Sen. Rick Santorum. Thanks to victories in places such as Cobb County, Ga., his common-sense approach won out and is gaining fair standards "the Big Mo."

For more about standards battles in states such as Kansas and Ohio, click "Sci. Standards" on www.intelligentdesignnetwork.org or search "standards" or "Santorum" on www.discovery.org

40. Science & Religion Do Mix

Here's what to say if someone says only stupid people who don't understand science believe in creation: "It doesn't take a rocket scientist to see that evolutionism isn't true; the most famous rocket scientist in the world, Wernher von Braun, was a creationist." That ought to send 'em to the moon, which is what von Braun did.

The more you study the works of creation scientists, the more you see how much sense they make. Although they are far from being able to explain every detail of the universe and there are still plenty of hotbeds of controversy in their ranks, there is at least as much validity to their claims as those of the evolutionary biologists. The idea that God made the universe and everything in it proves out with solid scientific backing at least as often as, if not more often than, the idea that everything evolved all by itself by random chance and mutation, as evolutionists contend.

Those who think religion interferes with science may not really understand either. They don't interfere; they're intertwined, just as religion and literature are intertwined, and religion and art, and religion and politics. One helps us understand the other and put things in context overall a little better. That's all.

Science and religion are not mutually exclusive. They don't have to be kept separate. Science can, and should, be used to challenge religious claims. Bible believers welcome that . . . because not a word in the Bible has ever been shown to be false, scientifically or otherwise. Science can't make the same claim. But Bible believers still understand and appreciate the contributions of science. Too bad it doesn't work the other way around. Maybe someday, it will.

For more on these key issues, see "The Fingerprint of God" by Hugh Ross; "On the Seventh Day: 40 Scientists and Academics Explain Why They Believe in God" edited by John F. Ashton; one of the Ralph O. Muncaster booklets listed in RESOURCES, or www.biblicalcreation.org

41. Science Class: Teaching About Evolution

Nobody's saying that the theory of evolution shouldn't be taught in science class. It's so widespread that of course, it should be taught. But it shouldn't be taught as the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Because it isn't, it never was, and it doesn't look to ever be.

Scientific theories should be taught "warts and all." That means the weaknesses, inconsistencies, flaws and problems of evolution need to be taught right along with the elements of the theory that make it so believable to so many people. But the negative truth does not come out in the vast majority of public-school science classrooms. The theory of evolution is all too often taught as incontrovertible fact.

A quality science classroom would include such content as:

Evolution is based on scientific naturalism, the belief system that excludes any kind of supernatural or divine influence in the world. This is why evolutionists have to twist the facts and skirt a lot of scientific truth in order to promote the idea of life without God's direction. Make sure kids get the story behind the story.

Leading evolutionists, including the late Stephen Jay Gould of Harvard, have acknowledged that major features of living things, such as feathers, hearts and eyes, are beyond the reach of natural selection acting on heritable mutation, which casts doubt on the veracity of evolution. Kids deserve to know that.

World-renowned scientists such as Francis Crick, Nobel laureate for his work on DNA, say there doesn't appear to be any reasonable explanation for the origin of life on earth, so those who teach kids that life sprang from inert chemicals are flat-out wrong. Kids need to know evolution's foes are smart.

For more on this important topic, see the chapter "Science or Myth?" in the book "Icons of Evolution" by Jonathan Wells, or the article, "The Teaching of Evolution in the Science Curriculum," on www.parentcompany.com/csrf/teachevo.htm

42. Scopes Monkey Trial

Most people think they know what happened at the 1925 Scopes Monkey Trial because they saw the 1955 movie made about it, "Inherit the Wind," with Spencer Tracy. But the movie was a gross distortion, full of unjust stereotypes and errors of fact.

The trial involved a Dayton, Tenn., high school biology teacher, John Scopes, who volunteered to be arrested for teaching evolution in violation of a unknown and unenforced state law. He was induced to do so by the same American Civil Liberties Union provocateurs who incite so many media circuses today. All Scopes risked was a fine.

Scopes was defended by the shrewd legal showman Clarence Darrow. Three-time unsuccessful presidential candidate William Jennings Bryan, a few days before his death, represented the people.

Even so, Bryan won the case. But just enough doubt was cast on the issue and public opinion was swayed just enough to begin the long, slippery slope to where we are now: evolutionism as the standard for life's origin and development, and creation on the outside looking in.

Among the movie's many false images: it showed Scopes in jail but he never spent a second in jail; it showed a lynch mob ready to hang Scopes but in fact he was honored at a banquet next to Bryan; the key evidence for evolution at the trial, "Nebraska Man," was not a missing link but a hoax but that wasn't included in the movie, and finally, the movie showed the jury returning a "guilty" verdict, when in fact Darrow pled Scopes guilty to try to avoid a closing statement by Bryan, which Darrow knew would be excellent.

Scopes' conviction was eventually overturned on a technicality.

The trial wasn't so damaging. It was the agenda-spurred motion picture and the power of Hollywood imagery that created polarization in the public's mind between science and religion.

For more on this trial, see "Tornado in a Junkyard" by James Perloff.

43. Spontaneous Generation: Oh, Really?

Darwin theorized in 1859 that life must have evolved from nonliving chemicals and then evolved into more and more complex organisms from there. However, decades later, French bacteriologist Louis Pasteur proved that life cannot spring from nonlife.

Until Pasteur, the spontaneous generation of life was widely believed to be true for microorganisms, which were supposed normally to develop from non-living organic material. The launchpad of evolutionism, abiogenesis, or life from nonlife, was taken away.

Evolutionists like to say that their theory doesn't cover life's origin. They say the theory of evolution just explains how life evolved into so many different kinds and forms.

The trouble is, we're all just a bunch of big chemistry sets. Even the smallest living thing is an amazing mix of intricately-organized, perfectly-synchronized chemicals. That complexity down to the cell level wasn't understood in Darwin's day, so he can be excused. The question is, how do cells and the bigger structures they form get into that intricate, perfect order? By chance . . . or by God?

Now zoom in scope upward, many Mv''6w, difM8w68, fc'a'?B, bw, like Mv''6w, to MvfM8w68, fc

The quea, level Mv''isd6w, zoom Mv''8w68, s Mv''B, thd. Mv'6', The Mv''6w'6w, big Mv''6waamaz

44. Students Asking Questions

Out of the mouths of babes come words of . . . you know what. Probably the wisest course of action for parents is to give solid information on the evolutionism controversy to their children, and encourage them to ask good questions of their science teachers, district curriculum chiefs, school-board members and the public.

Teenagers are testifying before school-board hearings, meeting with curriculum writers, lobbying state senators, writing letters to the editor, attending state education board hearings, giving interviews to national magazines, developing their own websites . . . it's exciting to see young people taking the lead in this controversy.

Here's some guidance if you want to join the fray:

Danny Phillips, a teenager in Denver, got people thinking, including some national media people who finally recognized their own bias:

www.rae.org/danny.html

The Institute for Creation Research has developed 33 outstanding questions that a teenager in high school or college could ask of a science teacher, district staff or school board in asking for more objective curriculum and instruction in the critical study of evolutionism. See "Why Should Evolution Be Immune From Critical Analysis in the Science Classroom?" on:

www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-282.htm

Students in grades 6-12 may obtain this study guide by Dr. Jonathan Sarfati from the Creation Education Center and share it with your teacher and classmates:

www.answersingenesis.org/cec/sy2001/2-1.asp

Also check the Intelligent Design and Evolution Awareness Club:
<http://www-ac.s.ucsd.edu/~idea/>

45. Teachers, Beware the Propaganda Push

Teachers and students should be aware of alleged distortions and bias in the evolution guidebook published by the National Academy of Sciences, "Teaching About Evolution and the Nature of Science."

The booklet contends that there is "overwhelming" evidence to support evolutionism. Overwhelming? As in, scientists are FAINTING under the weight of all that pro-evolutionism data?

NOT! If anything is overwhelming, it is the sense of sadness over seeing this organization getting so mixed up in propaganda and censorship that it could promulgate such balderdash. Teachers need to know that the National Academy of Sciences has been criticized for a distorted report on climate change that aligns with the United Nations' positions (www.john-daily.com/singer2.htm) and for having unbalanced committees with a lack of real or potential conflicts of interest. Don't let a fancy-sounding name blind you to bias.

For more specific, point-by-point dismantling of the booklet, see:

Refuting Evolution, Dr. Jonathan Sarfati, Australian physical chemist; responded to the evolution guidebook published by the National Academy of Sciences with a book of his own. See a review at www.trueorigin.org/sarfrev01.asp and read or download a free study guide at www.answersingenesis.org/docs/4059.asp

Teachers and students also should note the heavy criticism given to the fall 2001 series on evolution on PBS/NOVA for being one-sided propaganda that made fact errors and basically ignored legitimate criticism of evolution from other scientists. The eight-hour special is combined in a marketing campaign with in-school programs, subsidized curriculum, videos and an interactive website.

For a background in the critiques of the PBS series, see:

www.reviewevolution.com

search "PBS Evolution" on www.discovery.com

buy the "Creation" CD-ROM from www.answersingenesis.com

46. The Top 10 Doo-Dahs in Textbooks

In Jonathan Wells' book "Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong," he suggests that there be "warning labels" put in biology textbooks so that teachers and students can be aware of the 10 most common myths or misrepresentations about evolution that have been taught down the generations. Let's call them "doo-dahs" for short:

1. The Miller-Urey experiment did not produce life from nonlife
2. Darwin's Tree of Life metaphor has been chopped down
3. Similar homology from common ancestry is debunked by genetics
4. Doctored embryo drawings were a hoax, not proof
5. Archaeopteryx wasn't really a feathered dinosaur
6. Peppered moth photos were staged
7. Finch beaks don't prove evolution, but normal genetic reshuffling
8. Fruit fly mutants are disabled and less "fit," not more
9. Fossil horses evolved? That claim should go out to pasture
10. Artist's renderings of ape-man "missing links" are fictional

Parents can use this list to "debrief" their children on those "doo-dahs" that are in their textbooks. Be sure to share the list with your child's teacher, as well, and school-board members if you are bold enough to follow through and see about changing curriculum.

Probably the most useful thing parents can do is serve on a textbook selection committee. Most districts select new science textbooks every few years. Why not push for a more objective science text as primary or supplemental, that covers the problems of evolutionism as well as the evidence for Intelligent Design and creation? Examples:

Of Pandas and People: The Central Questions of Biological Origins, Dean H. Kenyon and Percival Davis

Evolution: Lies in the Textbooks, video, www.drdino.com

In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood, Walt Brown, Ph.D., www.creationscience.com

Exploring Creation With Biology, Dr. Jay L. Wile and Marilyn F. Durnell, www.high-schoolscience.com

47. 'Tree of Life' Idea Is Chopped Down

In the mid-1850s, Charles Darwin suggested that all living things descended from the same ancestor. He called this the "great Tree of Life." The oldest, simplest organisms were at the roots and the most divergent, most complex ones were up at the top and out at the sides.

Made sense. The trouble is, it isn't true. The fossil record starts with the abrupt appearance of fully-formed phyla and classes of animals in "Biology's Big Bang," the Cambrian Explosion. Before that, all that's been found has been single-celled organisms with a few multicellular ones . . . far from Darwin's long history of gradually-diverging change.

Generations of children who were brought up thinking that the diversity of life arose like a tree now had the image of the "Tree of Life" embedded in their minds from textbook illustrations. The imagery left by the tree metaphor, while inaccurate, is very hard to eradicate. That's not science education. That's propaganda.

Genetic research has contradicted the theory, too. Discrepancies, inconsistencies and incongruities pepper the comparisons of molecular structures of different organisms thought to be related. Rabbits are grouped with primates instead of rodents, cows are grouped closer to whales than horses, and so forth.

Because of these findings, some scientists began to refer to life's origins as more like a branching bush. Soon, not even that seemed correct, because of the extent of the diversification that they were finding, rather than evolutionary-style branching advancement. Some evolutionists began to refer to life's origins as more like a thicket.

Finally, people may begin to listen to creation scientists, who were saying all along that life is not like a tree or even a bush, but just exactly like the Bible put it all along: a big, beautiful garden.

For more refutation of the theory of common descent, see the IDEA Center, <http://www-ac.s.ucsd.edu/~idea> or Wells' "Icons of Evolution."

48. Vestigial Organs

Evolutionists taught us, falsely, that human embryos have a yolk sac like a chicken, a tail like a monkey and gill slits like a fish. They said those are vestiges, or useless leftovers, of our evolutionary ancestry. Illustrations of the monstrous lie that unborn babies look like animals have been used to induce girls and women to get abortions. Ewww!

Over the years, there have been as many as 180 organs listed as evolutionary vestiges: tonsils, appendix and all that. Supposedly, these were nature's leftovers that used to have survival value but as each species evolved, they weren't needed any more.

Good science has since proved essentially all of them to have significant functions in human beings after all. The appendix, for example, is now known to be a part of our immune system. The tonsils are a gatekeeper for the pharynx; it used to be common to have tonsil surgery, when they were thought to be useless vestiges of the evolutionary past, but that caused more problems than it solved.

The yolk sac in a human embryo has nothing to do with chickens; it provides the first red blood cells to keep the baby going until the bone marrow can develop and start making blood. The human tailbone is involved in defecation. The gill slits aren't gill slits at all, but the start of the tissues that form the palatine tonsils, middle-ear canals and parathyroid and thymus glands. Embryos never have "gill DNA."

Similarly, hip bones in whales don't mean they evolved from land animals; they are necessary for underwater mating. Rudimentary legs on some snakes doesn't mean they came from lizards; they are claspers used for mating. Wings of flightless birds are still used for balance in running and so forth and actually point to creation, not evolution. Evolution is supposed to add traits, not take them away.

For more, see "Creation: Facts of Life," by Gary Parker, "Vestigial Organs Are Fully Functional" by Creation Research Society Books, or an article on vestigial organs under "Matters Relating Specifically to Human Origins" on www.trueorigin.org/cam-plist.asp

49. Why Do They Still Believe in Evolutionism?

There are three reasons scientists believe in evolution despite the mounting contradictory evidence against it (from “Exploring Creation With Biology” by Dr. Jay L. Wile and Marilyn F. Furnell):

- Classrooms indoctrinate people at a very early age to believe in evolutionism. Alternatives are not allowed in, so people simply don't know about the contradictory evidence. It's hard to imagine such a dogmatic gatekeeper in other school subjects.
- Secularist college professors with endowed chairs ridicule opponents to defend their left-wing patrons' worldviews. Other evolutionists refuse to debate, reject articles for publications, steer away grant awards and promotions, and just in general make life very difficult for critics of evolutionism. Why? They want to save face and they're afraid of being proven wrong.
- The typical pro-evolutionist is an expert in one narrow scientific discipline but has never investigated the data from other fields. In science today, to be great, you have to zero in on your intricate, narrow specialty, so you can't always absorb and synthesize changes and findings from other disciplines into a solid, broadly-supportable worldview. Now, it's true that there are more scientists today than any time in the last century who realize that evolution is false. It may be just a matter of time until they compare notes and start speaking out more.

Other reasons evolutionism persists: misleading textbooks, statewide standards and assessments that are pro-evolution, ability of left-wingers to get public-TV funding and media coverage, popular magazines relying on scientists whose livelihoods depend on pushing the evolutionism agenda, schools fearing lawsuits from the ACLU if they allow the flaws of evolutionism to be taught, and so on.

For more on evolutionism propaganda and how to fight it, see www.trueorigin.org or “Tornado in a Junkyard” by James Perloff.

50. Why This Battle Matters

If you think God's reputation is worth defending, you will want to learn why evolution is false, and teach others. The Bible tells the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, but evolution is full of lies, deception, shifting interpretations and "spin." It should be exposed.

Defending scientific and religious truth is not the only reason it's important to teach people about this controversy. Here are some of the "social consequences" that logically follow a belief in evolution. This list is from the book "In the Beginning" by Walt Brown (p. 289):

1. Animal-like behavior: evolution "excuses" it.
2. Good vs. evil: if nature is all there is, there are no standards.
3. Survival of the fittest: killing "defective" children, euthanasia, forced sterilization and selective breeding of humans are A-OK.
4. Communism: Engels, Marx and Stalin were all evolutionists.
5. End of personal responsibility and self-control: no "rules" since we weren't created by a God who holds us accountable.
6. Secular humanism: humans are the pinnacle of evolution, the ultimate No. 1, and there is no God "competing" for supremacy.
7. New Age: since we all can "evolve" into gods, who needs God?
8. Marriage: animals don't marry, they just have sex; why shouldn't we, since we're just animals?
9. Racism: humans evolved from apes and some humans have evolved "higher" up the evolutionary ladder than others; Darwin was a racist and so was his fan, Adolph Hitler.
10. Abortion: the human fetus is just a glob of tissue that's evolving into human status, so it can be "terminated" without guilt.

Many of the books listed in RESOURCES have wonderful chapters that put the evolution controversy into clear perspective. Many of the best are written from a scientific viewpoint, not a religious one. Don't miss science journalist and design engineer Richard Milton's "Shattering the Myths of Darwinism," for example, in which he terms evolutionism "flat-Earth superstition" and calls passionately for an end to "scientific censorship." The truth will out. But it's essential that people like you get in there and fight for it. Ready? Set? Go!

Show 'n' Tell on Evolution: Resources & Links

BOOKS

(*** highly recommended)

A Case Against Accident and Self Organization

Dean L. Overman (Rowman & Littlefield, 1997)

Information science is clear: there is no way DNA put itself together by random chance.

The Amazing Story of Creation From Science and the Bible

Duane T. Gish (Institute for Creation Research, 1990)

It would be hard to believe in evolution after reading this book.

The Answers Book: The 20 Most-Asked Questions About Creation, Evolution and the Book of Genesis, Answered

Edited by Don Batten, Ph.D.; Ken Ham, Jonathan Sarfati, Carl Wieland (Master Books, 2000)

Entertaining, well-written answers to complex questions.

Astronomy and the Bible

Donald B. DeYoung (Baker Books, 1989, 2000)

With a doctorate in physics and a divinity degree, this author is a literal creationist who backs up his beliefs with 110 well-written Q&As.

Baker Encyclopedia of Christian Apologetics

Norman Geisler (Baker Books, 1999)

Scholarly explanations are valuable in the evolution section.

***** Body By Design**

Alan L. Gillen (Master Books, 2002)

This biologist and zoologist, who holds a doctorate in science education, provides physiological evidence for creation. He teaches at Pensacola Christian College in Florida and is working on a college biology textbook.

***** Bones of Contention**

Roger Lewin (University of Chicago Press, 1997)

Scholarly and readable account of human fossil finds and their implications, with good information on Mitochondrial Eve in this second edition.

Bones of Contention: A Creationist Assessment of the Human Fossils

Marvin Lubenow (Baker Books, 1992)

Great title for a book like this, so yes, this is another book, different from Lewin's book.

But it's also a great resource on paleoanthropology, the Leakeys, "Lucy" and much more.

Boyd's Handbook of Practical Apologetics

Robert T. Boyd (Kregel Publications, 1997)

Good writing in the section, "Science in the Bible."

The Collapse of Evolution

Scott M. Huse (Baker Books, 2000)

Well-done explanations in geology, anthropology and other areas.

Creation and Evolution: Rethinking the Evidence From Science and the Bible

Alan Hayward (Bethany House, 1995)

Here's a physicist who can write authoritatively, but understandably.

Creation & Evolution: Major Challenges to Darwinian Evolution You Should Know

Pamphlet, 1999, Rose Publishing

Astronomy, geology, paleontology, genetics, biochemistry, mathematics: theory vs. observations in succinct sections.

Creation and Time: A Biblical and Scientific Perspective on the Creation-Date Controversy

by Dr. Hugh Ross (NavPress, 1994)

Good nuggets of information from this respected writer.

***** Creation: Facts of Life**

Gary Parker (Master Books, 1994)

A Phi Beta Kappa biologist gives us an entertaining, convincing book.

***** Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution**

Michael J. Behe (Touchstone, 1996)

One of the best explanations of the most damaging counter-evidence.

By Michael Denton:

Evolution: A Theory in Crisis

(Burnett Books, 1985)

Nature's Destiny: How the Laws of Biology Reveal Purpose in the Universe

(Free Press, 1998)

Denton has issued a call to arms that has left evolutionists flat-footed.

By William A. Dembski:

The Design Inference: Eliminating Chance Through Small Probabilities

(Cambridge University Press, 1998)

***** Intelligent Design: The Bridge Between Science & Theology**

(InterVarsity Press, 1999)

Mere Creation: Science, Faith and Intelligent Design

(InterVarsity Press, 1998)

Signs of Intelligence: Understanding Intelligent Design

(Also edited by James Kushiner)

Any of these books would be an important read from this top pro, a mathematician and philosopher who is awfully hard to refute.

Does Carbon Dating Disprove the Bible?

Booklet by Dr. Don Batten

www.answersingenesis.com

Evolution: The Fossils Still Say No!

Duane T. Gish (Institute for Creation Research, 1985)

This creation scientist promulgated some controversial theories, but this is a classic in the war of words over evolutionism.

Exploring Creation With Biology

Dr. Jay L. Wile and Marilyn F. Durnell (Apologia Educational Ministries, 1998)

A good secondary-level biology textbook with 578 pages. It would make a good home-schooling textbook or an at-home supplement for a public-school student.

The Fingerprint of God: Recent Scientific Discoveries Reveal the Unmistakable Identity of the Creator

Hugh Ross (Whitaker House, 1989)

Science, philosophy and theology intertwine, and all point to God.

The Genesis Factor: Probing Life's Big Questions

David R. Helm, Jon M. Dennis (Crossway Books, 2001)

Getting the big picture on "why" God created, not so much "how."

The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications

Henry Morris, John Whitcomb (Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1961)
This is the classic book on creation science with timeless insights.

Getting the Facts Straight: A Viewer's Guide to PBS's "Evolution"

Discovery Institute Press, 2001

A fascinating guide to what was included and not included in the nationally-televised series.

How Blind is the Watchmaker? Beyond Naturalistic Science to Real Scientific Truth

Neil Broom (InterVarsity Press, 2001)

This biomaterials engineer doesn't write like a biomaterials engineer.

***** Icons of Evolution: Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong**

Jonathan Wells (Regnery Publishing, 2000)

The "must have" book for students and parents. This would be a great book to share with educators, school boards, churches, youth groups and the community to prevent an evolutionism controversy.

In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood

Walt Brown, Ph.D. (Center for Scientific Creation, 2001)

www.creationscience.com

This wonderful textbook is a great addition to any family library.

By Phillip E. Johnson:

***** Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds**

(InterVarsity Press, 1997)

Darwin on Trial

(Regnery Gateway, 1991).

Objections Sustained: Subversive Essays on Evolution, Law and Culture

(InterVarsity Press, 1997)

Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law, and Education

(InterVarsity Press, 1995)

Wedge of Truth

(InterVarsity Press, 2000)

He's been a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley for 30 years. He graduated from Harvard and the University of Chicago. He was a law clerk for Chief

Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court. Beyond all those credentials, he's a terrific, serious but entertaining writer. If you had to choose just one author to teach you about this topic: Phil Johnson.

Kansas Tornado

Paul Ackerman, Bob Williams (Institute for Creation Research, 1999)

What really happened with evolution standards in Kansas?

Intelligent Design in Public School Science Curricula

David DeWolf, Stephen Meyers and Mark DeForrest

(Foundation for Thought and Ethics, 2001)

For school-board members, educators, attorneys and parents who want to end censorship and ensure objective science education.

By Ralph O. Muncaster:

- **Creation Versus Evolution: Examine the Evidence**
- **Creation Versus Evolution: New Scientific Discoveries**

(Strong Basis to Believe, 1997)

These booklets provide a handy summary you could use to “debrief” a child whose school uses a pro-evolution science textbook. The author is a college professor who didn't believe in the Bible until he finally started studying the scientific evidence that it is true.

- **Science: Was the Bible Ahead of Its Time?**

(Harvest House, 2000)

Muncaster, a professor at Vanguard University in Southern California, has made a career of helping people with “belief struggles.” He shows how the Bible is totally consistent with science in everything from astronomy to physics to zoology, but the theory of evolution is not good science and is not consistent with Biblical truth.

The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods

John Woodmorappe (Institute for Creation Research, 1999)

Not THAT kind of dating. This book critiques the way evolutionists figure out the age they believe rocks and objects are. But these methods are flawed and unreliable.

Not By Chance!

Lee M. Spetner (Judaica Press, 1998)

The technical mind will appreciate this well-reasoned approach.

Of Pandas and People: The Central Questions of Biological Origins

Biologist Dean H. Kenyon and zoologist Percival Davis (Foundation for Thought and

Ethics, 1989)

This popular textbook is in lots of schools and homes.

On the Seventh Day: Forty Scientists and Academics Explain Why They Believe in God

Edited by John F. Ashton, Ph.D.

Forty scientists, all with Ph.D.'s in their fields, each write about how easy it is for them to square knowledge and faith, science and religion.

The Origin of Species Revisited (Volumes I & II)

W.R. Byrd (Philosophical Library, Inc., 1989)

Concise but complete descriptions and reference aid.

***** Refuting Evolution**

Dr. Jonathan Sarfati (Master Books, 1999)

Australian physical chemist responds to the evolution guidebook published by the National Academy of Sciences, and much more.

Science & the Bible: 30 Scientific Demonstrations Illustrating Scriptural Truths

Donald B. DeYoung (Baker Books, 2002)

With a Ph.D. in physics from Iowa State University and a Master of Divinity from Grace Seminary, Dr. DeYoung presents 30 unique demonstrations and experiments that demonstrate Biblical truths in science, including the hydrologic layering in geology that supports Noah's flood and the fast formation of the Earth, and debunks the theory of the gradually-amassing, evolutionary "geologic column."

Shattering the Myths of Darwinism

Richard Milton (Park Street Press, 2000)

This careful science writer drags skeletons out of the closet.

The Soul of Science: Christian Faith and Natural Philosophy

by Nancy R. Pearcey and Charles B. Thaxton (Crossway, 1994)

For the reader who goes beneath the surface of today's events.

The Structure of Scientific Revolutions

Thomas Kuhn (University of Chicago Press, 1996)

This scholar debunks the peer pressure and paradigm bias that lock people into evolutionism long past when objectivity and common sense would have moved them out of it.

Subdue the Earth: A New Theory of the World's Cataclysmic Formation and Its Energy Resources

Ralph Franklin Walworth (Delta, 1977)

This geologist lends scientific credence to the “Big Bang” hypothesis of sudden creation of the universe and fits it with the thesis that the Earth and its species did not simply evolve over millions of years, but appeared after tremendous cataclysms of various kinds over a period of thousands of years.

***** Tornado in a Junkyard: The Relentless Myth of Darwinism**

James Perloff (Refuge Books, 1999)

User-friendly explanation of why evolution is as likely to have created the diversity of life as a tornado slamming in to a junkyard might have created a supersonic airplane.

Perloff also has published a shorter book for busy people who want the refutation of evolution from genetics, origins science, biochemistry, paleontology, taxonomy and molecular biology in a “just the facts” format might order his 2002 paperback (83 pp.) from the same publisher: **The Case Against Darwin: Why the Evidence Should Be Examined**

What's Darwin Got to Do With It?

Robert L. Newman, John L. Wiester, Janet & Jonathan Moneymaker
(InterVarsity Press, 2000)

Comic-book format for students, teachers, parents and youth leaders.

VIDEOS, AUDIOS, CD-ROMS, DVDS

(Search by title on websites)

The Best of Ken Ham

(10-part audiocassette series)

www.answersingenesis.com

Creation Science Evangelism

(Videos, DVDs, tapes by Dr. Kent Hovind)

www.drdino.com

Darwinism: Science or Naturalistic Philosophy

(Videotaped debate with Dr. Phillip Johnson and an evolutionist on the beliefs and worldviews behind the science)

www.family.org

Evolution: Lies in the Textbooks

(2 1/2 hour video by Dr. Kent Hovind)

www.drdino.com

God's Fingerprints on the Universe I-II

(Audiocassette with Dr. William Dembski and Dr. Mark Hartwig)

www.family.org

Icons of Evolution

(video based on the Jonathan Wells book)

www.family.org

Teaching Children the Truth About Science I and II

(broadcast CD with Dr. Phillip Johnson)

www.family.org

Unlocking the Mysteries of Life

(video)

www.family.org

LINKS

(*** highly recommended)

The American Scientific Affiliation:

www.asa3.org

*** Answers in Genesis:

www.answersingenesis.org

*** Access Research Network:

www.arn.org

Ashby Camp's List of Articles:

www.trueorigin.org/camplist.asp

Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture:

www.discovery.org/crsc/index.php3

Center for Scientific Creation (online textbook, "In the Beginning"):

www.creationscience.com

Concerned Citizens for Objective Science Education, Nebraska grass-roots organization:

<http://www.ccose.org>

Creation-Evolution Encyclopedia:
www.pathlights.com

The Creation Research Society:
www.creationresearch.org

Creation Research Society Quarterly:
www.creationresearch.org/crsq.html

Creation Resource Bookstore:
www.creationresource.org

Creation Science Evangelism:
www.drdino.com

Creation Science Home Page:
<http://emporium.turnpike.net/C/cs/>

Creation-Science Research Center:
www.parentcompany.com

Creation Science Resource:
www.nwcreation.net/index.html

Creationism Connection:
www.members.aol.com/dwr51055/Creation.html#Internet%20Sites

Creationism.org:
www.creationism.org

William A. Dembski:
www.designinference.com

*** Discovery Institute:
<http://www.discovery.org>

Evolution Facts, Inc.:
www.evolution-facts.org

Focus on the Family:

www.family.org

Geoscience Research Institute:

www.grisda.org

Icons of Evolution (Jonathan Wells' book):

www.iconsofevolution.com

*** IDEA Center (Intelligent Design and Evolution Awareness Club which started at the University of California – San Diego and offers to help start student clubs in high schools and colleges):

<http://www-ac.s.ucsd.edu/~idea/>

*** Institute for Creation Research:

www.icr.org

*** Intelligent Design Network:

www.intelligentdesignnetwork.org

Intelligent Design:

www.idurc.org

Intelligent Design (Frequently-Asked Questions):

http://arn.org/id_faq.htm

Ralph Muncaster:

www.evidenceofGod.com

Reasons to Believe (old-earth creationist Hugh Ross):

www.reasons.org

The Revolution Against Evolution:

www.rae.org

Scientific Evidence for Creation (part of The Interactive Bible):

www.bible.ca/tracks/

“The Teaching of Evolution in the Science Curriculum”:

www.parentcompany.com/csrrc/teachevo.htm

“Teaching the Origins Controversy: Science, Or Religion, Or Speech?” by David K. DeWolf, Stephen C. Meyer and Mark Edward DeForrest, Utah Law Review, information