THE BIBLE AND MODERN SCIENCE

By

HENRY M. MORRIS, Ph.D.

CHAPTER TWO -

The Theory of Evolution

IT IS A SERIOUS MISTAKE to ignore, as many Christians seem willing to do, the tremendous implications and influence of the theory of evolution. By far the majority of college-trained men and women have been taught to accept evolution as a demonstrated fact of science, and it is being taught increasingly in the high schools and even the grade schools of the country. It has probably contributed more to the prevalent secularistic and materialistic philosophy of the world today than any other influence. Obviously, something that is so important ought to be seriously studied by all thinking men and women. On the other hand, very few people have actually had the opportunity to study the great mass of evidence against the theory, and in fact would usually be found to be quite ignorant of the fact that very powerful contrary scientific evidence does exist.

For that matter, evolution is not so much a science as it is a philosophy or an attitude of mind.

Evolutionists admit that evolution requires aeons of time in which to work and that the paltry few thousand years of written records that are available to us do not reveal one real example of genuine evolution taking place. And since no one was present to watch the supposed great evolutionary changes of the past, it is manifestly impossible to prove scientifically that they actually did take place.

Furthermore, the fundamental principle of evolution - that is, the concept of development, with increasing organization and complexity - seems to be essentially contradictory to the impregnably established laws of energy conservation. These laws teach, as we have already seen, that creation of matter or energy is not now taking place, and, in fact, that the available energy of the universe as a whole is continually running down rather than building up. Therefore, it seems evident that the creation of the universe and its components must have been accomplished and completed by means of processes which are no longer in force, and which therefore cannot be observed and studied at the present time. *The Bible, of course, also teaches the fact of a creation already completed by GOD, as revealed especially in Genesis 1.*

The theory of evolution, on the other hand, is essentially an attempt to explain the origin of all things in terms of processes which are still continuing and which therefore can still be studied in the present. It therefore ignores the Bible's witness to a completed creation, and assumes that creation is still going on (if one may call the process of evolution by the term "creation"). The history of "creation" that is built up by a study of the physical and biological processes that now prevail in the world must quite obviously, therefore, differ widely from the history of creation as revealed by GOD in the Bible, not only in principle but also in its details.

Evolutionary geology has it that living organisms originated in the sea, countless millions of years before plants or any other forms of life appeared on the land.

Genesis, however, states clearly that grasses, seed-bearing herbs, and fruit trees were created on the third day, and that water animals (and land animals and birds, as well) were not brought into existence until the fifth day. The Bible states that birds were created on the same day as the fish and other marine creatures.

Evolution, however, teaches that birds were evolved from reptiles long after the origin of the fish and probably even after the first appearance of mammals. According to Scripture, the "**creeping things**" (especially insects, see Leviticus 11:20-23) were among the last things created, coincident with the land animals and reptiles. According to evolution, insects appeared very early, reaching their greatest development even before the first appearance of reptiles, birds, and mammals.

The great lights for ruling the day and the night were not set at these functions until the fourth day, which would certainly be quite lethal to the vegetation created on the third day, if these days were longer than 24 hours. Further, the use of the words "evening" and "morning" as describing the beginning and end of each day, certainly would imply ordinary days as we know them. Some have made much of the fact that the Hebrew word translated "day" may sometimes be used to indicate a long, indefinite period of time. This is true, but it is also true that in the overwhelming majority of cases it refers to a 24-hour period, and that wherever it is used with an ordinal (first, second, etc.) as it is here, it always refers to a 24-hour day.

Another difficulty with the day-age idea is that the Bible says that death entered the world as a result of the sin of the first man and woman.

However, if these days can be taken as long ages, as pictured by some geologists, the bones of dead millions of GOD's creatures were in the ground before man was even on the scene.

Also, with such evidence of death and suffering prevailing throughout the world, it is passing strange that GOD would have pronounced His completed creation "**very good**," as He is said to have done in the last verse of Genesis 1.

Finally, GOD instituted the Sabbath as a memorial of His completed work.

As far back as any records go, mankind has been observing every seventh day as a day of rest. This is difficult to explain unless GOD did actually rest from His work on the seventh literal day of creation. In Exodus 20:11, in incorporating the observance of the Sabbath into the law of Israel, and just after saying in verse 10 that "**the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy GOD**," the following statement appears: "**For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it**." The explanatory argument for this command would have no force if the basis of man's work week and Sabbath rest was not an exactly equivalent work week and Sabbath rest experienced by the CREATOR.

Furthermore, the Hebrew word translated "days" in this passage (Exodus 20:8-11) is used twice,

once for the six work days of GOD, once for the six work days of man. The word is never used elsewhere in the Old Testament to mean anything other than literal days, although it occurs more than 700 times. It is well also to note that there is at least one good Hebrew word meaning "age" or "long, indefinite time," which could have been used here and in the Genesis account if that meaning had been in the mind of the writer. The fact that he used the words "day" and "days," without any intimation that he was using them in a symbolic sense, makes it very evident that the literal meaning was intended.

Even if it were possible to regard the story of the creation as a beautiful but unhistorical allegory, striking difficulties would appear at later parts in the Bible. Time and again throughout the Old Testament reference is made by the various writers to the creation and to Adam and to the other characters connected with the Genesis story, always with the obvious belief on the part of the writer that he is speaking of definite historical characters and events. This is true even in the New Testament.

Paul, intellectually one of the greatest men who ever lived, as well as one of the greatest Christians, refers again and again to the creation and fall of man. In fact, the fall of Adam and the resultant entering of sin into the world is one of the basic doctrines of Christian theology as presented by Paul.

Paul drives home the fact that all men are sinners by nature because of the fall of the first man, Adam, and that it is only through the last Adam, JESUS CHRIST, that man can be freed from the penalties and consequences of sin (Romans 5:12-19).

Evolution, on the other hand, does not concede that man ever fell. but avers that he has gradually risen from the state of the beast and is getting better all the time. Any evil that is in him is not sin inherited from his father, Adam, but simply beastly instincts that are a holdover from his simian ancestors.

Even JESUS CHRIST believed in the Genesis record of creation.

In Matthew 19:3-6, we read: "**The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore GOD hath joined together, let not man put asunder**." Certainly, if JESUS really was the Son of GOD, as He claimed to be, He would not have based His teaching about an important institution like marriage on a mythical or legendary event.

It is thus absolutely impossible to believe in the Bible as the complete and literal Word of GOD and to believe in the theory of evolution. But, more than that, it is almost impossible to believe in a personal GOD of any sort if one believes in evolution.

The so-called theistic evolutionists, who manage to think of evolution as "GOD's method of creation," and who profess to see in evolution a grand and beautiful and orderly process of nature - one that enlarges and develops one's conception of GOD - are being inexcusably inconsistent.

Evolution, by its very nature, is materialistic; it is nothing but an attempt to explain the facts of biology in terms of laws of nature without the necessity of recourse to the idea of the supernatural or the divine.

Mechanism and the doctrine of chance constitute the very quintessence of evolution.

If GOD actually did create the universe, including all living creatures, by the method of evolution, it appears to this writer that He must have selected the most inefficient and cruel and foolish method of doing it that one can imagine. If His goal was the creation of man, what possible reason could there have been for such misfits as dinosaurs to rule and roam the earth for millions of years, only to die out long before man arrived on the scene?

Evolution is supposed to have come about by means of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, which, if true, would mean that GOD deliberately instituted a law that would have depended for its enforcement on the credo that might is right and that the strong should exterminate the weak. Millions of animals must have perished in the course of the evolutionary process for no conceivable reason if, as the modernists assert, man was the ultimate goal of it all.

As one atheist professor puts it: "The whole history of evolution reveals and witnesses that there is no intelligence back of the process. You cannot understand evolution and believe in GOD."

Furthermore, the atheistic and satanic character of the doctrine is evidenced in the many evil social doctrines it has spawned.

Nietzsche and Marx, both radically atheistic, were profoundly influenced by the Darwinian ideas of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. They carried into the social and philosophic realms what Darwin had attempted to apply to the biological realm and concocted their deadly philosophies.

From Marx, the world has inherited socialism, communism, and anarchism.

Nietzsche's philosophy profoundly influenced German political thought and became the basis of the intense German militarism of the past half-century.

Mussolini was its most zealous disciple of Nietzsche, and Fascism was the result. Nazism was bred in the same cesspool. Evolution is also the basis of the many types of immoral doctrines now being taught in the psychological fields by Freud, Russell, and others. The gospels of gloom known as determinism and behaviorism have the same foundation.

It seems unthinkable that a theory of any kind could have had such far-reaching and such deadly effects as has the theory of evolution.

By the very fact of goodness and beauty in the world, it is hard to believe that such a theory could really be true. And yet, you may say, if science has proved that it is true, then we shall have to accept it regardless of the implications. That may be so, but we should certainly demand the most rigid and unquestionable proof before receiving such a godless theory as proved fact.

The purpose of this chapter is to make a brief survey of the so-called proofs that have thus far been offered by the evolutionists.

Evolution, as generally defined, means the gradual development or ascent of higher forms of life from simpler or lower types. In its usual form, the theory postulates an original form consisting of a single living cell that probably arose by spontaneous generation from a fortuitous combination of inanimate matter. From this cell gradually evolved plants and multicelled invertebrates, then fishes and insects; then amphibians, then reptiles, then birds and mammals, and finally man.

There is, of course, an absolutely fatal flaw right at the very outset, namely, the impossibility of accounting for the origin of life in the first place. To dismiss the difficulty with the simple statement that life "appeared" at some time in the past when "conditions" were just right is little better than dishonest. The popular notion of spontaneous generation as occurring about us on every hand persisted in one form or other down to within the past century, but was completely demolished by Pasteur, Tyndall, and others. It is as nearly certain as anything can be that spontaneous generation of life is not now going on anywhere in the world. Yet, if it had ever occurred in the past, it would be only reasonable to expect that it should be taking place now. In attempting to produce living matter from the nonliving, thousands of experiments have been made by scientists from all parts of the world, but every one without success.

The so-called simple cell is really not so simple after all.

It is known now, of course, that a cell is really a very wonderful and complex mechanism, consisting of several component parts, each of which is very important and has definite functions. It even has the faculty of reproduction. When it grows large enough, it simply divides into two parts, all parts of the cell being divided equally at the same time, so that two complete cells are thus formed where only one existed before. It is really quite impossible to see how such an organism as this could possibly have arisen spontaneously from inorganic matter, regardless of what the "conditions" were or how long ago it happened.

It is about as reasonable to say that a skyscraper arose spontaneously from a pile of bricks and scrap iron.

Even if it were possible to shove the start of life back onto the generation of pure protoplasm, which is the most important constituent of all living cells, the difficulty would not be much reduced. Protoplasm has defied all attempts at complete chemical analysis, but seems to consist of a mixture of a large number of very complex organic compounds, which in turn are composed of fourteen or more of the chemical elements.

Chemists have not yet succeeded in even synthesizing all the compounds involved, not to mention effecting the complete combination and finally imbuing the mixture with the breath of life. Their failure is not because of not trying either, for literally thousands of attempts to synthesize protoplasm have been made. Yet where man, with his wonderful ingenuity and knowledge of chemistry and biology has completely failed, evolutionists assume that blind chance succeeded at some time in the remote past. Of course, from the standpoint of the evolutionist, it is quite necessary to accept spontaneous generation, as that is the only way life

can be accounted for apart from a CREATOR. If GOD could be admitted at any part of the process, it is far more reasonable to suppose that He would have created the earth and the living creatures in it fully developed.

Not only does the theory fail to account for the origin of life, but it cannot even provide a satisfactory explanation of the method by which evolution works. A great many proposed explanations have been offered by a great many investigators and theorizers, but the mechanics of evolution remains just as mysterious as it was a hundred years ago. Many modern biologists frankly admit their ignorance on this most important phase of their theory.

The first important suggestion offered was Lamarck's theory of the transmissibility of characters acquired through the effects of environment or other external influences. The theory has been utterly disproved both by experiment and by the advance in genetic theory; so it need not detain us here.

Much the same dictum of complete rejection could be pronounced upon the Darwinian theory of natural selection.

According to Darwin's idea, the endless varieties and individual differences that are observed to occur among different members of the same species make occasional individuals better fitted to survive in the struggle for existence. These individuals then persist and transmit these favorable characteristics to their descendants, while others less fortunate gradually are eliminated. Infinite accumulations of these favorable hereditable variations are invoked to account for the gradual formation of all forms of life. Plausible as all this may sound, however, more detailed studies and knowledge of the specific and germinal characters of plants and animals has made it clear that natural selection alone cannot account for the origin of species.

In the first place, it cannot account for the origin of the very necessary variations. The rediscovered Mendelian laws of heredity, which were absolutely unknown to Darwin and the other founders of evolution, showed that all these chance variations followed definite, though frequently quite complicated, arithmetical laws. They showed that, except under very extraordinary circumstances not usually occurring in nature, all variation was within certain fixed limits and that no hereditable characteristic could appear in an individual that had not existed in one, at least, of his parents (that characteristic may have been "dormant" or not appearing in the parent or even in several generations of ancestors, but was nevertheless present germinally).

The countless experiments which have verified Mendel's laws have in recent years been further substantiated by increased knowledge of the character of living cells.

It is now known that all cells are not the same, but are fundamentally and definitely different among the various species. Even in the same creature, the cells composing different parts of the body are clearly distinct. Each cell contains a number of component parts, only one of which, though probably the most important, is protoplasm. From the standpoint of genetics and heredity, the most interesting parts of the cell are the chromosomes, which are known, from a study of the activity of the cells in reproduction, to be the carriers of heredity. Each chromosome is a threadlike structure and there is a definite number of them in each cell of the creature. This is true regardless of the part of the body in which that cell is located. The number of chromosomes

in each cell depends entirely upon the species in which the cells are found; for example, human cells contain 48 chromosomes. However, the germ cells of each species contain only half the usual number of chromosomes for the species, so that when the chromosomes of the male and female germ cells unite, a new cell will be formed that contains the correct number of chromosomes for the species.

In order to explain theoretically the laws of heredity discovered by Mendel, the gene theory has been developed.

According to this theory, each chromosome is composed of a large number of entities called genes. Each gene is supposed to govern or control some characteristic in the individual. Also, various combinations of genes may influence characteristics. Recombinations, shufflings, etc., of genes can thus be invoked to account mathematically for all the fixed and variable characters that are observed in members of a species. Note, however, that all heredity is carried by the chromosomes and genes of the germ cells, which incidentally are formed very early in the development of the embryo. Consequently, any change in the body cells through use, disuse, or any other environmental influence, could have no effect on the germ cells and would not therefore be hereditable. That is why acquired characteristics cannot be inherited.

Furthermore, modern genetic theory is almost as lethal to the Darwinian hypothesis as it is to the Lamarckian, because by it all of the small chance variations which are supposedly acted upon by natural selection to form new species are really nothing but new combinations of genetic factors, which were already in the parent or parents in the first place. Thus nothing new is added, and variation is held within fixed limits and tends to hover about a certain mean which has proved, by experience in nature, to be the best for the particular species concerned. Thus, natural selection, instead of tending to produce new species really acts to preserve those already in existence.

Furthermore, natural selection by its very nature requires an almost infinite number of transitional forms in the origin of a new species. But this is not borne out by the fossil record which in most cases reveals only very distinct forms. There are very few intermediate forms between established genera found either, in living forms or in the fossils. There are practically none between the families and comparatively few even between the species as ordinarily defined. These facts have led many evolutionists to conclude that evolution occurs, not by accumulations of small variations, but rather by means of sudden, relatively large genetic changes called mutations. This conclusion appeared to be necessary, not only by virtue of the discontinuous nature of the fossil record, but also because modern genetic theory had shown that all normal inheritance and variation followed the Mendelian laws and was strictly circumscribed.

The mutation theory was largely developed by Hugo DeVries, in his work on the evening primrose, and T. H. Morgan, experimenting with the fruit fly.

These and other workers observed that a distinctly new characteristic would sometimes suddenly appear in an individual. This change was called a mutation and it was found that the new character was hereditable and that it followed the Mendelian laws. Mutations were attributed to actual changes in the chromosomes or genes of the germ cells and have now become probably the most popular present day means of explaining evolution.

It is usually stated that when mutations occur they are then acted upon by natural selection and, if helpful in the struggle for existence, they will tend to survive and thus gradually form a new species.

However, this theory has been rejected by a large number of outstanding biologists and geneticists and for a number of reasons.

In the first place, a great many so-called mutations have been proved to be nothing but recessive Mendelian characters which suddenly appeared when the right parents happened to come together. It is thought by many biologists that all mutations are explainable in this way and certainly it would seem difficult to prove that they are really changes in the genes and not merely recombinations of genes already there.

Furthermore, true mutations occur comparatively rarely in nature and, when they do occur, they usually tend to disappear. This is because all genuine mutations that have thus far been observed are of either a pathologic or a neutral character. Never does a mutation seem to be in the least degree beneficial.

Most of the laboratory mutations have been induced artificially by chemicals, heat, X-rays, ultraviolet rays, etc. Furthermore, these mutations are almost always recessive when crossed back with the original type. That is another reason why they will not persist in nature. When one considers the great odds against a mutation's being helpful and surviving in the struggle for existence and then realizes that the formation of a new species would require not one mutation but thousands, and finally considers the tremendous number of species of plants and animals in the world, it would seem to demand a most amazing credulity to imagine that here is the method by which evolution takes place.

And yet that is precisely what is taught as gospel truth in probably the majority of schools today.

In recent years, an increasing number of outstanding evolutionists have become convinced that such mutations as have been observed in nature and in the laboratory are apparently of an entirely different order from those which would be required for genuine evolution to occur. These mutations have been called "micromutations" to indicate their relatively small magnitude and significance. The much larger mutations that seem to be demanded by both the fossil record and genetic theory have been called "macromutations," "systematic mutations," "saltational mutations," and similar terms. This sort of mutation has not been observed experimentally, of course, and seems impossible to account for on the basis of genetic theory itself, not to mention its implied contravention of the basic laws of energy transformation. Nevertheless, a large number of outstanding evolutionists have been driven to such a position as being the only remaining possible explanation of the mechanics of evolution.

The fact that the majority of men in these fields continue to believe in evolution would seem to result largely from the supposed external proofs of evolution. We can consider only the most important of these proofs - those that appear most often in textbooks. None of them is conclusive or convincing.

Comparative anatomy

is appealed to, for one thing. The anatomical and physiological resemblances between different species are considered, for some reason, evidence of relationship. For example, the general structural similarity between man and the ape, or between any other two mammals, for that matter, is cited as proof of kinship. As a matter of fact, the structural differences between species are of as great significance as the more or less superficial similarities. Anyway what does similarity of structure prove other than a common plan of creation, modified in details to meet specific needs? That would be the logical thing to expect on the hypothesis of special creation. The skeletal framework of every vertebrate is a model of design, especially arranged to accommodate the creature using it. The marvelous efficiency and ingenious construction of the skeleton is of especial appeal to the engineer interested in structural designing. It is safe to say that no building or bridge or any other engineering structure ever built could compare in excellence of design to the structural framework of the lowliest animal. Since all mammals, as well as man, have somewhat the same physical functions, it is only natural that the equipment for those functions should be similar.

The old argument from vestigial organs is still occasionally mentioned in textbooks. According to this idea, certain supposedly useless organs in man, such as the appendix, the ductless glands, the coccyx, etc., are vestiges of useful organs in lower animals, hanging over from man's former animal existence. At one time there were supposed to be 180 of these organs in man. However, as ignorance was replaced by knowledge of the use of these so-called useless organs, the number rapidly dwindled until now most evolutionists would not claim any.

Such organs as may truly be useless in various creatures would, it would seem, be poor evidence of evolution, anyway. They are probably the results of mutational changes which, as we have seen, are usually deteriorations.

Recapitulation theory

Another proffered line of evidence was the recapitulation theory which taught that the embryonic development of any organism was a condensed recapitulation of the past evolutionary development of that organism.

This theory, first vigorously promulgated by Haeckel, precipitated much embryologic study, engaged in mainly for the purpose of building up philogenies (evolutionary history) for different creatures.

Further Paleontologic, embryologic, and biochemical investigations have dealt so hardly with the theory that it has been quite generally discarded as a useful tool in embryologic or geologic research. Comparisons of many ontogenies (embryonic developments) with their supposed corresponding philogenies as indicated by expanding Paleontologic data, have revealed innumerable omissions, additions, accelerations, retardations, oversteppings, etc. Consequently, the theory has come to be regarded probably by most serious embryologists as incorrect, though they nevertheless often choose to regard embryonic development in an evolutionary perspective. In any case, there is surely no justification for offering such a theory as "proof" of evolution.

In the very early stages of the development of an embryo, there are many similarities among embryos of different species or even of different families. All embryos start from a microscopic

germ cell and of necessity must develop along similar lines for a time, so such resemblances are only to be expected and are no indication of any genetic relationship. However, after about a month, each type of embryo is visually distinguishable from those of other creatures. Even before this, at any time after conception, an examination of the embryo's cell-structure would of course unfailingly reveal its true character.

As a matter of fact, much evidence has been accumulated by qualified scientists that every stage in the development of every embryo that has been so studied is quite necessary to the most efficient development of that embryo. The marvelous embryonic growth of all living creatures at every step, instead of supporting evolution, actually offers abundant testimony to a great Designer and does not in any way give countenance to theories of materialistic origin and development.

Evidences for evolution based essentially on similarity, such as these from comparative anatomy and embryology, as well as those from similarities in blood serum and other biochemical and physiological properties of organisms, and even from the very fact that creatures can be classified into groups of different degrees of similarity, all assume the very point that needs to be proved, namely, that similarity implies relationship.

All such similarities, however, are more reasonably explained in terms of origin at the hand of a common Designer.

It is well to observe at this point that the Bible does not teach the fixity of species, and for the simple reason that no one knows just what a species is. There are few issues more alive among biologists today than this matter of what constitutes a species. Certainly, according to many definitions of the term, many new species have been "evolved" since the original creation. Genetic research has proved conclusively that chromosome changes, gene mutations, and hybridization can produce and, in fact, have produced many distinctly new varieties, in both plants and animals. These varieties are often considered new species, or even genera, by most modern methods of classification.

However, all evidence thus far in the genetic field seems to prove conclusively that these agencies of change cannot go beyond certain comparatively narrow limits and can very definitely not produce new "kinds." The Genesis account merely says that each created group was to produce "after its kind," with no clear indication as to what constitutes a "kind," except the implication that different kinds would not be interfertile (if they were, they would not be reproducing after their respective kinds). Thus, the Biblical account leaves ample room for just such conditions of change within the smaller groups and stability within the larger groups as is indicated by modern discovery.

We cannot be sure just what today constitutes a "kind," with the one exception of the man "kind." As all experience and evidence has conclusively proved, man cannot cross with any other creature in the earth, although all the very different races of men are freely interfertile.

Furthermore, there are very definite limits of crossing between the groups which in modern taxonomy are called genera, with seemingly no crosses among the families.

Thus, it is possible that the original Genesis "kind" is closely akin to what the modern

systematist calls a "family." And let it be stated in no uncertain terms that there is no evidence that evolution ever has occurred or ever can occur across the "kinds."

The Fossil Record

Finally, then, the only real factual data upon which the evolutionary hypothesis rests are provided in the fossil record, which we shall now examine briefly.

The statement is frequently made in textbooks that the fossils as found in the sedimentary rocks of the world always indicate evolution. That is, in the lower strata, only simple and unspecialized forms are found; then as the surface is approached, increasingly high and complex types appear. This gradual increase in size and complexity of the fossils has, in fact, served as the main basis of identifying the various geologic strata and correlating them from place to place. The time during which these strata have been deposited is believed to extend over hundreds of millions of years.

All of this is considered to be strong proof that evolution has occurred in the past, even though we may not now understand its mechanism.

There are a number of serious difficulties with the geological time scale and with the evolutionary interpretations placed upon the fossils in the rocks by Paleontologists and historical geologists. Some of these problems will be considered in the next chapter.

However, even if we assume for the sake of argument that the geologic time scale is trustworthy, several facts appear which are convincing evidence against evolution.

Some of these might be enumerated briefly as follows:

(1) Many, many species have remained absolutely fixed through all the supposed millions and millions of years of geologic time. Many such are now known and it is certain that many more would be recognized if it were not for the somewhat dishonest habit Paleontologists have of giving new names to all species found as fossils regardless of how closely they resemble living species. Among the creatures that have thus remained unchanged through all the course of evolutionary history are the very protozoa with which evolution is supposed to have begun. This is difficult to understand if evolution is the universal law of nature.

(2) A great many modern species are very evidently degenerate, rather than higher, forms of those that are found as fossils. These would include practically all mammals - elephants, tigers, wolves, apes, lions, rhinos, hippos, bears, beavers, etc. It is also true of multitudes of plants of all kinds, as well as insects, birds, fishes, amphibians, and reptiles (compare the dinosaurs to our modern snakes and alligators). Some evolution!

(3) All of the great phyla and most of the families, orders, and classes, as well as very many genera and even species, appear quite suddenly in the fossil record, with no preliminary or intermediate forms.

Paleontological "proofs" of evolution

It would be well, however, to consider a few of the more publicized Paleontological proofs of evolution, since these "proofs" are usually those that sound most impressive to the average student.

The famous case of the horse is, without doubt, the most noteworthy of these demonstrations and according to the evolutionists' own claims is the best proof evolution has. Well, let us see!

At the very most, the horse pedigree usually drawn up in popular evolutionary textbooks does not prove evolution across family boundaries, but only within the family.

The very earliest member, *Eohippus*, is quite obviously as much a member of the horse family as the living *Equus*.

Eohippus was small, about the size of a fox, with four toes on the front foot and three on the hind. The modern horse, of course, has only one toe on each foot, with possible vestiges of others. There are other minor differences between *Eohippus* and *Equus*, which, however, are mainly adaptations (or designs) as a result of their difference in size. Between these two genera have been ranged about a dozen others, found as fossils. Some of these had the same toe arrangements as *Eohippus*, some had three toes on each foot, and still others have the side toes reduced to splints as in the modern horse.

However, all these animals are said to have lived in the Tertiary, late in geologic time. They are found near the surface, in the relatively unconsolidated Tertiary deposits.

The different forms are not found superimposed one over the other, but at widely separated localities, often continents apart. No gradual evolution from one to the other is evident, but only a series of sudden jumps at best.

There is, further, no clue to the origin of *Eohippus*, who was as highly developed, specialized, and fitted to his environment as is the modern horse. All things considered, it seems quite as plausible to say that each of the several genera may have been living simultaneously, perhaps as mutant variants of the originally created horse kind, and that they, in common with many other zoological inhabitants of a former age, have for one reason or another since become extinct.

Even if one of these forms actually should prove to be the ancestor of the modern horse (and such has not yet been proved by any means) the loss of one or more toes is obviously to be attributed to a mutation, and in common with all known mutations is in the nature of a deterioration rather than an advance. As to size, it is obvious that there are many families in the present world containing members differing in size quite as much as *Eohippus* and *Equus*.

Furthermore, many fossil horses have been found in many regions, fully as large and sometimes larger than the modern horse. Many of them seem, in fact, quite identical with *Equus*, though others have three toes and other differences.

All things considered, this supposed best demonstration of evolution falls more than somewhat short of being such a demonstration at all. And the same sort of criticisms could be brought against the supposed evolutionary pedigrees of the camel, the elephant, and other animals, which

are sometimes, but with less confidence, offered as evidence in popular textbooks.

Prehuman fossil men

There remains then the problem of the fossil men that have been classed as prehuman. These bear especially hard on our belief in the Bible story of man's creation and so are particularly interesting.

It becomes obvious upon examination that these finds, which are extremely fragmentary and questionable, are very poor demonstrations of the theory of man's descent from the ape, or from a pre-ape, as you prefer. Now thousands of fossil apes have been found of both living and extinct species. Similarly, a great many fossil skeletons of modern man have been found, about which most textbooks are strangely silent. But only a very few bone fragments have been found which could be imagined into any sort of a lower species of man. The very paucity of such evidence is alone enough to demolish the theory of man's relationship to the ape. However, let us glance at the nature of three or four of the most "convincing" finds.

Pithecanthropus Erectus

The most notorious of all is the famous Pithecanthropus Erectus, found in Java in 1891 and 1892. This find consisted of a part of a skullcap, a fragment of a left thighbone and three molar teeth.

(1) These parts were not found together but within a range of some 50 feet.
(2) They were not found at the same time but within the space of a year apart.
(3) They were found in an old river bed, far below high water mark, mingled with much debris and many bones of extinct animals.

In recent years there have been other finds in Java which have affected the status of Pithecanthropus, so that he is now regarded by most present-day anthropologists as essentially identical with modern man. The original skull has come to be regarded as that of a small woman. The femur is admittedly completely human in form. The teeth were probably simian and did not belong with the other remains at all.

Neanderthal cavemen

The Neanderthal race of cavemen has been more widely publicized perhaps than any other of these ancient men, except possibly Pithecanthropus.

The original Neanderthal Man consisted of a skullcap, which was attested by various experts to be that of an ape man, a Negro, an idiot, a modern Cossack, an early German, and several other things. Since that time, a number of other skeletons and fragments have been found in Europe and at other points around the Mediterranean. Many of these are very questionable, but some evidently belonged to the Neanderthal Race, which is now acknowledged by probably the majority of Paleontologists to be identical in species with modern man. Fairly frequently perfect Neanderthal types appear among modern peoples. It seems most probable that the Neanderthals represented a degenerate, rather than a developing, race.

Peking Man

The Peking Man is represented by quite a number of individuals found in caves near Peking, China, the first in 1929. This was also first acclaimed as an important "missing link."

With the discovery of more remains, however, it has been found that some of them are quite modern. Others are similar to the Neanderthal type, and there are none of the skeletal features which cannot be duplicated in modern races or individuals.

Australopithecus

Another important group of fossil discoveries has been made over the past 30 years in South Africa by Dart and others. This form has been called Australopithecus.

He was originally thought to be a manlike ape, but evidence has accumulated in recent years that he was probably truly human. It is now agreed by most authorities that most of his features were human, including his teeth and posture, except that his brain capacity seemed to average only about half that of modern man. Despite this apparently small brain size (and many anatomists have pointed out that brain size is no infallible index of intelligence), Dart has assembled much evidence that the Australopithecines used weapons, possibly used fire, and in general had a truly human, though possibly very degenerate, culture. They were quite small, only about four feet high, and thus possibly may have been related to the pygmies, whose brain capacities are also much smaller than the average for modern man.

There are others that might be discussed, but those already mentioned are the best known and are supposed to provide the best evidence for human evolution. This whole subject seems replete with varying opinions and ever-changing interpretations on the part of the different experts involved.

The past sixty or so years has even witnessed a number of outright boners on the part of several such authorities, such as the elephant's kneebone discovered in Java in 1926, acclaimed for some time as a new skull of Pithecanthropus.

Then there was the Hesperopithecus tooth found in 1922 in Nebraska, which was accepted so widely as evidence of man's antiquity that it was introduced by the evolutionists as expert testimony in the famous "evolution trial" in Tennessee in 1925. Two years later, however, the complete skeleton was found and proved rather to have belonged to an extinct pig.

The so called Colorado Man (also constructed from a tooth) was later found to have belonged to the horse family.

An apeman skull, also found in Colorado, exhibited as such for a time in a museum, was actually the skull of a pet monkey buried a few years previously.

A bone found near Seattle, identified as an ancient human fibula, turned out to be part of a bear's hind leg.

Finally, the famous Piltdown Man, regarded until recently as one of the three or four most important of the "missing links" in man's evolution, has now been formally pronounced to have been a clever hoax which fooled all the anthropological specialists for 40 years before being exposed.

It is of great significance that many fossilized skeletons of modern man have been found at many different locations, and often with every indication of being as old as or older than the supposedly less advanced hominoids that have been unearthed. Some of the more famous of these include the Men of Swans combe, Galley Hill, Grimaldi, Oldoway, Foxhall, Wadjak, Fontechevade, and others - all of whom are practically indistinguishable from modern man and which yet give evidence of at least as great geologic age as any of the other presumably more primitive types.

Many of the outstanding present-day anthropologists have therefore adopted the theory that modern man existed contemporaneously with Neanderthal man, and the others, and that all represent variant races evolved from some as-yet-undiscovered ancestor.

On the other hand, there is no real evidence against the far more reasonable theory, adopted by some, that the Neanderthals, Peking Man, etc., represent degenerate races, descended from Homo Sapiens as a result of mutation, isolation, etc. In fact, there is some evidence that modern man himself is a somewhat deteriorated descendant of his ancestors.

The Cro-Magnon race of men, who inhabited Europe about the same time as the Neanderthals, are well known to have been superior to modern man, both in physical size and in brain capacity.

Recent discoveries of Weidenrich and others in the Far East, especially Java, have been quite spectacular in this regard. A number of individuals have been unearthed, of great apparent antiquity, but truly human, and of tremendous size, far larger even than the Cro-Magnon skeletons. In fact, Weidenrich and those of his school now regard these exceptionally large individuals, such as Gigantopithecus and Meganthropus, as ancestral to Java Man, Peking Man, and similar primitive fossil men.

These facts serve to add emphasis to a principle already alluded to several times, namely, that developmental evolution is not the universal law of biology, but rather deterioration or degeneration. As we have seen, there is no real evidence of progressive evolution, but very much evidence for deteriorative evolution or, at best, biologic stability.

We have already seen, in the previous chapter, that this law of degeneration, or entropy increase, is universally operative throughout the physical and chemical realms; it now seems also to pervade the biologic realm. In fact, this truth is beginning so to disturb evolutionists that several significant papers have appeared recently in scientific journals, attempting to harmonize the concept of evolution with the second law of thermodynamics, but with no real success.

Law of Morpholysis

More and more it appears that there is one great degenerative principle pervading all nature, of

which the law of entropy is merely its special manifestation in physical phenomena. This law has been called by Dr. R. E. D. Clarke the "law of morpholysis" (morpholysis means "loosing of structure"). In other words, there is a universal tendency from the highly organized to the disorganized, from the ordered to the disordered. Never is there an inherent, natural, undirected, unaided, trend toward increase of order or organization. The natural tendency is always downward.

In biology an important example is found in the very agencies supposed to bring about evolution, i.e., gene mutations and chromosome changes or aberrations. All such changes are harmful or at best indifferent, as far as the organism is concerned. They seem clearly to represent a breaking-down of the original ordered arrangement of the genes in the germ cells, brought about through penetration of the germ cell by X-rays, cosmic radiation, or some other disorganizing medium. In some way the genetic structure is disarranged and since if the mutations are not actually lethal they are both harmful and hereditary, the eventual result is a deterioration of the racial stock.

This would most likely account for the fact that most of the living creatures of the present are represented in the fossil record by larger, more highly developed members of the same species.

It might likewise partially account for the extinction of so many once highly developed forms of living creatures that once inhabited the earth, but are now known only as fossils.

It would, furthermore, explain the phenomenon of the atrophy of once-valuable organs until they become vestigial, or even disappear.

Thus it seems evident that if evolution has taken place on any large scale at all (that is, of course, progressive evolution.), it must have done so at complete variance with the indications of all modern genetic research and indeed with all basic physical law. Most of even the proffered evidence for evolution can be better interpreted in the light of the law of deterioration, and with far better scientific basis.

~ end of chapter 2 ~

***