

A Response to the National Academy of Sciences

2008 publication “Science, Evolution and Creationism”

This publication is being released by the Creation Studies Institute (CSI) in response to the 2008 publication by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) entitled “Science, Evolution and Creationism”. The publication being discussed here is available for free download from the NAS web page <http://nationalacademies.org/evolution/>.

The purpose of the NAS publication is to discredit the concept of creation as being “non-scientific”, and to suppress any teaching of creation alongside evolution in the classrooms of our educational establishments.

CSI believes that many of the opinions put forth by the NAS:

- are biased by an atheist-oriented world view
- are scientifically flawed or are based on weak and circumspect evidence
- are worded such as to confuse or mislead the reader
- are disrespectful to the Christian, Jewish and other faiths
- ignore the beliefs on which our great nation was founded and our fathers of science held to be true
- fail to address scientific research and evidence that contradicts evolutionary theory
- disenfranchise the growing number of scientists who do not support these views.

Introduction

Before we begin reviewing the NAS publication, it is necessary to make a few general points about this publication and about the position being upheld by the NAS.

Who is the National Academy of Sciences?

The NAS is a body of elected members and was established by a charter granted by an Act of Congress in 1863. It is the foremost body that advises the United States Government and the nation in general, in matters of science, technology, engineering and medicine. The Institute of Medicine, who published the publication being discussed here, was established in 1970.

A formidable organization indeed, but let's look a little deeper at the composition of the NAS membership from the perspective of the *world views* they espouse. A 1998 survey published in the *Nature* scientific journal, revealed the following alarming statistics about the NAS membership¹:

- 72.2% were professing atheists.
- A further 20.8% were agnostics.

That leaves only 7% of their membership who believe in God, in stark contrast to 90%² of the general US population, whom this self-elected body of scientists is supposed to serve!

This begs the question: did science influence their theological beliefs, or did their theology influence their scientific beliefs?

1 Percentages are of the biological and physical-science members of the NAS who responded to the survey.

2 According to a 2003 Harris poll and later confirmed in a 2007 Newsweek poll.

Why do we Take Issue with their Publication?

The Bible declares that God created the heavens and the earth, and that God created man in His image. The NAS publication is basically declaring the Bible to be untrue on this matter, one of its most basic tenets. This presents a major and troubling dichotomy. Our nation was founded with the concept of a Creator God inherent in our Declaration of Independence, Pledge of Allegiance and in the beliefs and testimony of most of our founding fathers.

*In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.
(Gen 1:1, NKJV)
So God created man in His own image; in the image of
God He created him; male and female He created them.
(Gen 1:27, NKJV)*

Despite the inclusion of some quotes from religious leaders designed to appease people of faith, the NAS publication amounts to a thinly-veiled promotion of the atheist views that seemingly pervade their organization. We are all familiar with the “separation of church and state” battle-cry (which, by the way, is nowhere to be found in the US Constitution), but for a government-sanctioned institution to become actively antagonistic toward the teachings of the Bible is a troubling development that cannot go unheeded. Those 90% of Americans who profess a belief in God should be very alarmed, even outraged, at this disturbing corporate stance by our National Academy of Sciences.

A Conflict of “World Views”

Arguments about Creation versus Evolution inevitably boil down to what is called one's “world view”. There is one “camp” who believe that life as we know it was created by a superior being, a deity which most would call God. There is another camp who has bought into the concept of “evolution”, popularized by the works of Charles Darwin in his 1959 book “Origin of Species”.

The creationist camp believes that life started “high” (in terms of complexity and function) and has gradually deteriorated over time through disease, destructive mutations, environmental influences and extinction. The evolutionist camp believes that life started “low” (chance combination of chemicals) and evolved through undirected forces of nature and beneficial mutations to become ever more complex over eons of time. There are many confused people somewhere in the middle who perhaps *want* to believe the former (after all, the existence of God gives us a sense of purpose in this life and a hope for eternal life), but through decades of indoctrination have perhaps come to put some degree of faith in the teachings of evolution.

In our opinion, the teaching of evolution has been one of the most cunning, subversive and deceitful tools employed by the secular world in its “War on God”, and its attempt to undermine Christianity at its very foundation.

Are we saying that the NAS is deliberately being deceitful? Not necessarily. Readers will have to draw their own conclusions about this. Many scientists sincerely embrace the theory of evolution. People can sincerely believe in something and yet be sincerely mistaken.

*This is the verdict:
Light has come into the world, but men loved darkness
instead of light because their deeds were evil.
(John 3:19, NIV)*

Creationists are Not the Fringe Group they're Portrayed as Being

Keep in mind that *Creationists* did not invent *Creationism*. The Creation account comes to us from the Word of God. Creationists are merely its advocates.

Based on a 2005 poll³, 64% of Americans believe they were created directly by God. Only 22% fully buy into the theory of evolution. When compared with a similar poll taken nearly a decade earlier, we see that public opinion has stayed pretty constant on this issue. This, despite *gargantuan* efforts to brainwash the public over many decades that evolution is a “fact”, the outright censorship of the creation message, and attempts to paint “creationists” as a fringe group of simple-minded, uneducated fanatics.

2008 marked the release of a major motion picture “Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed”, starring Ben Stein. In this documentary-style movie, we see that public science policy and dogma is forged by an elite few who control our media, and our institutions such as universities, museums, and of course, organizations like the NAS. We begin to realize that perhaps our science institutions are home to many quiet dissenters who dare not speak up for fear of losing their very livelihoods.

Should we Challenge the Scientific Authority of the NAS?

We take no pleasure in trying to “take on” an institution with the standing of the NAS, and flat out declare that they are wrong. We'd much prefer that they'd adopt a position of neutrality toward the controversial subject of origins. The NAS could have left people to their own opinions on this sensitive subject, *without any detriment whatsoever to the quality of science education*. Nonetheless, the NAS decided to release this document, and as believers in Creator God we have no choice but to rise to this challenge.

Frankly, we feel that the release of this publication by the NAS:

- is inflammatory
- does absolutely nothing to further the cause of true science.
- was simply unnecessary.

Our hope is that the reader will not be intimidated by the stature of the NAS as an institution, into believing whatever they say must be well researched and true. As we'll reveal here, their arguments – in our opinion - are contrived, flawed and weak. The NAS – we believe – are simply throwing their weight around in order to fulfill an underlying agenda. That is, to redefine science – and limit science – to the study of naturalistic causes (naturalism). The hidden agenda, we suspect, is to separate an entire generation of students from any belief that we were created in God's image, that human life has any inherent value or purpose, and to indoctrinate the belief that we are just the result of one big cosmic accident.

We feel that *true* science, evidence, truth and logic are on *our* side. Truthfully, it does not take a doctoral degree to understand the very basic flaws and holes in the concept of evolution; it just takes some careful thought and introspection over the issues involved, and a modicum of common sense.

The Word of God versus The Theories of Man

Let's be clear: the Theory of Evolution stands in *direct defiance* to the Word of God as recorded in the Holy Bible. There can be *no* middle ground. The two concepts are polar opposites. Although many try to do so, logically one cannot believe in both the inerrant truth of the Bible and in evolution.

3 Based on a June 2005 Harris poll.

CREATION aligns itself with BELIEF AND FAITH IN GOD
EVOLUTION aligns itself with ATHEISM

A study of the Old Testament reveals 87 occurrences of the Hebrew word *bara'* (which means “to create something out of nothing”), translated into the English words *Create, Creator, Maker* and their derivatives. The NAS publication, despite taking aim at the inherently biblical subject of creation, *totally ignores* what the Bible actually has to say on this subject. Not one verse from the Bible is even examined in their document. Our purpose is to set the record straight from both a biblical and scientific standpoint.

As powerful and authoritative as the NAS may appear to be, the Word of God is the ultimate authority that trumps any human opinion. The NAS have sadly exalted themselves above the Word of God in deciding to adopt the position that they are taking.

*Although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God,
nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts,
and their foolish hearts were darkened.
Professing to be wise, they became fools.
(Romans 1:21-22, NKJV)*

A Cunning Game of Words

Scientists are renowned for using very precise and exacting terminology. In fact, absolute clarity and non-ambiguity are the hallmarks of scientific literature. Yet when it comes to the topic of evolution, proponents of this theory seem to abandon these principles because this seems to be the only way they can make an effective argument. We discover scientists, who'd be meticulous in discussing any other subject, suddenly sounding more like tabloid news reporters. They'll resort to misleading or ill-defined terminology and “bait and switch” techniques to try and sell a story to an often gullible public. The NAS publication is a prime example of this practice which will become apparent as we dissect its claims and its cunning choice of wording. *Amazingly, almost every paragraph of their publication exhibits these traits.* If folks are going to represent themselves as an authority in “science”, let's demand a scientific caliber of clarity in their arguments.

*“Scientists who go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life
are great con-men, and the story they are telling
may be the greatest hoax ever.”*

Dr. T. N. Tahmisian, Atomic Energy Commission

Publications that Fail to Define the Very Phenomena they're Talking About!

Charles Darwin did not once define the term *species* anywhere in the 600+ pages of his book “Origin of Species”⁴. 150 years later, a single definition eludes scientists even today. The creation account doesn't talk about *species*, it talks about *seed* and *kinds*.

Then God said, “Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb that yields seed, and the fruit tree that yields fruit according to its kind, whose seed is in itself, on the earth”; and it was so. (Gen 1:11, NKJV)
So God created great sea creatures and every living thing that moves, with which the waters abounded, according to their

⁴ The full title of Darwin's book was: “On The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life”. Just as the Bible doesn't talk about *species*, it also doesn't talk about *races* since it teaches that we are all descendants of Adam and Eve.

*kind. (Gen 1:21, NKJV)
And God made the beast of the earth according to its kind,
cattle according to its kind, and everything that creeps on the
earth according to its kind. (Gen 1:25, NKJV)*

The NAS *has* been gracious enough to define “species” for us, although their definition is really better suited as a description of the biblical term “kind”. (Note that that they still leave us without a definition of species for *asexually* reproducing organisms.)

*Species: In sexually reproducing organisms,
species consist of individuals that can interbreed with each other.*

However, the NAS is almost as guilty as Darwin when it comes to the term *evolution*.

So what is Evolution?

The NAS does set out some definitions within the margins of their main publication (including “micro-evolution” which we’ll examine later). However, they almost evade any definition for *evolution* itself. The full publication does in fact provide one definition for *evolution*, but it’s buried within a lengthy page-and-a-half of text.

The “fickle” NAS definition of evolution:

*“Biological evolution refers to changes in the traits of organisms
over multiple generations.”*

So let’s ask ourselves . . . is that all they really mean by *evolution*? By that definition, we can finish our rebuttal right here! We can all agree that organisms exhibit changes in traits over multiple generations.

But wait a minute! That definition is *not really* the concept that the NAS is trying to get across, is it? The NAS, by defining *biological evolution* this way, is being *very* fickle. Their definition does not align with their hypothesis or agenda.

In reality, they want us to believe that *upwardly complex* change occurs; *now that’s a different kettle of fish altogether*. The NAS wants us to believe in generational changes that give rise to an *increase in genetic information*, leading to the development of capabilities, limbs and organs that were not present in the parent generations.

Their definition also requires that *organisms* are present to begin with, since it does not touch on the aspect of *origins*. Yet – by implication – they also want us to believe that non-matter evolved itself into matter (e.g. the “big bang”), and then inorganic matter (non-life) somehow evolved into the very first living organism in order to start this whole process off. All these concepts are part of the bigger picture of evolution that the NAS is hoping we’ll buy into, yet are missing from their definition of evolution. Many evolutionists will be quick to point out that evolution makes no claims about the subject of origins. However that stance is a just a “cop-out” since, if true, they’d have no business in trying to dismiss the concept of Creation, which deals *exclusively* with origins. If the NAS is going to take aim at the credibility of the Creation account, then we must demand that they supply an alternate explanation of *origins*.

How *should* we define evolution? (Our “litmus test”)

In fact, after much research, we haven't really uncovered *any* good definition of “evolution” (or “Darwinian Evolution” or “Neo-Darwinian” evolution for that matter) in the scientific literature *that encapsulates the entire process starting from the very origin of life*. So we are pretty much forced to invent our own.

Why would we want to invent a definition for something we don't even believe in? Because . . . if we are really going to get to grips with this subject, then having a definition of “evolution” that could mean *any type of change* just won't cut it. This is both futile and frustrating for the person who's really trying to understand what's being claimed, and misleading for the person who's reading it more superficially.

From this point forward, we will adopt the following definition of *evolution* as our “litmus test” as to whether a *change* really constitutes *evolution*, or – simply – *change*.

Our “Litmus Test” definition of *evolution*:

“A theory which postulates that matter and life first formed by entirely natural processes, and that all living organisms originated from the same single-celled organism via a process of generational change, from a lower or simpler state to a higher or more complex state.”

We feel this is a much fairer definition of the underlying concept that the NAS is trying to have us embrace.

We're dwelling on this issue because, as you read our rebuttal, you'll see how the NAS leans on their own blurry definition to make statements about evolution that would never hold up under a more scrupulous definition. So much so, that we'll begin to sound like a broken record every time we point it out!

Micro-Evolution versus Macro-Evolution

Many, including creationists, have attempted to differentiate between types of change by introducing the terms *micro-evolution* and *macro-evolution* in a well-meaning (but not all that successful) attempt to clarify things.

Micro-evolution is defined by the NAS to mean:

“Changes in the traits of a group of organisms that do not result in a new species.”

Macro-evolution is not defined by the NAS in their publication, but we could deduce it to mean:

“Changes in the traits of a group of organisms that DO result in a new species.”

Creationists will agree that micro-evolution does take place, while macro-evolution does not. However, this terminology can still cause some challenges which are exploited by the evolutionist. Typically it leads to the retort: “Well . . . if micro-evolution is true, isn't it reasonable that macro-evolution could also be true?” In other words, the implication is made that macro-evolution is just a logical extension of the micro-evolution concept.

The fact is, any “micro-evolution” that we can observe only ever acts on genetic information that was *already present* within the parent organism. These changes in traits do not involve any new genetic information.

Micro-evolution is a term whose use we'd like to discourage, since it describes changes that are not changes *from a lower or simpler to a higher or more complex state* so it is not really a form of evolution by our litmus test.

A CHAPTER BY CHAPTER ANALYSIS OF THE CLAIMS MADE BY THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

The NAS actually has 2 versions of its publication. There is a 70-page full version, and 8-page summary version available as a PDF file from their website <http://nationalacademies.org/evolution/>.

Since many folks may only take the time to read the shorter publication, and since the summary version makes some statements that the full version does not, we'll tackle the summary version before we examine the fuller version.

To distinguish between what the NAS is saying and our response, we use *green text* to quote a paragraph or a title taken from the NAS document.

In a few places, the NAS document brings up a ***Focus Topic*** where we will explain the biblical/creationist position in greater detail.

Let's start with the title of the publication itself:

Science, Evolution and Creationism

The very title of the NAS document is a subtle attempt to belittle and marginalize the creation concept by labeling it as an “ism”: i.e. *creationism*. If they're going to use the word “Evolution” in their title, then they should be consistent and balanced enough to use the term “Creation” in like manner. Or perhaps, refer to their belief as “*Evolutionism*” to make things equal!

Why is Evolution Important?

Whoa! Not so fast! Wasn't the whole purpose of this document to put the concepts of science, evolution and creation into perspective, and discuss the merits or flaws of each? Shouldn't a scientific analysis start out with a statement of the problem, set out the competing hypotheses, discuss the evidence for each, and *only then* draw a conclusion and possibly expound on the merits of that conclusion. By declaring “evolution is important” in its very opening paragraph, the validity of evolution is presented as a foregone conclusion, and this leaves no room for objectivity in the discussion that follows. This is a blatant example of the built-in *bias* we see in most mainstream literature and the media toward this subject.

Now, of course, some could accuse us of doing the very same thing. But remember, our purpose here is specifically to refute the NAS document. The NAS claims to represent “science”, and given its standing as a government-sanctioned scientific organization, it ought to be far more objective in its presentation and analysis of opposing views. A more reasonable and balanced opening question might have been “Why is an Understanding of Origins Important?”.

Since we disagree with the whole concept of “evolution”, what can we really say when the NAS considers the propagation of something we consider to be a falsehood, to be “important”?

*All things were made through Him,
and without Him nothing was made that was made.
(John 1:3, NKJV)*

The discovery and understanding of the processes of evolution represent one of the most powerful achievements in the history of science.

This is a grand statement with no substance behind it. The NAS publication is full of such statements. As we define evolution, no processes of evolution have been discovered, only hypothesized. Evolution (i.e. upward change involving new genetic information), does not occur and has never been observed to occur. As for understanding, if there are scientists who possess this understanding then they've done a poor job at communicating it. No satisfactory evidence *or even a satisfactory theoretical explanation* for evolution has yet been put forth, in our opinion: this is one reason why we are so adamantly opposed to this dogma.

Evolution successfully explains the diversity of life on Earth and has been confirmed repeatedly through observation and experiment.

No! *Natural selection* successfully explains the *diversity* of life on Earth and *natural selection* has been confirmed repeatedly through observation and experiment. There are two key issues to point out here: (1) *Natural selection* partially explains *diversity*, but *natural selection* is emphatically *not evolution*. Natural selection – as with any phenomena that leads to death - should more logically be considered an enemy of evolution, in fact. (2) *Diversity* does not mean the same thing as *development*. Diversity, by our statement above, simply refers to genetically expressed *variation within a “kind”*.

Focus Topic: Natural Selection

Natural selection simply means the “survival of the fittest” and the dying off of individuals that are genetically disadvantaged and less able to survive and reproduce in a given environment. Natural selection actually culls out individuals with *traits* that are less suited to survival. By so doing, it eliminates features that existed in the gene pool of the original population, resulting in *specialization*. Natural selection *does not create new genes*. The specialized population can never even regain the traits that it once possessed, once the genes for expressing those traits have disappeared from the surviving population. Natural selection *never* results in a *gain* of genetic information that wasn't present in the original population. Honest biologists – including ardent evolutionists – know this and will not dispute this fact.

150 years ago, Darwin believed that natural selection was *the* evolutionary driving force. Sadly, at the high school and lay person level, people are still being duped into believing that natural selection is an evolutionary process – it is not. Natural selection is basically a process of selective *extinction* of certain populations or sub-populations within certain environments.

Since Darwinism is considered synonymous with the term “natural selection”, many people assume that creationists do not believe in natural selection. Evolutionists capitalize on this false perception, and the creationist is thereby made to look foolish. The process of natural selection clearly *does* occur in nature. So let's be clear: *Creation scientists do believe in the process of natural selection*. Where we differ from Darwin, is that we realize that this process cannot account for wholesale transition from simple to complex lifeforms.

Now, at this point, the evolutionist will bring up the concept of *beneficial mutations* acting *in combination* with natural selection. This, too, is a fallacy that we'll address shortly. Yet, when it boils down to it, these are the only two mechanisms that evolutionists have at their disposal.

Evolutionary science provides the foundation for modern biology.

The truth is, *empirical science* – not evolutionary science – provides the foundation for modern biology. Biology is primarily concerned with what can be observed in the present. Since evolution has never been

observed, and is alleged to have required billions of years to run its course, any application in modern biology is limited and purely speculative. Moreover, “evolutionary science” - whatever that really means - is going to be faulty if it involves a belief in evolution. Anything built on a faulty foundation will ultimately fail. We suspect that the NAS is really implying DNA research and genetics by their use of the term “evolutionary science”, however this would be a misleading use of the term “evolution”, as will be discussed later.

In the few instances where evolutionary beliefs have been applied to practical biology, the conclusions drawn from these beliefs can be outright dangerous. An example would be biologists' belief that we possess vestigial organs that “no longer” serve any useful purpose. Many organs have been so-labeled in the past decades, only to have later been discovered to *have* a purpose, after all. The thyroid gland is one such example. Once considered an evolutionary “leftover”, it is now known to be vital for health. Even the human appendix is now known to have a role in the bacterial action in the digestive system. A much more solid foundation for biology would be the belief that our Creator did not make any mistakes, and that everything was created for a purpose.

It [evolutionary science] has opened the door to entirely new types of medical, agricultural, and environmental research, and has led to the development of technologies that can help prevent and combat disease.

Again, this is a grand statement with no substance behind it. Again, word games, as they give no clue as to what they really mean by “evolutionary science”. We believe that the NAS is probably referring to DNA and genetic research when using this term. However, to label such as evolutionary science would be misleading. Any useful technologies that have come out of DNA/genetic research, have everything to do with our ability to gain a better understanding of present-day organisms, not suppositions about the past.

For a discussion about technologies that combat disease, which we will argue have nothing to do with evolution, refer to our commentary on SARS and resistant bacteria later in this response.

Regrettably, effective science education in our schools is being undermined by efforts to introduce non-scientific concepts about evolution into science classrooms.

“Non-scientific concepts about evolution”? Didn't they intend to say “non-evolutionary concepts about science”? Creationists are not trying to teach concepts about evolution, they are declaring that evolution is a falsehood, period. Again, the NAS is trying to frame their sentence to suggest that “evolution is all there is”, before they've even made an argument to that effect.

No, the real regrettable fact is that science teaching in schools has become a matter of preaching philosophic dogma that students are required to memorize and regurgitate back to the teacher in rote, “parrot” fashion. Science was once about encouraging critical inquiry and allowing the student the freedom to explore the evidence. Fear of disciplinary action is leading teachers to squash even honest questions from students that so much as hint of any skepticism towards Darwinian evolutionary concepts.

*They exchanged the truth of God for a lie,
and worshiped and served created things
rather than the Creator—who is forever praised. Amen.
(Romans 1:25, NIV)*

How Science Works

We agree with many parts of the section entitled “How Science Works”. Nonetheless, we take objection to its “patronizing” tone. By including this section, the NAS seems to be implying that creationists don't understand

how science works. Let's be very clear: "science" is not the exclusive domain of the evolutionist. There are many highly-credentialed scientists who reject evolution, but understand the scientific method every bit as well as their evolutionist counterparts.

The study of evolution provides an excellent example of how scientists go about their work.

We'd argue that scientists are not subjecting evolution to the same scientific rigor that they'd employ and demand in other branches of science. If they did so, many would (and do) end up rejecting the theory.

We have no issue with the study of evolutionary theory; in fact we think the concept of evolution *should* be studied rigorously, but *not to the exclusion, mockery and censorship of other hypotheses.*

Some scientific explanations are so well established that no new evidence is likely to alter them. The explanation becomes a scientific theory. (Intermediate text omitted for brevity.) A good example is the theory of gravity.

The NAS neglects to mention that there is also the term "law" employed in science. A scientific "law" generally trumps a scientific "theory" in terms of the degree to which it is established and accepted.

They later go on to cite the theory of gravity as a comparison. Generally, the theory of gravity is more commonly referred to as the "Newton's Law of Gravity". To place the theory of evolution on the same rung of the "acceptance ladder" as Newton's Law of Gravity, would be a mistake.

The bottom line is: we can "split hairs" over what a *theory* is or isn't, but *we simply don't feel evolution deserves to be called a scientific theory.* To do so, is to elevate it way above the stature it deserves. Evolution is - *at best* - a *hypothesis*. Some have called it a fairy tale. However, it is a fairy tale that has led some of its most ardent believers to commit some of the greatest human atrocities of modern times.

Interestingly, even Newton's Law of Gravity is being challenged by some. The fact that gravity cannot be measured at distant stars and planets is leading some to suggest that universal gravity should "*only*" be considered a theory, not a law. We won't open that can of worms here. Suffice to say that a theory – and even a law – is not absolutely irrevocable, should the evidence turn out to refute it.

The NAS would do well to humble themselves enough to concede that we know embarrassingly little about many basic phenomena that can be observed in the *present*, never mind the past.

Evolution stands on an equally solid foundation of observation, experiment, and confirming evidence.

Only by the fickle NAS definition of evolution. Our "litmus test" definition of evolution has no such foundation of observation, experiment or confirming evidence. Not by any stretch of the imagination!

The Theory of Evolution Has Been Repeatedly Tested and Confirmed

The statement made by this title is simply not true. Evolution, by our definition, is really not testable and has *not* been confirmed.

*"Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory,
but a metaphysical research program."*

Karl Popper, evolutionist and leading philosopher of science.
Originator of the idea of falsifiability, as a criterion of demarcation of science from non-science.

*“Evolution is unproved and unprovable.
We believe it, only because the only alternative is
special creation, and that is unthinkable.”*

Sir Arthur Keith, Evolutionist
Author of the foreword for the 100th edition of “Origin of the Species”

We all know from our experience that biological traits pass from parents to offspring. This is the basis of evolution.

This is the basis of *reproduction, not evolution*. The reproductive system in itself is a miracle of creation, which required both male and female forms of every (mammalian) kind to appear simultaneously. Given that NAS themselves agree that only individuals from the same “species” are capable of interbreeding, how “evolution” could have accomplished this feat is perplexing, to say the least.

Sometimes traits change between generations.

Yes, but changes in traits are caused primarily by gene expression or non-expression. A gene inherited from a parent will not necessarily become dominant or be expressed in the immediate offspring. Sometimes, such changes are caused by loss or mutation of genes from one generation to the next, but never by new genes being formed that weren't present in the parents.

If a new trait results in an offspring doing better in its natural surroundings and producing more offspring that also inherit the trait, that trait will become more widespread over time. If the new trait makes the offspring less able to survive and thus leave fewer offspring, the trait will tend to fade from existence. Natural selection is the process by which some traits succeed and others fail in the environment where the organism lives. For every type of life we see today, there were many other types that were unsuccessful and became extinct.

The NAS is simply describing the observable process of natural selection, and we have no argument here *except* that they have craftily inserted the word “new” (i.e. “new trait”). Traits are rarely new, and the genes for expressing the traits are *never* new; they always existed in the parent population, ever since God created the original *kind* to reproduce *after its kind*.

Scientists no longer question the basic facts of evolution as a process.

BAIT AND SWITCH WARNING! Weren't they just talking about *natural selection* in the preceding paragraph? Suddenly, they've switched *natural selection* with *evolution* and implied the two concepts are one and the same.

However, this is a deplorable statement for another reason. Most of the NAS document is trying to put forth an *opinion*. This sentence seems to cross the line from opinion to *deception*. Deception is defined in the dictionary as *the concealment or distortion of the truth for the purpose of misleading*. To say that “scientists no longer question the basic facts of evolution as a process” is a statement that the NAS must surely know to be untrue. *Plenty* of scientists question the basic ideas – which are emphatically *not facts* – of evolution.

Over 700 PhD-level scientists felt strongly enough to declare publicly their dissent from Darwinism by signing the following statement: “*We are skeptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged.*” (See www.dissentfromdarwin.org.) The list covers just about every branch of scientific

specialization from molecular biologists to geneticists to botanists to paleontologists, to name but a few.

Not convinced yet? Physicians and Surgeons for Scientific Integrity (www.pssiinternational.com) has 851 physicians and surgeons as signed-up members who feel strongly enough to declare publicly: “*As medical doctors we are skeptical of the claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the origination and complexity of life and we therefore dissent from Darwinian macro-evolution as a viable theory.*”

Keep in mind, these lists are only the tip of the iceberg. For every brave name on those lists, how many more are keeping their opinions hushed for fear of professional repercussions? We go back to the message of the movie “Expelled”. We suspect the true list would number into the tens of thousands if the fear of speaking out publicly were not a factor. Folks, the NAS is either deceiving you – or else very ignorant of the facts – when it makes the blanket statement “Scientists no longer question the basic facts of evolution as a process”.

“Science today is locked into paradigms. Every avenue is blocked by beliefs that are wrong, and if you try to get anything published by a journal today, you will run up against a paradigm, and the editors will turn it down.”

Sir Fred Hoyle, Nobel Prize winner

“Under a new anti-religious dogmatism, scientists and educators are not allowed to even think thoughts that involve an intelligent creator. They cannot even mention the possibility that – as Newton or Galileo believed – these laws were created by God or a higher being. They could get fired, lose tenure, have their grants cut off.”

Ben Stein, author, actor

“EXPELLED: No Intelligence Allowed”

The concept has withstood extensive testing by tens of thousands of specialists in biology, medicine, anthropology, geology, chemistry, and other fields. Discoveries in different fields have reinforced one another, and evidence for evolution has continued to accumulate for 150 years.

What concept? *Evolution* or *natural selection*? Having just employed their bait-and-switch technique we're not sure *which concept* they're now referring to. We'd agree that *natural selection* has withstood extensive testing by tens of thousands of specialists. But evolution (see our litmus test definition) is conjecture about the past that has never been observed nor is it repeatable in the present, so how could it possibly be extensively tested?

If evolution was supposed to have required billions of years, what do they mean when they say evidence has continued to accumulate for 150 years? Wouldn't the evidence have been accumulating for billions of years? Presumably this is a reference to the age of Darwinism. Actually, 150 years ago, Darwin had challenged the world to find fossil evidence to prove his theory right. 150 years later, that fossil evidence is still missing.

The Fossil Record

The fossil record is actually one of the strongest evidences *for creation*. It stands as almost undeniable testimony *against* the theory of evolution, when examined with proper scientific integrity. Millions of fossils would be expected to show transitional forms of life – but *all* are missing.

The concept of evolution is supported by fossil findings in rock layers from different ages of Earth's history. In general, fossils that more closely resemble today's life forms are found in younger rock layers, while many fossils that only distantly resemble life today occur in older layers. Based on such findings, naturalists proposed that species change, or evolve, over time.

These statements are based on the belief that the Earth's rock layers tell the story of 4.5 billion years of Earth's history. We strongly disagree.

Focus Topic: Fossils – A Record of Billions of Years or a One-Time Catastrophe?

Most lay people don't know a whole lot about how fossils are formed, how they are found in nature, or how fossil-bearing rocks are dated.

Fossils are typically formed during catastrophic flooding and are mostly found in sedimentary rock. The process requires rapid burial in sediment carried by massive flows of water. (Slow burial would give too much opportunity for scavengers to dismantle the carcass before burial was complete.) The sediment then undergoes “cementation” due to the minerals present and the water pressure above it.

Sedimentary rocks cannot be dated using normal (radiological) dating techniques. Geologists instead rely on *circular reasoning* to “date” rock layers: the age of the rock layer is declared by examining the type of fossils found in it. The age of the fossils are determined by current evolutionary belief about when those creatures (or more commonly sea shells, since most “index fossils” are in fact sea shells) are thought to have existed. If evolution is a false theory, then the dates produced by this circular method will be utterly meaningless.

The overwhelming *real* geologic evidence indicates that virtually the *entire* fossil record was laid down in one global catastrophic event: the Genesis Flood.

*“If there had been a global flood, what would we expect to find?
Billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the Earth!
When we look at the Earth, what do we find?
Billions of dead things, buried in rock layers, laid down by water, all over the Earth!”*
Ken Ham, President and Founder, *Answers in Genesis*

There are some isolated examples of fossilization being caused by more recent localized events, which only goes to prove that long ages are not required for fossilization, only the right ingredients and conditions.

It is interesting that many cultures around the world, not just the Judeo-Christian culture, allude to a global flood in their traditions.

The creation account of the Genesis flood is the only mechanism that can adequately explain:

- why we find an abundance of fossils – predominantly *marine* fossils – on the tops of some of the highest mountains. The whole earth had to be catastrophically covered by water.
- why we do not find evidence of soil layers or biologic activity (bioturbation) between consecutive rock layers, if millions of years elapsed between each layer being deposited.
- why we see many examples of polystrate fossils – for example fossilized tree trunks that are sitting upright and passing through supposedly “millions of years” of successive rock layers.
- why layers of rock strata are bent or folded. Solid rock would crack rather than bend.
- the existence of water gaps: where rivers take the most illogical route through a seemingly impossible-to-erode mountain range, for example, when an “more natural” route would have been available.
- other phenomena too numerous to list here.

The depiction of the geologic column that we see adorning our textbooks is a very idealogical construct. These progressive layers never conveniently appear in one column, all in one place, in the real world. However, there is clearly some degree of “sorting” of fossils evidenced in the rock layers. Just as definite, though, is the

frequent discovery of fossils that are “out of place” according to the predictions of the geologic column.

The layering effect is easily explained by contemplating how the global flood would have progressed in severity and by considering the likely *order of burial*. The flood would have buried small sea-floor dwellers first, then water plants, then many fish caught up in sedimentary flows, then coastal plants, then land plants, then mountain plants. Land creatures would naturally try to escape to higher ground, many larger and more intelligent animals being better able to outrun the rising water level than smaller animals and insects for example. Birds could have flown away until there was nowhere left to fly, and would have succumbed to the water very late in the process. The later the burial, the more likely that post-flood erosion or remaining scavengers in the seas would destroy the evidence. Remember that the global flood would not have destroyed all sea life by any means, so scavengers would be plentiful. Also, mammals tend to bloat and float after drowning, rather than sinking and becoming fossilized. This explains why fish, amphibians, reptiles and mammals *collectively* only comprise 0.0125% of the fossil record. Over 99% of the fossil record is made up of shellfish, marine invertebrates, algae and plants.

It is not true to say that “fossils that more closely resemble today’s life forms are found in younger rock layers”, even if one were to accept that the higher rock layers are younger, which we do not. The fact is that, although some fossils have gone extinct, there are many creatures found alive today have not changed in the slightest from specimens found in the fossil record.

*“The more one studies the paleontological record,
the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone.”*

Dr. Louis T. Moore, Evolutionist
Professor of Paleontology, Princeton University

Natural selection has been identified as a driving force behind these changes.

Here they go again, attributing evolution to natural selection. We have already made our point on this issue. Natural selection is not evolution, and natural selection physically *cannot* account for the types of change being postulated here. Frankly, the NAS is not doing a particularly good job at articulating the evolutionary community's own beliefs. Any evolutionist will agree that natural selection is powerless without the combined effect of *beneficial mutations*. This would make beneficial mutations the “driving force”, not natural selection, but it is still a process which fails to provide a sufficient mechanism for evolution to take place. Let's take a moment to understand why this is the case.

Focus Topic: Do Mutations lead to Improvements in Function and Complexity?

Mutation simply refers to a copying error in DNA replication. Copying errors always corrupt the original information. Even so, it is conceivable that a copying error could give rise to a beneficial change. Mutations will either be negative, neutral or positive in their effect on the viability and fitness of the organism.

Mutation fails as an evolutionary process for several very basic reasons:

A Copy Requires an Original

Mutation, by definition, is a copying error. Any copy requires an original. Mutation requires that the DNA had already been *created*, as a prerequisite. The theory of evolution does not provide an answer as to how DNA first came into being. DNA represents a literal information source that is unfathomably and marvelously complex. To claim that the first DNA came into being by accidental processes of nature would be a bit like claiming that today's Kennedy Space Center formed itself through millions of years of hurricanes hitting the Florida peninsula. Mutations can only produce new alleles, which are genes that belong to a family of genes performing the same

basic function. Therefore, mutations can only produce minor variation within a created kind, not a wholesale change from one created kind to another.

Mutations are Rare

This is a fact that itself speaks volumes about our amazing Creator. Copying errors only occur once in about 10 million replications. Having said that, the average living creature has trillions of cells and will therefore carry a certain number of mutated cells, despite their rarity. The insurmountable problem for evolution is that significant, beneficial and survivable changes in organisms would require a whole series of *related* mutations to take place. To achieve *just seven, closely related* mutations you'd have to multiply out the one-in-ten-million probability (of one mutation) to end up with a probability of one in 10^{49} (ten to the 49th power): that's more molecules than are estimated to exist in the entire earth. Now, how many mutations would it take to turn gills into air-breathing lungs, scales into feathers, or any of the other implausible changes that evolutionists try to tell us have happened? The answer: most likely they would require *millions* of related mutations. Even then, we don't get around the problem of irreducible complexity that many living organs exhibit, where multiple changes would have to occur simultaneously since an individual, stepwise change would be unsustainable. Mathematicians have disproved the ability of mutations to evolve new body parts, using nothing more than simple statistics.

DNA has an in-built error detecting/correcting mechanism

At birth we inherit 2 sets of chromosomes, one from each parent. If we inherit a mutated gene from one parent but a good version of that gene from the other parent, the good gene will typically “save the day” since our genetic system is still able to recover the original “correct” information and ignore the corrupted version. Mutated genes will typically become dormant unless we happen to inherit the same mutation in both chromosomes, leading to disease or disfigurement. Thus, even if the mutation was theoretically capable of conferring an advantage, it's “error-flagged information content” is likely to be rejected or suppressed once passed onto the offspring.

Mutations nearly always lead to Disfigurement, Disease and Degeneration

A mutation is far, far more likely (it has been suggested at least 1,000 times more likely) to be detrimental than beneficial. In fact, if you take the view that God produced the optimum design of DNA to begin with, then all mutations are ultimately going to be detrimental although they may occasionally be perceived to confer a benefit in some limited – and typically artificial – environments.

We know for a fact that mutations are leading to degeneration, decay, disease and ultimately extinction. Approximately only 25% of the “species” that once existed on earth are still found alive today. “Genetic load” is a well known medical problem: it has led to a proliferation of diseases in recent generations, only kept in check to a limited degree by modern medicine. This hardly makes mutation a likely engine for successful progressive evolution from the simple to the complex. We *know* this to be true, both intuitively and experientially, so why are so many so willing to embrace mutation as a viable engine for goo-to-you evolution?

Incidentally, we can measure the rather alarming rate at which generational genetic load is increasing in the human race, and this provides strong evidence that we humans have not been around anywhere near as long as evolutionists would have us believe, nor will we continue to be viable for too many more generations since the mutational load follows an exponential curve.

Since then, scientists have found an overwhelming number of fossils in rock layers of different ages that repeatedly confirm the changes in life forms that are predicted by the theory of evolution.

If this were true, then why would one of evolution's biggest advocates and most notable paleontologists have made the following confessions:

*“The extreme rarity of transitional forms
persists as the trade secret of paleontology.”
“To preserve our favored account of evolution
by natural selection we view our data as so bad
that we never see the very process we profess to study.”*
The late Steven J. Gould, Evolutionary Paleontologist, Harvard University

The truth is that the *complete absence of transitional fossils* is probably *evolution's biggest embarrassment*. The NAS surely knows this, but has simply declared the very opposite to be true, leaning on their stature as an organization to get away with it.

Granted, almost weekly, we see tabloid news reports of some “strange, new fossil” having been found with some scientist attaching some evolutionary significance to the find, through the use of nothing more than imagination. These are “just so stories” that pop up and just as quickly fade away with no follow through. They are part of big media's attempt to blitz the public with the doctrine of evolution. Unfortunately these junk news stories are bombarded at us with such frequency that – unless we're really on our guard against this – there's a tendency we'll just soak it all in!

The transitional, intermediate forms of creatures (showing how one kind of creature transformed into another), as predicted by the theory of evolution, are *emphatically not being found*. Not at all. If evolution had occurred, we should expect to find millions, *yes millions*, of intermediate fossils. Instead, *not one* fossil has *ever* been found, where a *watertight* case can be made that it demonstrates an intermediate form between one kind of creature and another. This might be the biggest reason to utterly reject the theory of evolution.

Virtually all the fossil finds that have been seriously trumpeted as proof of ape-to-man transition, fish-to-reptile, reptile-to-bird, or whatever the case may be, have been discredited or proven to be hoaxes over time.

DNA Research

If ever there was a reason to put a nail in the coffin of evolution once and for all, it was the discovery of DNA and the advent of genetics research.

DNA provides us with undeniable evidence of design in nature. Not just design, but irreducibly complex design of awesome, mind-boggling complexity.

Furthermore, DNA research actually shows there is no mechanism that exists for evolution to occur.

*“We see that mutation/selection cannot create a single gene – ever. In my
opinion this constitutes what is essentially a formal proof that (macro-evolution)
is false.”*
Dr. John C. Sanford
Cornel Geneticist
Inventor of the gene gun

Molecular biology and genetics have revealed how evolution works at the level of molecules.

No, molecular biology and genetics have begun to reveal how *growth and cell reproduction* works and how *existing traits are passed on to offspring* at the level of molecules. These disciplines, when studied with

scientific integrity, totally *disprove* evolution as we define evolution.

Unknown when evolution and natural selection were first proposed in 1859, genetics has shown that traits are passed from parent to offspring through DNA, a molecule in all living things that directs how cells grow and reproduce.

We agree; no issue with this so far.

DNA studies support findings from other branches of science. For example, species that appear to be more distantly related from their positions in the fossil record are found to have correspondingly greater differences in their DNA than species that appear more closely related in the fossil record.

Scientists have not fully mapped the DNA sequences of most of the species found in the fossil record, so we feel that this statement is quite misleading. However, to the extent that current knowledge might support this claim, it would be easily explained by the *order of burial* during the onset of the global flood, as discussed earlier. It shouldn't surprise us that similar categories of organisms, that were laid down during a particular stage of the flood, would have closer DNA. Let's also remember that the geologic column, found in our textbooks and museums, is never found as a complete column in any one place in the real world.

Comparison of the human and chimp DNA sequences for the gene that encodes the hormone leptin (which is involved in the metabolism of fats) reveals only five differences in 250 nucleotides. Where the human and chimpanzee sequences differ, the corresponding nucleotide in the gorilla (shaded bars) can be used to derive the nucleotide that likely existed in the common ancestor of humans, chimpanzees, and gorillas. In two cases, the gorilla and human nucleotides match, while in the other three cases, the gorilla and chimpanzee sequences are the same. The common ancestor of the gorilla, chimpanzee, and human is most likely to have had the nucleotide that is the same in two of the three modern-day organisms because this would require just one DNA change rather than two.

The NAS has *selectively* picked out 250 nucleotides that happen to exhibit this similarity, but we need to keep in mind that the human genome sequence consists of around *3 billion* nucleotides. Within those, there are about 35 million base pair differences between human and chimp DNA. Also, humans have about 45 million nucleotides that are not present in chimps: where did these come from? Even if we accept “billions of years” for the age of the Earth, evolution does not have enough time at its disposal to create all these changes through a process of beneficial mutation.

Granted - in percentage terms - human and chimp DNA is remarkably similar, but that would be expected between two creatures that share many similarities in form and function.

Similarity in design is, in fact, strong evidence for a *common designer*. A good designer may well decide to re-use parts of a design that work well. A divine designer would get the design right the first time and would almost certainly replicate those parts that served the same purpose. Honda may use the same engine part in more than one of its cars. That does not mean one model evolved from the other, it just means they had a common designer. Since both humans and chimpanzees must metabolize fats, similarity of design in this particular gene sequence is to be expected.

People of faith should be outraged to read this presumptive, “matter of fact” statement “*common ancestor of the gorilla, chimpanzee, and human*” from a major American public institution. It is stated with total irreverence to the travesty they've just committed to the collective faiths of millions of Americans. There *is no* common ancestor. This is an insult to humankind! Readers who have any sense of self-worth as a human being, we implore you: do not stand for this nonsense from your National Academy of Sciences! Rest assured, you did not evolve from an ape, pond scum or whatever else the NAS would have you believe. You were fearfully and

wonderfully created in God's own image. Why would anyone would want to demean themselves by believing otherwise?

*So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.
(Gen 1:27, NKJV)*

Common Ancestry

There are common structures and behaviors among many species. A person writes, a cow walks, a whale swims, and a bat flies with structures built of bones that are different in detail but also remarkably similar to each other.

In what way are writing, walking, swimming and flying “common behaviors”, other than the fact that 3 of the 4 are forms of locomotion and we can all agree that creatures need a method of moving around? One would be hard pressed to find 4 more *dissimilar* behaviors!

The bones involved in these behaviors are also vastly different. A person writes primarily with their fingers. Neither cows nor whales have fingers. Bats have fingers, but attempts to get them to write even simple sentences have so far failed. A bat flies with its wings. Neither humans nor cows nor whales have wings. Is this really the best the NAS can come up with?

When fossils are compared to one another in structure and in age, it becomes clear that an ancestral species gave rise to an array of successor species with the same basic arrangement of limb bones.

Since the global flood was responsible for virtually all of the fossils in the world today, the majority of fossils are of identical age. The fossil record gives no indication of ancestry whatsoever.

As new findings have repeatedly demonstrated, for any two species living today, their evolutionary lines can be traced back in time until the two lines intersect in a common ancestor.

There are no finds that demonstrate evolution, that are not capable of being challenged and interpreted a different way. Not a single one. Connecting lines drawn into a text book do not prove anything except the author's imaginative license. Unless the lines being drawn are indicating observed variation within a kind, than all such lines are imaginary. There is no credible evidence to support the ancestral lines forming the evolutionary trees we find in textbooks and museums.

The fossil record, DNA research, the evidence that species have common ancestors, and other findings add up to overwhelming evidence that evolution by natural selection is how life on Earth arose and became diverse.

Notice something *very devious* here. Please DO NOT MISS THIS: They've suddenly and craftily slipped in the word “arose”: “how life on Earth *arose*”! Yet nothing the publication has discussed thus far, says *anything* about how life on Earth first *arose*. Even the full-length publication offers no mechanism by which life arose. The only mechanisms they've really discussed, attempt to convince us how life diversified, not how it started in the first place.

In the full publication, we read statements like: “Figuring out how life began is . . . a challenging scientific problem” . . . “Re-creating conditions that led to those earliest organisms is difficult” . . . “Constructing a plausible hypothesis of life's origins will require that many questions be answered.” and “*none of these*

hypotheses has yet achieved consensus” (Some quotes are shortened for brevity.)

How, then, can the same authors that made the above statements *possibly* conclude that there is “overwhelming evidence that evolution by natural selection is how life on Earth *arose*”? This is simply deceiving those who don't take the time to read the longer document, and it is unacceptable. They are telling us in the detailed publication they don't really know how life began, but then claiming in the summary version of the publication they have overwhelming evidence.

Even more absurd: how can natural selection *possibly* be the mechanism by which life *arose*? Yet this is what the NAS just claimed! Natural selection needs *existing* creatures or organisms from which to select, *by definition*! Their entire statement is a total contradiction in terms! Folks, the NAS is spoon-feeding you complete and utter nonsense of the highest order, and hoping you just soak it all in without even thinking about what they've just said.

The basic fact is that nothing in the theory of evolution explains how the first life arose from non-life. Even less so, how that first form of life was immediately capable of self-replicating from day one. If chance combination of chemicals and energy were responsible, then the best minds of science should have figured out and replicated some plausible mechanism by now.

*Who is this that darkens my counsel
with words without knowledge?
Brace yourself like a man;
I will question you, and you shall answer me.
"Where were you when I laid the earth's foundation?"
Tell me, if you understand.
(Job 38: 2-4, NIV)*

Some of the world's most outspoken atheists are asked this question in “Expelled”, and the best explanation they can come up with is that perhaps aliens seeded our planet. They have no answer. The NAS has no answer. Science has no answer. The Bible has the answer in Genesis chapter 1.

There simply is no plausible mechanism apart from a supernatural Creator God.

Creationism Does Not Belong in the Science Classroom

Some people argue that the diversity of life did not evolve through natural processes.

We don't hear anyone arguing that *diversity* of life did not evolve through natural processes. Natural processes operate on the (God-given) DNA/genetic system to produce variation and diversity within a *created kind*. We argue that the *origin* of life and of *discrete kinds* did not occur through natural processes.

They advocate that creation be added to the school science curriculum alongside biological evolution.

This is mainly because schools insist on indoctrinating students with the falsehood of evolution within the science curriculum (and just about everywhere else for that matter). If school science would limit itself to the reasonable study of operational and experimental science, and refrain from taking a dogmatic position on the sensitive origins debate, then we'd be much less vocal about wanting creation added to the school science curriculum. As long as the science curriculum remains offensive and disenfranchising to Christians and people of faith, by teaching the Religion of Evolution as fact, we'll continue to use every legal and constitutional means to bring balance to the ideas taught in the classroom.

But creationism is not science.

We do not claim that creation is science. Creation was a one-time, unrepeatable, historic event recorded in the Bible, and was supernatural in nature. However, science can and should quite reasonably be used to examine evidence and signatures left behind by God's act of creation. Belief in creation creates a sound framework within which science can be pursued. Most of our most famous “fathers of science” understood this.

Creationist arguments are based on beliefs about an entity outside the natural world. But science can only investigate naturally occurring phenomena.

The NAS is attempting to redefine science as *methodological naturalism*. This is very dangerous and subverts the true nature and goals of science. This statement is also a contradiction in terms: it is suggesting that before we can investigate an effect, we must already know its cause. Science is all about investigating phenomena that we don't yet fully understand and - for all we know - may be supernatural in nature or causation. Science can and should, in fact, investigate *any* phenomena to the best of its ability *without presuppositions*.

In fact, the many questions about evolution raised by creationists are readily answered by available and accumulating scientific evidence.

Yes, these questions are being answered *in our favor* by accumulating scientific evidence: evidence for a young earth, evidence for irreducibly complex design in nature, evidence for a universe that is “winding down” (i.e. exhibiting entropy, the second law of thermodynamics) and going from order to decreasing order, all pointing to a recent and supernatural creation.

For example --

- *Creationists argue that the theory of evolution is faulty because of gaps in the fossil record (creationists identify as gaps those situations where intermediate fossil forms between two related species are as yet undiscovered). But an increasing number of intermediate forms have been and continue to be found.*

Again, we reiterate, intermediate forms have emphatically *not* been found. It is misleading to state otherwise. So, *yes* this *does* mean that the theory of evolution is faulty.

Even without actual fossils in hand, scientists can use modern techniques in molecular biology and genetics along with the principles of evolution to infer what forms of life existed and predict where and what kinds of fossils will likely be found.

Now we're getting to the crux of the matter: “*even without actual fossils in hand*”. Doesn't this sound like a tacit admission, that perhaps they don't have as many “transitional” fossils as they've so far led us to believe? The point is, if evolution were true, there should be so many millions of transitional fossils that they'd have an abundance of fossils “in hand” to prove their case; they do not.

Again we see the truth coming out in the phrase “*infer what forms of life existed*”. The only two tools they have in their arsenal, when it boils right down to it, are *imagination* and *inference*.

- *Some creationists claim that certain features of living beings are too complex to have evolved through natural processes. They claim that structures such as a bacterium's flagellum (the hair-like part that gives the bacterium motion) , the human eye, or the immune system are “irreducibly complex” and must have been created intact by an “intelligent designer.”*

That's right, we do say that. And we say it very loudly. The Bible unambiguously declares this “intelligent designer” to be God, and that God did indeed create these things intact. But even without a Bible or any concept of God, one would have to reach the same conclusion. Natural processes would have no mechanism, reason, or governing influence to create these kinds of structures. Lifeforms that don't have eyes, for example, have no information in their DNA to code for the production of eyes; so from where would that information come? Small, step-wise change caused by molecular mutations cannot account for the emergence of irreducibly complex features. The entire feature has to be present, fully-formed, or else the feature – and typically the survival of the creature itself – would not be viable.

We challenge our readers to spend some time studying the amazing design of the human eyes (which, by the way, operate in matched pairs: itself a problem for evolution). If you don't study anything else, just the study of the human eye *alone* is sufficient to totally and utterly refute the idea of evolution. Take some time to study:

- how the human eye is sensitive to a single photon of light (the smallest unit of light that exists), and can adjust all the way up to 10 billion photons, giving it a dynamic range of about 1 million times that of modern photographic film.
- the amazing optical precision of the eye
- how the body forms a crystal clear, transparent lens for the eye when every other part of our body is opaque
- the complex muscular system that controls our eye movements
- how it is our brains don't see the blood vessels that are in front of our cornea
- how the eye cleanses itself and pumps tear fluid from its surface
- the involuntary blinking reflex to protect the eye
- how our eyes are wired to our brains and to our blood supply

If you can seriously conclude that human eyes came into being by undirected mutations, then you'd be deluding yourself and – like the NAS – simply don't want to accept the inevitable conclusion that our eyes were designed by an awesome, unfathomable Creator.

But biologists have discovered that components of the flagellum have their own individual functions and also have found intermediate forms of flagella. Both of those findings support the idea of the flagellum evolving from existing structures over time.

Many components of living things have more than one function. This, again, is evidence of good and efficient design. We do not accept that biologists have found intermediate forms of flagella, or intermediate forms of *anything* for that matter. This is supposition, with no evidence to back it up. Evidence for this would have to come from the fossil record, but the fossil record contains no evidence of flagellum evolution over time, and would be incapable of capturing that kind of detail. No, they may have found other variants of flagella, but not intermediate ones.

Also, the creationist argument that such features “must” have been designed is based on their preconceived idea of a Creator, while the scientific position is based on observable facts and falsifiable explanations.

“*Their* preconceived idea of a Creator”? This ignorant and reprehensible statement really speaks volumes about the values and beliefs of those who authored and approved this document. The NAS would have you believe the idea of a Creator is just some silly idea dreamed up by a radical, minority group of people that call themselves “creationists”. No, let's get one thing clear: this is not *our* idea. It comes from God's revelation to mankind in the Holy Scriptures. Their mocking language makes it very clear that the NAS neither understands, respects - nor wants anything to do with - the idea of God. Make no mistake, this organization unashamedly represents atheism at its very core.

The truth is, *scientists* have developed *tests* to determine the existence of design in nature. Yes, there are objective tests for design that are unbiased by philosophical preconceptions, and can be applied on a case-by-case basis. Design is clearly and abundantly evident in nature, with or without a belief in the Bible. To ignore this fact is to bury one's head in the sand. In fact, the obvious examples of design in nature ought to be the very thing that would lead one to take very seriously the necessity of a designer or Creator.

*For since the creation of the world
His invisible attributes are clearly seen,
being understood by the things that are made,
even His eternal power and Godhead,
so that they are without excuse.
(Romans 1:20, NKJV)*

By contrasting creationists with “the scientific position”, the NAS is suggesting that creationists are not scientists, and scientists cannot be creationists. This is pure bigotry. As we have previously stated, a scientist has the personal right to either belief system. A creationist with scientific credentials has every bit as much right to the title of “scientist” as an evolutionist.

• *Some creationists argue based on scripture that the Earth cannot be old enough for the diversity of life to have emerged through evolution. Yet measurements from geology, astronomy, and other fields have repeatedly confirmed the ancient age of the Earth (approximately 4.5 billion years).*

Focus Topic: Age of the Earth

The Holy Scriptures lay out a chronology and genealogy for us that only support the Earth being about 6,000 years old, from the 6 literal days of Creation to the present day. This is a key reason why the Old Testament goes to great pains to tell us “who begat who” and lists out long lines of family lineages, along with information about how long each person lived and even their ages when key events took place in their lives. It is possible to create a complete, uninterrupted “family tree” all the way from Adam and Eve, down to Noah and his family, and then from Noah all the way down to recent kings and queens of England. This chronology tells us that Adam and Eve were created about 6,000 years ago.

One simply cannot squeeze billions of years into the scriptures. So again, we face the dilemma that if you want to accept the evolutionary version of billions of years, then you'd have to reject the Word of God. Or modify it, which is really the same thing as rejecting it.

Unfortunately, the concept of “billions of years” has become so ingrained into our society's belief system that our assertion of a 6,000-year-old earth - for some readers - will seem to be the most outlandish statement in this response. We don't have the space to tackle this issue in depth, in this response. We do, however, ask the reader to consider *why* “billions of years” is the prevailing belief. We'll suggest it is mainly because the evolutionists *require* billions of years to have any credibility whatsoever. It is one of the very pillars upon which the theory of evolution stands, so it *had to be* ingrained into our thinking before we - as a society - would ever buy into neo-Darwinian Evolution. Frankly, the evolutionists have done a far better job at convincing our society of “long ages” than they've thus far done at convincing society of evolution itself. The more complexity evolutionists discover in life, and the more inconsistencies they discover in their account of evolution, the more they simply expand their time spans to try and compensate. This 4.5 billion years has been an ever growing number.

Most people are unaware that there are *many* techniques and observations (“natural chronometers”) that can be used to date the Earth. Up to 90% of the techniques actually indicate a very young Earth. The secular science world will not reveal this, preferring to dwell on the 10% of techniques - such as radiologic dating - that *seem to*

support long ages. It is important to realize that all techniques can only give a maximum age, since they all rely on assumptions about initial conditions that nobody was around to observe. Since the initial conditions on Earth cannot be recreated, dating techniques are not falsifiable. If God created the Earth with a degree of inbuilt maturity from week one (e.g. Adam and Eve were created as adults with mature plants and fruit trees to feed them), then physical properties of matter may already have given an *appearance of age* when first created.

However, when it comes to radiologic dating, we believe there is a very specific explanation. Recent studies have suggested that radiologic dating techniques may be *very* flawed. The *same rock sample*, when subjected to different parent-daughter isotope tests, can yield discordant dating results that vary by “millions” of years. Radiologic dating techniques assume that radioactive decay had always occurred at a constant rate throughout earth's history. Yet only small changes in the molecular forces that hold atoms together could have led to *exponential* changes in the decay rates. A recent 5-year scientific study known as the RATE⁵ project, found good evidence that radioactive decay may have occurred exponentially faster in the early days of earth's history than it does today – leading to the *appearance* of millions of years worth of decay (by today's standards) occurring in perhaps just days, weeks or months around the time of creation and/or the global flood.

Helium – used in laboratories to detect leaks due to its superior ability to escape - should have escaped to undetectable levels from rocks more than a few tens of thousands of years old. Yet we find an abundance of helium in rocks. The helium leak rate is very stable and mathematically predictable, and ought to be more reliable than radiologic dating methods. The RATE team has confirmed that helium leak rates support rock ages of just 6,000 or so years – the same rocks that test as millions of years old using radio-isotope methods.

Carbon 14, likewise, should not be present in detectable levels in anything older than a few tens of thousands of years. Yet recent advances in the sensitivity of measuring equipment has revealed that Carbon 14 is found in coal and even in diamonds.

There are *numerous* other evidences that support – and even *demand* – a *very* young Earth.

This is frankly an issue that causes division even among creationists. The purpose of this response is not to convert the reader into a “Young Earth Creationist”, but simply to draw attention to the fact that there are valid challenges to the dating methods trumpeted by the evolutionary community. Science students should be free to question and explore these challenges, just as they should be free to critically analyze the idea of evolution itself. The bottom line is, even with long ages, evolution has no credible mechanism.

Because science has no way to accept or refute creationists' assertions, creationist beliefs should not be presented in science classrooms alongside teaching about evolution. Teaching non-scientific concepts in science class will only confuse students about the processes, nature, and limits of science.

This would be like saying that because science has no way to accept or refute the density of the earth's core, belief that the Earth's core is solid should not be presented in science classrooms. Isn't science all about *inquiry*?

Moreover, the NAS just admitted they have no way to refute our assertions, although that's exactly what their publication attempts (rather unsuccessfully) to do. Despite this, they propose a policy of censorship, tantamount to “book burning”, and brainwashing a *minority-held* and *highly controversial* belief into students with no opportunity for critical inquiry.

Science and Religion Offer Different Ways of Understanding the

5 RATE is an abbreviation for “Radio-isotopes and the Age of the Earth”, a 5-year scientific research project funded by the Institute for Creation Research.

World

Science and religion address separate aspects of human experience.

Christians rarely refer to their faith as a “religion”, knowing this to be (more often than not) a “label” used by those who don't grasp what their faith is all about. Clearly, the NAS would fall into that category. “Religion” refers to a set of dogmatic, man-made rules; “faith” refers to a set of beliefs. In essence, Jesus Christ came to put an end to religion and to invite people into a relationship with Him.

People of faith understand that every aspect of their human endeavors should glorify God first and foremost, and the study of science cannot be excluded from this.

Both science and faith should be about the quest for *truth*. There cannot be one set of truths for Sunday at church and another set of contradictory truths for the science classroom. Real science is one of the best tools we have for researching the truth. Sadly, organizations like the NAS are subverting science by trying to put a box around it, called “naturalism”.

“It has to be admitted, of course, that science grew out of religious tradition.”
Professor Richard Dawkins FRS, Oxford University, England
Author of “The God Delusion”

Many scientists have written eloquently about how their scientific studies of biological evolution have enhanced rather than lessened their religious faith.

The only scientists we know of, whose study of evolution have enhanced their faith, are those who – after studying it – have abandoned evolution realizing it to be a totally bankrupt theory. Belief in evolution can *only destroy* faith in a Creator God, *by definition*. Anyone who claims otherwise, is either confused or doesn't know the Word of God.

“It is clear that the doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of Creation. Evolution, if consistently accepted, makes it impossible to believe the Bible.”
Thomas Huxley
Known as “Darwin's Bulldog”

Reader, here's the truth: The moment it truly “sinks home” for the first time that evolution is a thoroughly impossible hypothesis, is the very moment you are left with the fearful and profound realization (or confirmation) that you were truly created by an Almighty God.

And many religious people and denominations accept the scientific evidence for evolution.

We don't like the use of this patronizing “religious people” label to describe people of faith. But sadly, yes they do. They've compromised the Word of God and fallen for the very dogma that the NAS is trying to perpetuate with this publication. Much of the church bought into this evolutionary propaganda at a time when it perhaps didn't have the scientific clout or stamina to fight it. Today, however, that landscape is changing. The church is beginning to realize that real, honest, objective science supports the Bible's claims after all, in much the same way that archaeological finds and historical research have repeatedly confirmed the Bible's accounts. Today, there are more and more highly-credentialed scientists joining the creationist ranks.

Let's put it bluntly: We cannot speak for other faiths, but if you believe in evolution then you cannot believe the

Bible to be the inerrant Word of God. Jesus personally validated the book of Genesis by directly quoting from its text. In fact, the whole ministry and purpose of Jesus Christ is predicated on the foundational account of Genesis. Ultimately, those who call themselves Christians need to reject the theory of evolution, but they need to know why they are doing so.

*Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman who needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.
(2 Tim 2:15, NKJV)*

Our education system and our society as a whole are best served when we teach science, not religious faith, in science classrooms.

So teach science then. Teach *empirical* science, instead of indoctrinating our kids with the one-sided religious faith of Darwinian evolution that adds nothing of value to science education.

However we, as do many, believe that society was best served when all our classrooms taught a Christian-based education that espoused the concepts of faith and purpose-in-life rather than “descended-from-pond-scum” purposelessness that degrades students and fills them with a sense of futility in life.

Evolution in Action

Medicine’s Challenge in Countering Resistant Strains of Harmful Bacteria

In late 2002, several hundred people in China came down with a severe form of pneumonia caused by an unknown infectious agent. Dubbed “severe acute respiratory syndrome,” or SARS, the disease soon spread to Vietnam, Hong Kong, and Canada and led to hundreds of deaths. In March 2003, a team of researchers at the University of California, San Francisco, received samples of a virus isolated from the tissues of a SARS patient. Using a new technology known as a DNA microarray, the researchers compared the genetic material of the unknown virus with that of known viruses. Within 24 hours, they assigned the virus to a particular family based on its evolutionary relationship to other viruses -- a result confirmed by other researchers using different techniques. Immediately, work began on a blood test to identify people with the disease (so they could be quarantined), on treatments for the disease, and on vaccines to prevent infection with the virus.

As commendable as the medical community's rapid response to SARS may be, the claim that SARS has an “evolutionary relationship” to other viruses is pure conjecture. There is no evidence that SARS was even a new virus at the time of the human SARS outbreak. Most likely it was just a previously unidentified coronavirus that made a jump from animals into humans. But even if SARS was a new strain of virus, it would simply have *mutated* from another strain of coronavirus. Such mutation is not evolution by our “litmus test” definition. Mutation results in the loss or corruption of the original information.

Mutation *can* make a virus more effective at fooling the immune system, and if one chooses to say that the virus has therefore “evolved” its effectiveness *at being a virus*, then so be it. But keep in mind what a virus actually is: it is an invader that is destructive to the very processes of life itself. Viruses therefore would at best hinder and at worst totally undo any advances that evolution supposedly achieved!

Strictly, a virus should not even be classified as a living organism, since viruses can only reproduce by attaching themselves to other living cells. A virus certainly would not be classified as “life” according to the biblical terminology of “nephesh” life (a living creature carrying the breath of life). Life clearly had to exist before viruses could sustain and reproduce themselves, so viruses are a poor example to hold up as playing any role in

“goo to you” evolution. In fact, evolutionists do not claim that viruses played any such role, so the whole discussion of viruses seems to be a misdirection tactic, adding yet more confusion to an audience that is already confused enough about the claims that evolutionists are trying to make.

Understanding the evolutionary origins of human pathogens will become increasingly important as new threats to human health arise. For example, many people have suffered from severe medical problems as bacteria have evolved resistance to antibiotics. When a bacterium undergoes a genetic change that increases its ability to resist the effects of an antibiotic, that bacterium can survive and produce more copies of itself while non-resistant bacteria are being killed. Bacteria that cause tuberculosis, meningitis, staph infections (sepsis), sexually transmitted diseases, and other illnesses have evolved resistance to an increasing number of antibiotics and have become serious problems throughout the world. Knowledge of how evolution leads to increased resistance will be critical in controlling the spread of infectious diseases.

Here again, we see the NAS trying to twist and contort our perspective on a subject that really needs to be looked at very differently. We need to start off by understanding that most bacteria are *not pathogens* but in fact are *essential to life*. Only about 10% of bacteria are pathogenic (“bad bacteria”). Bacteria would certainly have been a part of God's original “very good” Creation and have only developed pathogenic properties over time through the processes of destructive mutation. If good bacteria are essential to life, and therefore would be essential to the broader picture of macro-evolution if evolution were true, then bad bacteria would work against evolution (i.e. against the survival of the population they are attacking). So to suggest that a proliferation of deadly bacteria in any way lends credence to the overall scheme of macro-evolution, is to turn logic completely on its head.

Many pharmaceutical antibiotics were in fact developed by studying the natural chemicals that are generated by bacteria themselves and used to ward off other types of bacteria that compete for a limited food supply. So in many cases of antibiotic-resistant bacteria, the resistance to the antibiotic always existed in a part of the original bacterial population. The resistant bacteria are suddenly able to thrive, multiply, and take over because the over-use of antibiotics (in today's society and in hospitals in particular) is killing off the other bacteria which would normally keep them “in check” and with which they'd have to compete for available nutrients.

These bacteria have sensationally been dubbed by the media as “super-bugs”, in keeping with their overall agenda to brainwash society with the doctrine of evolution.

Bacteria also have the unique ability to transfer DNA to other bacteria, a process which can pass on information for resistance to a drug. However, the resistance had to be present in the original bacterial population.

It is possible for mutations to increase a bacterium's resistance to antibiotics, but only because the mutation has *degraded* some part of the bacterium's original function. There is no evidence that mutations have occurred in bacteria where information, function or complexity has increased. For example, a mutation may impair a bacterium's ability to ingest nutrients, which would also mean it doesn't ingest antibiotics as well. However, the bacteria has been degraded nonetheless and again only thrives because “normal” competing bacteria are being killed off by the use of antibiotics. Such resistant bacteria typically have a survival *disadvantage*, if and when the overall balance of good bacteria can be restored back to normal ratios.

We must remember that these resistant bacteria were not usually the the cause of the patient's hospitalization in the first place. Rather, they are a secondary symptom of the hospitalization itself, where an unnatural, aggressively antibiotic-laden environment allows these resistant bacteria to proliferate.

Tiktaalik

A Case Study in Scientific Prediction

Using the principles of evolution, scientists have been able to predict what new fossils might be discovered.

People can predict whatever they want to predict. What the NAS neglects to tell us is that those predictions are not coming true. “Might be” is the operative phrase here! Tiktaalik is the sole example they are able to cite. Tiktaalik is one solitary fossil find out of the 200 million plus fossils that have been collected around the world. If evolution were true, we should have millions of “transitional” fossils.

For example, scientists had found fossils of ancient fish that lived in shallow waters in earlier times and fossils of four-limbed land dwellers that appeared later in time. What happened in between?

What happened in between was simply the continued onset of the single worldwide flood. The “later in time” is in fact only days or weeks, not millions of years. We contend that all of these fossils were laid down in a single catastrophe - the worldwide flood.

Evolutionary theory predicts that there would be one or more creatures with characteristics of both the ancient fish and the later land-dwellers. A team of scientists decided to look in sedimentary rock in northern Canada that was deposited about 375 million years ago, about the time these intermediate species were thought to have lived, based on other evidence from the fossil record.

Please refer to our earlier response on dating methods and the weight of evidence that contradicts rocks being millions of years old.

In 2004, the team found what they had predicted: the fossil of a creature with features of fish (scales and fins) and features of land-dwellers (simple lungs, flexible neck, and fins modified to support its weight).

Contrary to what the NAS is suggesting, the fins of the Tiktaalik would *not* have been capable of supporting its weight *on land*. We know this because Tiktaalik's fin is not connected to its main skeleton. They would possibly have been capable of supporting their own weight *in water*, for moving about the sea floor, but whether they even used their fins for that purpose is only supposition at best. To say the fins have been “modified” is also pure supposition. Evolutionists made the *exact same claim* about the fins of the Coelacanth fossil, only to have egg on their faces when living Coelacanths were later discovered and observed to use their fins only for swimming, never for walking.

LiveScience's April 2006 article entitled “Fishy Land Beast Bridges Evolutionary Gap” is very revealing about how the media attempts to exaggerate these discoveries. In their HTML meta tag⁶ description, displayed by website search engines, we find the caption “Tiktaalik had some fishy features, but *it could do push-ups on land.*” Curious at this attention-grabbing headline, we looked at the article to find what evidence they had to support this claim, only to find that the article itself in fact makes no such claims. It says only that Tiktaalik was “capable of supporting its body *underwater, in the shallows, or in mudflats*”. It goes on to say that “the *somewhat awkward animal probably didn't walk, since it likely couldn't rotate its shoulders. Instead it might have dragged itself along on land*” (italics added for emphasis). We encourage readers not to be “taken in” by these types of grossly exaggerated headlines, but instead to research and critically analyze the details of the claims being made.

The bones in the limbs of this fossil, named Tiktaalik, resemble the bones in the limbs of land-dwelling

⁶ A *description meta tag* is a brief one- or two-sentence description of a web page encoded in the Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) that allows search engine users to see a brief summary of a web page before opening it.

animals today.

Many would argue that they don't. Claims of “resemblance” are always *very* subjective since they are subject to individual perception and biases. Similar features, where they do exist, are better explained as being evidence for a common designer.

By understanding evolution, scientists were able to predict what type of creature existed and in what geologic layer it would be found. The discovery of Tiktaalik fills another gap in the fossil record.

Tiktaalik may fill a gap in the fossil record, but only in the sense that it is a previously undiscovered type of fish. Its discovery does not imply anything about ancestry or evolution, unless one chooses to interpret it that way. Remember, we interpret the fossil record as that of a one-time catastrophe, and do not accept that the fossil record is a record of ancestry over time. In fact, when one gets into studying the lineage that evolutionists have mapped out for Tiktaalik, it is very difficult to see a clear and logical progression of change. For example, the number of digits decrease, then increase, then decrease again. Yet, in other evolutionary trees, the existence of an identical number of digits is cited as strong support for common ancestry. They use an argument where it suits them, and dismiss it where it works against them. The size of the creatures in the alleged ancestral chain is also inconsistent, but the graphic artists employed by evolutionary publications have a deceptive tendency to re-scale everything to a common size when illustrating lineages.

“No matter how far back we go in the fossil record of previous animal life on earth, we find no trace of any animal forms which are intermediate between the major groups of phyla. Scientists have sometimes come up with a few things that they have elected as candidates as transitions, but on a later closer examination these have been seen to be misinterpretations. There are no such things as missing links. We might as well quit looking for them.”

Dr. Austin Clark, Biologist
Smithsonian Institute, Washington

Paleontologists searched this remote valley in north central Canada for a species intermediate between fish and limbed animals capable of living on land because they knew the sedimentary rocks there were deposited during the period when such a transition had taken place.

How did they “know”? Were they there to witness this deposition?

Tiktaalik and other fossil intermediates between fish and tetrapods. These fossils represent an assortment of species that lived between 385 and 359 million years ago, spanning the evolution of fish to amphibians.

This caption underneath the photograph states “and other fossil intermediates”, “these fossils” and “an assortment of species”, but as far as we can tell from studying this picture and other photos we've seen of the same Chicago Field Museum exhibit, only tiktaalik is present. Tiktaalik is shown in fossil form along with an imaginative artist's reconstruction depicting Tiktaalik walking on its fins which we have already discussed as highly speculative. The transparent flat piece of acrylic seen in the photo is meant to represent the surface of water, but it is difficult to discern as such from the angle at which this photo is taken. Without careful scrutiny, the photo almost appears to show Tiktaalik walking on land but in fact the museum display is showing it walking in water with its head poking through the water's surface. We don't see any other fossil intermediates so cannot comment on something that is implied to be present in the photograph, but in fact is not.

Tiktaalik's left and right fins had a single upper bone (the large bone at the bottom of each of these

drawings) followed by two intermediate bones, giving the creature an elbow and a wrist, as in more recent organisms.

Let be very clear that Tiktaalik was a fish. Despite the evolutionary claims about it, even evolutionists would agree that Tiktaalik was 100% fish. It is an irresponsible misuse of terminology for the NAS to label its fin bones as an elbow and a wrist, even if superficially they are seen to have similar characteristics.

Conclusion

The NAS publication represents the best efforts of some of our nation's most esteemed scientific minds to endorse the theory of evolution and dismiss the Biblical account of Creation. Yet, when studied critically, it is little more than a collection of boldly stated propaganda devoid of any real evidence. The few things cited as evidence for evolution are pitifully flimsy when one considers how much evidence ought to be left behind by such a process. It is alarming that our society with its richly biblical heritage is now – at an institutional level – relentlessly trying to sanitize all mention of God and our Lord Jesus Christ from all facets of life, education and government.

The Creation versus Evolution debate is not a side issue. Readers should ask themselves: is this debate really even about science, or is that just a smoke screen? The book of Genesis is the foundational book of the Holy Bible and ardent atheists and evolutionists know this. Could it be that the agenda of many individuals behind the evolution movement is to undermine, marginalize and ultimately silence the voice of Christianity from Western society?

Reader, our message to you is that the theory of evolution is nothing but the perverse fruit of a generation that has decided to turn itself from God, trumpet its own wisdom, and worship “Mother Nature” over the true Creator. History shows that whenever a society follows this path, “as in the days of Noah” judgment will follow. We are seeing the signs of this in our nation and in our world today, yet so many people are failing to connect the dots. Reader, we urge you to take a stand and not to fall for the deception inherent in the evolutionary world view.

Action Steps

Here are some action steps you can take.

Study the overwhelming evidences for creation

The bible instructs us as follows:

*Study to show thyself approved unto God
(2 Tim 2:15, NKJV)*
*Be ready always to give an answer to every man who asketh you
a reason for the hope that is in you
(1 Peter 3:15, NKJV)*

You wouldn't know it from a visit to your local library or bookstore, but there is an abundance of well-researched books, DVD's, seminars and other resources available to you for further, in-depth study on the evidences for Creation. The depth and quality of materials available may well astound you. Please visit our website www.creationstudies.org to find an interesting title and get started in your quest for further information today.

Read your bible

Read and meditate on the Word of God.

Suggested reading: Genesis 1-9, Job 38 onward, Romans 1.

Make a decision to trust the Word of God without compromise

The Genesis account of Creation, the Worldwide Flood, and the ensuing Ice Age fits observed evidence so much better than any contrived theory of man. *Real* science and *real* evidence do not require you to compromise the holy Word of God in any way, shape or form. You can confidently stand on the absolute authority and reliability of the Word of God. Your very eternity may hinge on which world view you decide to believe.

Pray

If you come to the point of realizing you're one of the many millions who've been duped and deceived by evolutionary teaching, decide now to repent and pray to God for forgiveness and – if you've not done so before – for your salvation. We invite you to pray this prayer:

*“Father, I have strayed from the truths of your teachings and allowed myself to accept a worldly philosophy that is contrary to Your Word. Forgive me Lord. Today I am ready to turn back to the truth of Your Word, to study it and to obey it. I believe that You are my Creator; that You alone created our universe and everything in it, out of nothing. I believe that you sent Your Son Jesus Christ to die for my sins and that you raised Him from the dead so that I might be saved. Today I open my heart and I invite you inside. Please God, forgive me of my sins and change my life. For Christ's sake and for Your glory.
In Jesus name, Amen”*

If you did pray this prayer, please call or write to our ministry and let us know.

Take a Stand for Truth and Balance

- Write to the NAS and ask them to stop publishing this biased, offensive and misleading material. Tell them you expect higher standards of objectivity and scientific rigor from an organization of their standing and caliber.
- Write to your school board or state representatives and demand that our schools and educational establishments should not to teach evolution as fact and should honor opposing viewpoints.
- Stop subscribing to news media that are pushing evolutionary propaganda without balance in their reporting. Write to the editor a letter of protest when you see such a news article.
- Find a bible believing Christian Church that firmly adheres to a literal 6-day Biblical Creation.
- Become a Friend of CSI (details on our website www.creationstudies.org) and get involved.

***OUR RESPONSE TO THE DETAILED NAS DOCUMENT IS IN PROGRESS
AND WILL BE AVAILABLE SHORTLY***