

THE RELIGION OF DARWINISM

In our public schools, Darwinism is taught in the science classes giving students the mistaken notion that it is a science. I will attempt to show that the religion department would be more appropriate for the teaching of Darwin's theory of macroevolution.

DARWINISM DEPENDS ON THE SUPERNATURAL

SUPERNATURAL (Beyond the powers or laws of nature; miraculous.)

Darwinism with its attending doctrines, like the big bang theory, depends on the supernatural for explanation. The big bang, as Paul Davis wrote in his book, *The Edge of Infinity*, page 161 **"represents the instantaneous suspension of physical laws, the sudden, abrupt flash of lawlessness that allowed something to come out of nothing. It represents a true miracle - transcending physical principles...."**. The first law of thermodynamics states that matter can neither be created nor destroyed. The law of the conservation of energy states that energy can not be created or destroyed. So the big bang theory must have been a miracle.

Evolutionists tell us that life began in the water. Let's take a look at the first "simple cell". Cells are mostly proteins. Most proteins have hundreds of amino acids. Every amino acid has at least one activation enzyme. Protein formation requires that amino acids be activated by their enzymes and collected by a substance called transfer RNA. Since enzymes and transfer RNA are only found in living cells, where did the first cell get these things? It must be a miracle. Another problem, when amino acids join a chain to form protein, a water molecule is released. If water is present, a water molecule will normally be given back, and the chemical process reversed. So the formation of a first cell by accident would require a miracle and for it to form in water would require another miracle. For this cell to come to life and operate, we would need still another miracle. Every cell needs DNA with a lot of information stored on it. In the life section of *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, 15th ed., Vol. 22, 987, Carl Sagan wrote; **"The information content of a simple cell has been estimated at around 10 to the 12th bits, comparable to about a hundred million pages of the encyclopedia Britannica."** And there could be no mistakes in any of the information. The probability of that

information forming out of random chance is mathematically impossible. Another miracle.

When circles were found in wheat fields in England and Ireland, scientists concluded that it was the work of intelligent life because of the symmetry of the patterns. In Michael Denton's book; *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, pages 328-329, the molecular biologist describes a simple cell as follows; **"To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometers in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings, like the portholes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity. We would see endless highly organized corridors and conduits branching in ever direction away from the bank in the nucleus and others to assembly plants and processing units. The nucleus itself would be a vast spherical geodesic dome inside of which we would see, all neatly stacked together in ordered arrays, the miles of coiled chains of DNA molecules. A huge range of products and raw materials would shuttle along all of the manifold conduits in highly ordered fashion to and from all the various assembly plants in the outer regions of the cell...**

We would see around us, in ever direction we looked all sorts of robot-like machines. We would notice that the simplest of the functional components of the cell, the protein molecules, were astonishingly complex pieces of molecular machinery, each one consisting of about three thousand atoms arranged in highly organized 3-D spatial conformation. We would wonder even more as we watched the strangely purposeful activities of these weird molecular machines, Particularly when we realized that, despite all our accumulated knowledge of physics and chemistry, the task of designing one such molecular machine - that is one single functional protein molecule - would be completely beyond our capacity at

present and will probably not be achieved until at least the beginning of the next century...

We would see that nearly every feature of our own advanced machines had its analogue in the cell: artificial languages and their decoding systems, memory banks for regulation the automated assembly of parts and components, error fail-safe and proof-reading devices utilized for quality control, assembly processes involving the principle of prefabrication and modular construction. In fact, so deep would be the feeling of *deja-vu*, so persuasive the analogy that much of the terminology we would use to describe this fascination molecular reality would be borrowed from the world of the late twentieth-century technology."

For scientists to insist that the cell, just described, came into being by a series of accidents would be mathematically impossible and would, therefore, be classified as a miracle. That circles in a grain field show intelligent design and a cell doesn't is ridiculous.

DARWINISM IS NOT FOUNDED IN EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

Albert Fleischmann, "The Doctrine of Organic Evolution in the Light of Modern Research" *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 65 (1933) said, "The Darwinism theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination." He also said, "The theory suffers from grave defects, which are becoming more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge, nor does it suffice for our theoretical grasp of the facts...No one can demonstrate that the limits of a species have ever been passed. These are the Rubicons which evolutionists cannot cross....Darwin ransacked other spheres his views on selection from T.R. Maltus' ideas regarding the danger of overpopulation, to which he added the facts recorded by breeders. ...But his whole resulting scheme remains, to this day, foreign to scientific zoology, since actual changes of species by such means are still unknown."

Louis Bounoure, former director of the Strasbourg Zoological Museum, and later the director of research at the French National Center of Scientific Research, said in 1984: "Evolutionism is a fairy

tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the process of science. It is useless."

Dr. Wolfgang Smith, who taught at MIT and UCLA, and who writes on many scientific subjects, in his book, *Teilhardism and the New Religion*, (1988) 5,6; wrote, "And the salient fact is this: if by evolution we mean macroevolution (as we henceforth shall), then it can be said with the utmost rigor that the doctrine is totally bereft of scientific sanction. Now, to be sure, given the multitude of extravagant claims about evolution promulgated by evolutionists with an air of scientific infallibility, this may indeed sound strange. And yet the fact remains that there exists to this day not a shred of bona fide scientific evidence in support of the thesis that macroevolutionary transformations have ever occurred."

Colin Patterson, the senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, said in a keynote speech in 1981 at the American Museum of Natural History; "One of the reasons I started taking this anti-evolutionary view, or let's call it a non-evolutionary view, was last year I had a sudden realization for over twenty years I had thought I worked on evolution in some way. One morning I woke up and something had happened in the night, and it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for twenty years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be misled so long. Either there was something wrong with me or there was something wrong with the evolution theory. I knew there was nothing wrong with me, so for the last few years I've tried putting a simple question to various people and groups of people. Question is: Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing, and one thing that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got was silence for a long time and eventually one person said, 'I know one thing - that it ought not be taught in high school.'"

Patterson came under heavy fire from Darwinists for having said the things he did in that speech but in a conversation with Philip Johnson in 1988, he didn't retract any of the skeptical remarks that he

made, though he does believe that evolution is the only conceivable explanation for certain features of the natural world.

THE LAND OF HOAXES

One thing that has characterized Darwinism is the abundance of hoaxes. The most famous hoax is the Piltdown man. On December 22nd 1912, the New York Times ran the headlines, "**DARWIN THEORY PROVED TRUE**". Charles Dawson had found the bones of "the missing link" in Piltdown England. The official name of this individual was "Eoanthropus dawsoni" in Dawson's honor. The scientist who had worked on the fossil, Arthur Smith Woodward, anatomist Arthur Keith, and brain specialist Grafton Elliot Smith were all knighted for their work. Meanwhile, clergy who had denounced evolution were ridiculed; Piltdown, it was said, had proven them wrong. The British Museum put plaster casts of the fossils on display but the actual fossils were kept locked up. In 1953, over forty years after its discovery, the Piltdown hoax was exposed. The skull wasn't hundreds of thousands of years old as the "experts" said. In fact, the area was a burial site during the great plagues of 1348-49. The jaw was found to be very new and belonged to an orangutan. The teeth had been filed down to make them look more human. The bones had been treated with chemicals to make them look older. All of the science books for 40 years had pictures of the Piltdown Man and we were told what he ate and how he behaved and all of it built on some doctored bones and a lot of imagination.

In 1922, a single tooth was found in Nebraska by geologist, Harold Cook. Paleontologist, Henry Fairfield Osborn, an ardent evolutionist, declared the tooth to belong to an early ape-man and named it "Hesperopithecus haroldcookii" in honor of Cook. The find became known commonly as Nebraska Man. Osborn wrote in his book, *Evolution and Religion in Education*, "...this little tooth speaks volumes of truth - truth consistent with all we have known before, with all we have found elsewhere." William K. Gregory and Milo Hellman, who specialized in teeth at the American Museum of Natural History, after careful examination, said that the tooth was from a species closer to man than to an ape. In his book, *The Pedigree of the Human Race*, Harris Hawthorne Wilder, a zoology professor at Smith College, said, "Judging from the tooth alone the animal seems to have been about halfway between Pithecanthropus and the man of the present day, or perhaps better between Pithecanthropus and the man

of the Neanderthal type..."Meanwhile, in England, Grafton Elliot Smith, of Piltdown fame, convinced The Illustrated London News to run an artist's rendering of the Nebraska man. The picture showed two brutish naked ape-persons, a male and a female, gathering roots. And all of this from a single tooth. Further excavation at cook's sight revealed that the tooth didn't belong to either an ape or a man or an ape-man, but to a peccary, a relative of the pig. They did come close however. Instead of finding the missing link, they found the missing oink, only one letter off.

Some evolutionists try to tell us that some skeletal remains found by Dr. Johanson, that he calls Lucy, is an example of a transitional form from some ape like creature to man. We are told that Lucy walked upright because of her pelvis and knee joint. What we are not told is the fact that, even though Lucy is only about 3 1/2 ft. tall, her knee joint was found more than one mile away and about 100 ft deeper than the rest of the skeleton. There is simply no end to the hoaxes that evolutionists try to pull in order to make a point that is simply not supported by the fossil record. **THIS IS NOT SCIENCE!!**

Lucy is simply another australopithecine, of which there have been many found. In 1987 Charles Oxnard, in *Fossils, Teeth and Sex: New Perspectives on Human Evolution* (Seattle: University Press) p 227, wrote, "**The various australopithecines are, indeed, more different from both African apes and humans in most features than these latter are from each other. Part of the basis of this acceptance has been the fact that even opposing investigators have found these large differences as they too, used techniques and research designs that were less biased by prior notions as to what the fossils might have been**".

There was perhaps, no greater hoax than Earnst Haeckel. He developed a series of drawings that juxtaposed the pictures of the embryos of a hog, a calf, a rabbit, and a human in various stages of development showing that, at the beginning they were indistinguishable from one another but became different as they developed. He claimed that they all went through the various stages of evolution as they developed in the womb. This became known as the "embryonic recapitulation" as well as "the biogenetic law". It was a pure fabrication! Haeckel was charged with fraud by five professors at Jena, the university where he taught. His deceit was exposed in a 1915 book entitled, "Haekel's Frauds and Forgeries" by J. Assmuth and

Ernest J. Hull. They quoted 19 leading authorities of the day. Yet some of his theories persist to this day.

THE AYATOLLAHS OF EVOLUTION

In some sects of Islam you are not allowed to question anything that is taught. If you do, the consequences can be quick and severe. The same can be said for the religion of Darwinism. In 1980, a South Dakota teacher named Lloyd Dale, who had taught biology for seventeen years, was dismissed for teaching both creation and evolution as possible explanations of the origin of life.

In 1983, a Tennessee mother named Vickie Frost was arrested and jailed for trying to remove her daughter from a class that taught evolution and other material that conflicted with her religious beliefs.

In 1996, in a letter to a Lakewood Ohio newspaper, a high school senior praised his Physics teacher, Mark Wisniewski, who had encouraged the students to consider how their own world views influenced their outlook on the evolution-creation debate. None of the town's people said anything, but the ACLU threatened litigation and Wisniewski was ordered to stop.

Universities demand an evolutionary viewpoint. Robert Gentry was working on his doctorate in Physics at Georgia Tech. When his research into radio halos suggested a young earth, he was told to pursue a more conventional thesis topic. Later, when he testified on the behalf of creationism in the Arkansas "balanced treatment" court case, his contract with Oak Ridge National Laboratory was canceled.

Tenured professor Dean Kenyon taught a course on evolution at San Francisco State University. When he co-authored, *Of Pandas and People*, a book advocating intelligent design, he was censured and his course was taken away.

In the early 1980's, Dr. Halton Arp was considered one of the world's top astronomers and president of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific. After disputing the interpretation that "red shift" substantiated the Big Bang, Arp was denied access to telescopes and finally moved to Europe to continue his work.

Scientists who don't tow the Darwin line find it hard to get published in scientific journals, and those same journals criticize them for not publishing. In 1985, Roger Lewin claimed in *Science* that no evidence for creation could be found in technical literature. When Dr. Robert Gentry responded, documenting that he had published numerous articles on polonium halos (which validate creation) -

including several in *Science* itself, the magazine refused to print his letter. When Dr. Russell Humphreys of Sandia National Laboratories wrote to *Science* criticizing them for not printing Dr. Gentry's letter, they refused to print his as well.

Not all evolutionists are so closed minded. Some have a sense of true science and education. In 1982, the following letter appeared in the October issue of *Physics Today* by J. Willits Lane:

"After reading a spate of virulently anti-creationist articles and letters in your publication, I decided that something less virulent and more thoughtful should be said.....

I have myself sat in class after class in sciences and humanities in which any idea remotely religious was belittled, attacked, and shouted down in most unscientific and emotionally cruel ways. I have seen young students raised according to fundamentalist doctrine treated like loathsome alley cats, emotionally torn apart, and I never thought that this treatment was any better than the treatment that religious prelates, who held authority, gave Galileo. Why scream about the inhumanity of nuclear war if you are also willing to force people of fundamentalist faiths to attend public schools in which their most cherished beliefs will be systematically held up to ridicule and the young children with it? The people are mostly too poor for private schools to be an alternative. The state tries to prevent them from teaching their children at home rather than sending them to school. What choice to they have? Would you call it freedom? Do you call it fair?

Is it really a terrible thing for a textbook to mention that, aside from the Darwin theory of evolution, there have existed other ideas, many of them religious in nature? Would that not open the minds of students rather than close them to scientific possibilities?"

SCIENCE EDUCATION

In every science textbook that I taught from, the fact that the church leaders held veto power over the discoveries of scientists like Galileo and others, was taught. And it should have been taught because it was part of the truth of the development of science. In the same way, the hoaxes are part of the truth of the history of the theory

of evolution. To not include them in the discussion of evolution is both dishonest and poor education. To not tell the students that there is not a single transitional form in the fossil record is negligence and a cover up of the facts. To exclude competing ideas in a science class is itself unscientific. Creation science doesn't stand on faith or the Bible; it stands on evidence and scientific laws. The same cannot be said for evolution. The more evidence that is discovered, the harder it is to have faith in evolution.

Some claim that the teaching of creation science is just a way to bring in religion through the back door, but it could be equally argued that the teaching of evolution is a way to bring in atheism through the front door. In Sept. 1978, G. Richard Bozarth wrote an article in the *American Atheist*, entitled, "The Meaning of Evolution". He wrote, **"Christianity has fought, still fights and will fight science to the desperate end over evolution because evolution destroys utterly the very reason Jesus' earthly life was supposedly made necessary. Destroy Adam and Eve and the original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the Son of God. If Jesus was not the redeemer who died for our sins, and this is what evolution means, then Christianity is nothing."**

That is why Evolutionists act more like religious zealots than like scientists. Scientists don't violate the laws of science. Scientists invite competing theories in a search for the truth. Scientists don't ridicule those who have differing views; they engage them to learn more. Scientists don't plant fake evidence. Evolutionists don't act like scientists.

Paul Ziegler