EVOLUTION

G. Michael Cocoris

The theory of evolution is that life began and evolved through a series of mutations and natural selection over a long period of time. More specifically, sunlight acted on chemicals in the sea to form, by chance, one or more single-cell organisms, which have developed through beneficial mutations and natural selection into all living plants, animals, and people (Ryrie, p. 171).

The Explanation of Evolution

Mutations Evolution explains that mutations (changes) occur. These small changes are passed on to the offspring, causing them to differ from their parents.

Natural Selection Natural selection preserves the changes caused by mutations. The process of natural selection preserves the changes that are *beneficial* to the organism. "A beneficial mutation is one that increases the complexity of the organism" (Ryrie, p. 174). Charles Darwin said, "I will give absolutely nothing for the theory of natural selection if it requires miraculous additions at any one stage of dissent" (Darwin, cited by Ryrie, p. 171). In other words, natural selection is by chance.

By the way, after Darwin wrote *On the Origin of Species*, Herbert Spencer used the expression "survival of the fittest" for Darwin's idea of natural selection. That interpretation of natural selection caught on, and Darwin even used it later in his book. Today, the way Darwin used the expression "survival of the fittest" is often misunderstood. To those unfamiliar with natural selection, "fittest" means the best physical specimen of the species and only those who survive. That is not always the case. Therefore, "survival of the fittest" is not the best way to describe what natural selection really is. For Darwin, "fittest" meant the one best suited for the environment, which is the idea of natural selection. The "fit" survive; that is, *those who adapt to their environment* live long enough to pass down their genes to their offspring.

Because of the misunderstanding, it has been suggested that the expression "survival of the fittest" be avoided "when discussing the Theory of Evolution or natural selection" unless "the more scientific definition is understood" because it "can be very misleading. Students, especially those who are learning about evolution and natural selection for the very first time, should really avoid using the term until a deeper knowledge of the subject has been achieved" (https://www.thoughtco.com/survival-of-the-fittest-1224578).

Time Long periods of time are necessary for evolution. Since mutations do not occur frequently, there must be a lot of time for enough beneficial mutations to occur and be preserved by natural selection to change organisms to increasingly complex ones.

The Arguments for Evolution

Embryology The argument from embryology is that the embryo passes through the same stages in its development that human beings have gone through in their evolution. For example, it is argued that when an embryo is a month old, it has folds that suggest the gills of a fish.

Comparative Anatomy The argument from comparative anatomy contends that the similarity of certain animals to humans indicates a common ancestry. For example, they have vertebrae. The theory is that similarity demands relationship.

Geology The argument from geology states that older rock formations contain fossils of simple life forms, while younger rocks contain fossils of more complex life forms. The assumption is that life could only have progressed from the simple to the complex. Radioactive dating is used to determine the age of the various rock formations.

The Problems with Evolution

Mutations No one questions that there are changes *within a species*. In other words, microevolution occurs. No one, however, has ever demonstrated macroevolution, a change from one species to another. Breeding a donkey and a horse produces a mule, which cannot reproduce.

Natural Selection Change for improvement by chance is highly unlikely. An evolutionist has acknowledged, "In fact, natural selection with evolutionary consequences has only been observed where men have created dramatically new conditions, which impose a heavy selection pressure" (J. B. Haldane, *Nature*, March 14, 1959, p. 51, cited by Ryrie, p. 175).

Time The ultimate problem for evolution is that time is not a cause. Julian Huxley, a staunch evolutionist, conceded that the mathematical odds against evolution are staggering: one chance in 1,000 to 1 millionth power, that is, one followed by three million zeros (Julian Huxley, *Evolution into Action*, pp. 45-46, cited by Geisler, p. 90).

If a million monkeys were permitted to strike the keys of a million typewriters for a million years, they might, by chance, type a copy of a Shakespearean play. Davidheiser set up a controlled experiment with only capital letters, continuous typing at a uniform rate of speed, and requiring only the first verse of Genesis. He demonstrated that in a billion years, a million monkeys would never type Genesis 1:1, let alone a Shakespearean play (Davidheiser, cited by Ryrie, p. 177).

As for dating, many reputable scientists have pointed out that radioactive dating is not reliable beyond 10,000 years.

Embryology The embryo does not pass through the same stages that evolution says human beings went through in their evolution. The resemblance of folds to the gills of a fish is superficial. The folds of the embryo never function as gills, nor do they have the material of gills. They gradually develop into the jaw and neck of the fetus. Someone has said, "The gill argument offers about as much proof that humans evolved from the fish as the moon-shaped face of a young Chinese is proof that he evolved from the moon."

Comparative Anatomy Similarity does not demand a relationship. Similarity could be nothing more than an indication of the same designer.

Geology The problem with the geological argument for evolution is that the geological column is totally man-made; it cannot be found in any one place on the surface of the earth in all of its layers. The *actual* fossil record is a problem for evolution. Before the Cambrian explosion, most organisms were simple, composed of individual cells that were occasionally organized into colonies. *The Cambrian explosion was the rapid appearance of most major groups of complex animals in the fossil record.* (For a more detailed explanation of the fossil issue, see the Appendix.)

The rapid appearance of fossils was noted in the mid-19th century, and Charles Darwin saw it as one of the main objections that could be made against his theory of evolution by natural selection (Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of the Species by Natural Selection*. London: Murray, pp. 315-316). Darwin knew that the fossil record was contrary to his theory! He blamed it on the

imperfection of the fossil record (see "On the Imperfection of the Geological Record," chapter 9 of his book). He wrote, "For my part, following out Lyell's metaphor, I look at the natural geological record as a history of the world imperfectly kept and written in a changing dialect; of this history, we possess the last volume alone, relating only to two or three countries. Of this volume, only here and there a short chapter has been preserved, and of each page, only here and there a few lines. Each word of the slowly changing language in which history is supposed to be written, being more or less different in the interrupted succession of chapters, may represent the apparently abruptly changed forms of life, entombed in our consecutive but widely separated formations (Darwin, pp. 310-311).

He also wrote, "All these causes taken conjointly, just have tended to make the geological record extremely imperfect, and will to a large extent explain why we do not find interminable varieties, connecting together all the extinct and existing forms of life by the finest graduated steps. He who rejects these views on the nature of the geological record will rightly reject my whole theory" (Darwin, p. 342).

"The number of intermediate varieties which have formerly existed on earth must be truly enormous. Why, then, is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory" (Charles Darwin).

The Second Law of Thermodynamics The second law of thermodynamics states that energy tends toward entropy, that is, every system tends to move from order to disorder. Available energy becomes less and less until a state of complete randomness is reached. Thus, *all systems are running down*. If all systems moved toward disorder, life could not evolve from so-called simple orders. The clock of the universe is not being wound up. It is winding down, suggesting that someone wound it, and now it is ticking down. "The second law of thermodynamics makes complete random development unlikely. For if the world is tending to disorder unless there is behind it an ordering power, it would be more and more—if not completely—chaotic by now" (Geisler, pp. 90-91).

Intelligent Design Intelligent design is the idea that the complexities of the universe and living things are best explained by an intellectual cause, not by the process of natural selection. For example, Michael Behe, a biochemist, argues that there is an "irreducible complexity" that cannot be explained by chance mutations over time. He defines "irreducible complexity" as a single system that is composed of several parts where the removal of any one would cause the system to cease functioning. The mousetrap is an illustration. All of the parts must be in place *at the same time* for the mousetrap to work. Removal of any one piece destroys its function. Natural selection could not have created such an irreducibly complex system because the selectability function is present only when all parts are assembled together.

Summary: The explanation of and the evidence for evolution are not supported by facts or reason, and the evidence from the second law of thermodynamics and intelligent design argues against it.

The great hurdles of evolution are insurmountable. What exists today had to go from nothing to something (matter), from the inorganic to the organic (life), and from the organic to man (human life).

Darwin wrote, "I am quite conscious that my speculations run quite beyond the bounds of true science" (a letter by Darwin to Gray on June 18, 1857. The original letter can be found in *The*

Correspondence of Charles Darwin. Burkhardt, Frederick, and Smith, Sydney, eds., 1989. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 6:412). If it is beyond science, it must be based on faith. Evolution requires an incredible amount of faith. It requires believing that changes selected by chance caused all life to develop from a single, simple cell to the complexity in human beings.

Many secular scientists today are questioning evolution. For example, in his book *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Michael Denton, an Australian biologist and agnostic, claims that no discovery since 1859, when Charles Darwin published *On the Origin of Species*, has supported Darwin's theory. He calls evolution "the great cosmogenic myth of the twentieth century." In his book, he says, "Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality, the smallest element of which—a functional protein or gene—is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality which is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man." Dr. Murray Edan, professor emeritus at MIT, said that Denton's book "should be made required reading for everyone who believes what he was taught in college about evolution."

In 1981, Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist for the British Museum of Natural History, told biologists at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, "I woke up and realized that all my life I have been duped into taking evolutionism as revealed truth in some way." He went on to say that no real transitional forms have ever been found anywhere in the fossil record, and "I don't think we shall ever have any access to any form of (evolutionary) tree which we can call factual."

At the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar at the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, Patterson challenged them to tell him one thing they knew for sure about evolution. He said that all he got was silence for a long time and eventually, one person said, "I do know one thing—it ought not to be taught in high school."

Charles Thaxton, Walter Bradley, and Roger Olsen, former evolutionists with doctorates in chemistry, geochemistry, and materials science, have written a book entitled *The Mystery of Life's Origins: Reassessing Current Theories* in which they conclude that a "Creator beyond the cosmos" is the most plausible explanation for life's origin. After reading that book, evolutionist Dean Kenyon of San Francisco State University wrote that many scientists hesitate to admit or study the theory's problems because they would "open the door to the possibility (more than necessity) of a supernatural origin of life."

APPENDIX I

EVOLUTION: Summary

What is the theory of evolution? What are the arguments for it and the problems with it?

Theory of Evolution

1. Mutations. Changes happen.
2. Natural Selection. (later called Survival of the Fittest) Changes are preserved.
3. Time. Changes need time, a lot of time.

Arguments for Evolution

1. Embryology. Embryos pass through the same stages as evolution. A one-month-old embryo has folds like a fish.
2. Comparative Anatomy. Similarity indicates common ancestry. (pictures of small animals to humans)
3. Geology. Fossils of life forms go from simple to complex.

Problems with Evolution

1. Mutations. There are changes within species, but not changes from one species to another. Breathing a donkey and a horse produces a mule, which cannot reproduce.
2. Natural Selection. Changes by chance that improve are highly unlikely.
3. Time. Time is not a cause. The odds of evolution being true are one chance in 1000 to 1 millionth power, that is, one followed by 3 million zeros.
4. Embryology. Embryos do not pass through the same stages that evolution says humans do. The folds for one-month embryos never function as gills.
5. Comparative Anatomy. Similarity does not demand the relationship. Similarity could be nothing more than an indication of the same designer.
6. Geology. The Cambrian explosion shows the rapid appearance of complex creatures.
7. The Second Law of Thermodynamics. All systems are running down. The light would not evolve from simple to complex.
8. Intelligent Design. An intelligent cause best explains the complexity of the universe and living things.

Summary: The arguments for evolution are not supported by facts or reason, and the Second Law of Thermodynamics and intelligent design argue against it

What exists today had to go from nothing to something (matter), from inorganic to organic (life), and from organic to humanity (human life).

Evolution requires an incredible amount of faith. I do not have enough faith to be an evolutionist.

APPENDIX II

THE PROBLEMS WITH THE FOSSIL RECORD

1. The first major problem with the fossil record is that it shows species originating abruptly. This contradicts the predictions of Darwin's hypothesis. His hypothesis calls for very many intermediate forms, gradually grading from one species to another. But instead, the record shows the opposite—species arise abruptly.
2. Secondly, the geologic record shows that species do not change significantly through time. For millions of years, they have remained constant—with only minor and random changes. This also contradicts the predictions of Darwin's hypothesis.
3. The "Cambrian explosion" represents a period in which most of the current phyla [broad groups of life forms] all appeared in a very short geological span of time. This seriously contradicts Darwin's hypothesis.

The problems with the fossil record are more extreme than they might seem. The evidence of the fossils is in stunning contradiction to Darwin's theory. Generally, this contradiction is not well known, so I have attempted to bring out the details in this newsletter (author unknown).

Species Don't Significantly Change

In pursuit of this subject, I acquired a copy of "The Structure of Evolutionary Theory" by Steven Jay Gould. It is a 1400-page tome that, while well-written, would not appeal to the general reader. I wanted to reach a clearly knowledgeable source, and Gould is a well-known Darwinist who also admits to some of the problems in Darwin's view. Most of the quotes from Gould are from that book. [The book is available on Amazon. For a summary of the book, see the article entitled "The Structure of Evolutionary Theory" on Wikipedia.]

Gould has called "stasis" [a period of stability during which little or no evolutionary change in a lineage occurs] the "trade secret of paleontology." One section of the book attracted my interest. In chapter nine, that section is headed "What Every Paleontologist Knows." I hoped that the chapter would reveal and prove the "secret." And it did. Most of the quotes here from Gould are from that source. Now, more people can learn the "trade secret of paleontology."

Here are some reasons, according to Gould, why such a "secret" naturally occurs.

The common knowledge of a profession often goes unrecorded in the technical literature for two reasons: one need not preach commonplaces to the initiated and one should not attempt to inform the uninitiated in publications they do not read. The long-term stasis, following a geologically abrupt origin, of most fossil morphospecies, has always been recognized by professional paleontologists.... (Gould, pp. 749-750).

But another reason, beyond tacitly shared knowledge, soon arose to drive stasis more actively into textual silence. Darwinian evolution became the great intellectual novelty of the later 19th century, and paleontology held the archives of life's history. Darwin proclaimed an insensibly gradual transition as the canonical expectation for evolution's expression in the fossil record. He knew, of course, that the detailed histories of species rarely show such a pattern, so he explained the literal appearance of stasis and abrupt replacement as an artifact of a woefully imperfect fossil record. Thus, paleontologist could be good Darwinians and still acknowledge the primary fact of

their profession, but only at the price of sheepishness or embarrassment. No one can take great comfort when the primary observation of their discipline becomes an artifact of limited evidence rather than an expression of nature's ways. Thus, once gradualism emerged as the expected pattern for documenting evolution—with an evident implication that the fossil record's dominant signal of stasis and abrupt replacement can only be a sign of evidentiary poverty—paleontologist became cowed or puzzled and even less likely to showcase their primary datum. (Gould, p. 750)

Gould gives a number of quotes to confirm the stasis of species. He concludes: "In what I regard as the most fascinating and revealing comment of all, Gorge Gaylord Simpson, the greatest and most biologically astute paleontologist of the 20th century (and a strong opponent of punctuated equilibrium in his later years), [Gould's own theory] acknowledged the literal appearance of stasis and geologically abrupt origin as the outstanding general fact of the fossil record, and as a pattern that would 'pose one of the most important theoretical problems in the whole history of life' if Darwin's argument for artifactual status failed. Simpson stated at the 1959 Chicago centennial celebration for the "Origin of Species" (in Tax, 1960, p. 149):

"It is a feature of the known fossil record that most taxa [a group of organisms] appear abruptly. They are not, as a rule, led up to by a sequence of almost imperceptibly changing forerunners, as Darwin believed should be usual in evolution. A great many sequences of two or a few temporally intergrading species are known, but even at this level, most species appear without known intermediate ancestors, and really, the perfectly complete sequence of numerous species are exceedingly rare ... These peculiarities of the record pose one of the most important theoretical problems in the whole history of life; is the sudden appearance ... a phenomenon of evolution or of the record only, due to sampling bias and other inadequacies? Such discordance between theoretical expectation and actual observation surely falls within the category of troubling 'anomalies' that, in Kuhn's celebrated view of scientific change (1962), often spur a major reformulation" (Gould, p. 755).

Translation: The data so strongly disconfirms the hypothesis that it may induce a paradigm shift.

Darwin claimed the reason for the discrepancy was an "imperfect" record. Gould claims this reason "works." But while seeming to excuse Darwin, he admits the contrariness is "stunning."

The "argument from imperfection" (with its preposition purposefully chosen by analogy to the "argument from design") works adequately as a device to save gradualism in the face of an empirical signal of quite stunning contrariness when read at face value." (Darwin, p. 758)

But if an "imperfect" record can excuse the sudden appearance of species, how does one explain the unchanging nature of a species once it appears? This unchanging nature is called "stasis." After hearing so much "explaining away," Gould makes the point that stasis is data. Since those on the spiritual path will have heard of mantras, I thought you might enjoy Gould's emphatic explanation.

But how can imperfection possibly explain away stasis (the equilibrium of punctuated equilibrium)? Abrupt appearance may record an absence of information, but stasis is data. Eldredge and I became so frustrated by the failure of many colleagues to grasp this evident point—though a quarter-century of subsequent debate has finally propelled our claim to general acceptance (while much else about punctuated equilibrium remains controversial)—that we urged the incorporation of this little phrase as a mantra or motto. Say it ten times before breakfast every day for a week, and the argument will surely seep in by osmosis: "stasis is data: stasis is data."

The fossil record may, after all, be 99 percent imperfect, but if you can, nonetheless, sample a species at a large number of horizons well spread over several million years, and if these samples

record no net change, with beginning and end points substantially the same, and with only mild and errant fluctuation among the numerous collections in between, then a conclusion of stasis rests on the presence of data, not on absence!

Another admission from Gould (I respect his honesty): So if stasis could not be explained away as missing information, how could gradualism face this most prominent signal from the fossil record? The most negative of all strategies—a quite unconscious conspiracy of silence—dictated the canonical response of paleontologists to their observations of stasis.

Paleontologists, therefore, came to view stasis as just another failure to document evolution. Stasis existed in overwhelming abundance, as every paleontologist always knew. But this primary signal of the fossil record, defined as an absence of data for evolution, only highlighted our frustration and certainly did not represent anything worth publishing. Paleontology, therefore, fell into a literally absurd vicious circle. No one ventured to document or quantify. Indeed, hardly anyone even bothered to mention or publish at all the most common pattern in the fossil record: the stasis of most morphospecies throughout their geological duration.

The trade secret comes out: All paleontologists recognized the phenomenon, but few scientists write papers about the failure to document a desired result. As a consequence, most nonpaleontologists never learned about the predominance of stasis and assumed that gradualism must prevail, as illustrated by the exceedingly few cases that became textbook "classics:" the coiling of Gryphae, the increasing body size of horses, etc. (Interestingly, nearly all these "classics" have since been disproved, thus providing another testimony for the temporary triumph of hope and expectation over evidence; see Gould, 1972.) Thus, when punctuated equilibrium finally granted theoretical space and importance to stasis, and this fundamental phenomenon finally emerged from the closet, nonpaleontologists were often astounded and incredulous (Gould, p. 761)

Gould is probably not thinking exactly what I think when he writes these words: I find this situation particularly frustrating as paleontology's primary example of an insidious phenomenon in science that simply has not been recognized for the serious and distorting results perpetrated under its aegis. (In his defense, actually, Gould refers to problems that result for science in general when this kind of selection against publishing occurs in any field of study. But in this case, the results for humanity are very serious indeed.)

Cambrian Explosion

The problem with the so-called "Cambrian explosion" is that many different basic body plans of animals appeared relatively instantaneously—in geologic time—about 600 million years ago. This is exactly the opposite of Darwinism's prediction of the gradual development of life forms.

I quote here from "Darwin on Trial," a very well-written book by Philip Johnson published in 1991 that has significantly raised people's awareness of the problems of Darwinism.

The single greatest problem the fossil record poses for Darwinism is the "Cambrian explosion" of around 600 million years ago. Nearly all the animal phyla appear in the rocks of this period without a trace of the evolutionary ancestors that Darwinists require. As Richard Dawkins [a staunch advocate of Darwinism] puts it, "It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history." In Darwin's time, there was no evidence for the existence of Precambrian life, and he conceded in "The Origin of Species" that "The case at present must remain inexplicable, and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained." If his theory was true, Darwin wrote, the Precambrian must have "swarmed with living creatures."

In recent years, evidence of bacteria and algae has been found in some of the earth's oldest rocks, and it is generally accepted today that these single-celled forms of life may have first appeared as long ago as four billion years.... And then dozens of independent groups of multicellular animals appeared without any visible process of evolutionary development. Darwinism requires that there have been very lengthy sets of intermediate forms between unicellular organisms and animals like insects, worms, and clams. The evidence that these existed is missing, however, and with no good excuse.

The problem posed by the Cambrian explosion has become known to many contemporary readers due to the success of Gould's book "Wonderful Life."

The general picture of animal history is thus a burst of general body plans followed by extinction. No new phyla evolved thereafter. Many species exist today that are absent from the rocks of the remote past, but these all fit within the general taxonomic categories present at the outset. The picture is one of evolution of a sort, but only within the confines of basic categories, which themselves show no previous evolutionary history. Gould described the reclassification of the Burgess fossils as the "death knell of the artifact theory." [The theory proposed by Darwin is that it is only an accident of the record that the evidence is so bad.]

An orthodox Darwinist would answer that a direct leap from unicellular organisms to 25 to 50 complex animal phyla without a long succession of transitional intermediates is not the sort of thing for which a plausible genetic mechanism exists, to put it mildly. Gould is describing something he calls "evolution," but the picture is so different from what Darwin and his successors had in mind that perhaps a different term ought to be found. The Darwinian model of evolution is what Gould calls the "cone of increasing diversity." This means the story of multicellular animal life should begin with a small number of species evolving from simple forms. The dozens of different basic body plans manifest in the Cambrian fossils would then be the product of a long and gradual process of evolution from less differentiated beginnings. Nor should the cone have stopped expanding abruptly after the Cambrian explosion. If the disconfirming facts were not already known, any Darwinist would be confident that the hundreds of millions of years of post-Cambrian evolution would have produced many new phyla. [But none were produced.]

Instead, we see the basic body plans all appearing first, many of these becoming extinct, and further diversification proceeding strictly within the boundaries of the original phyla. These original Cambrian groups have no visible evolutionary history, and the "artifact theory," which should supply such a history, has to be discarded. Maybe a few evolutionary intermediates existed for some of the groups, although none have been conclusively identified, but otherwise, just about all we have between complex multicellular animals and single cells is some words like "fast-transition." We can call this thoroughly un-Darwinian scenario "evolution," but we are just attaching a label to a mystery.

Sudden appearance and stasis of species in the fossil record is the opposite of what Darwinian theory would predict (Gould, pp. 54-56)

Gould's book "Wonderful Life," mentioned above, studies the Cambrian period from the "Burgess Shale in Canada, which gives the best fossil record of the Cambrian period up to that time. In doing just a little research on the Cambrian period on the internet, I came across this information on a yet better and more recent fossil record of that period, the Chengjiang site. This site is "much older than the Burgess Shale, and the preservation of the specimens is much, much finer."

The following interview is between "Real Issue," a Christian outlet, and Dr. Paul Chien, now a Christian due to his findings, who has changed his career in biology to further study this issue.

Dr. Paul Chien was born in China and graduated from a university in Hong Kong, where he earned degrees in chemistry and botany. He completed his doctorate at the University of California, Irvine, and his post-doc at Caltech in marine biology. Presently, he is the chairman of the biology department at the University of San Francisco.

Chien recently accepted a unique invitation to travel to China to study the fossils at the Chengjiang site. What Chien found and what he has since learned about the Cambrian fauna has changed the focus of his career. Today, Chien concentrates on further exploring and promoting the mysteries of the Cambrian explosion of life. Subsequently, Chien possesses the largest collection of Chinese Cambrian fossils in North America.

Real Issue: As you became more interested in this and discovered more about it, did you find it really was an "explosion of life"?

Chien: Yes. A simple way of putting it is that currently, we have about 38 phyla of different groups of animals, but the total number of phyla discovered during that period of time (including those in China, Canada, and elsewhere) adds up to over 50 phyla. That means [there are] more phyla in the very, very beginning, where we found the first fossils [of animal life than exist now.

Stephen J. Gould, [a Harvard University evolutionary biologist], has referred to this as the reverse cone of diversity. The theory of evolution implies that things get more and more complex and get more and more diverse from a single origin. But the whole thing turns out to be reversed. We have more diverse groups in the very beginning, and in fact, more and more of them die off over time, and we have less and less now.

RI: What information is the public hearing or not hearing about the Cambrian explosion?

Chien: The general impression people get is that we began with micro-organisms, then came lowly animals that don't amount to much, and then came the birds, mammals and man. Scientists were looking at a very small branch of the whole animal kingdom, and they saw more complexity and advanced features in that group. But it turns out that this concept does not apply to the entire spectrum of animals or to the appearance or creation of different groups. Take all the different body plans of roundworms, flatworms, coral, jellyfish, and whatever else appeared at the very first instant.

Most textbooks will show a live tree of evolution with the groups evolving over a long period of time. If you take that tree and chop off 99 percent of [the earlier portion of] it, [what is left] is closer to reality; it's the true beginning of every group of animals, all represented at the very beginning.

Notice Chien's conclusion, "all represented at the very beginning." It is also interesting that Gould calls this a "reverse cone of diversity." The complete opposite of what Darwin taught.

Summary: The three major problems for evolution from the fossil record are: it shows species originating abruptly, it shows that species do not change significantly through time, and it presents a period in which most of the current phyla [broad groups of life forms] all appeared in a very short geological span of time.

APPENDIX III

THE STORY OF A MEDICAL DOCTOR

"I saw goads work effectively in the life of a resident physician named Bob, who went to work in a large city hospital. They began to sting him as soon as he entered this atmosphere of suffering, heartache, and death. He had been reared in a respectable non-Christian home. His parents were well-to-do, and he had always enjoyed comfortable surroundings. None of his close relatives or friends had died. He was aware of death, but he had never thought about it very much. He had succeeded in pushing all morbid thoughts out of his mind. Like the majority of his fellow students in medical school, he had accepted the hypothesis that everything, including human life, is a product of the evolutionary process.

"But now, seeing firsthand the sufferings of flesh-and-blood human beings, he had to confront the full meaning of his own humanity. He was unable to think of men and women in deep pain as mere collections of atoms or to look upon them as mechanical, unfeeling objects. When he saw people show tender sacrificial love toward dear ones enduring great agony, he somehow knew these deep personal expressions were more than mechanical or chemical responses. A myriad of disturbing thoughts raced through his mind, and they stung!

"This led him to ponder his own relationships with people. He loved his wife, his small daughter, his parents, and his brother. Was nothing significant or meaningful about his feelings toward them? Ouch! The goad penetrated deeply this time!

"He began to wonder about his profession. His folks had sacrificed much to send him to medical school, and he had worked many long hours to succeed. He knew that if he were to be conscientious, his life as a doctor would not be easy. Would the material rewards make up for all the pressures? Besides, if man is nothing more than an accidental step in an evolutionary process, why give all you have to save an individual life? Bob winced in pain as he reflected upon these questions. The goads were digging in more deeply!

"While haunted by all this inner turmoil, Bob had from time to time meet Christians. They showed remarkable serenity, even under the most difficult circumstances. Some of them shared their faith with him, but he found it hard to accept what they had to say. Day and night, his thoughts tormented him. The goads were jabbing him mercilessly! Finally, he accepted the Scriptures and placed his faith in Jesus Christ. Now, his heart is filled with deep peace and joy and he knows how to truly help others. He had been wise in facing up to life's basic problems, and his thoughts had acted as goads to drive him to the Savior" (Richard DeHaan, *The Art of Staying off Dead-end Streets*, pp. 9-11).

APPENDIX IV

A MONKEY'S PERSPECTIVE

Three monkeys sat in a coconut tree
Discussing things as they're said to be
Said one to the other, "Now listen, you two,
There's a certain rumor that can't be true
That man descended from our noble race
The very idea is a disgrace

No monkey ever deserted his *wife*
Starved her babies and ruined her life,
And you've never known a mother monk
To leave her babies with others to bunk,
Or pass them on from one to another
Till they scarcely know who is their mother.

And another thing you'll never see,
A Monk build a fence 'round a coconut tree
And let the coconuts go to waste,
Forbidding all other monks a taste,
Why, if I'd put a fence around a tree,
Starvation would force you to steal from me.

Here's another thing a monk won't do,
Go out at night and get on a stew,
Or use a gun or club or knife
To take some other monkey's life.
Yes, man descended, the ornery cuss,
But brother, he didn't descend from us!"—Anon.

“The Monkeys’ Jamboree”

The monkeys one day had a big jamboree,
Their leader sat up in the tallest palm tree
And said with a chuckle, “My good fellow Monk,
If you want a good laugh just give ear to this junk.

The teachers of men in a place they call ‘school’
Are training each youngster to grow up a fool,
The kids all run wild and never get spanked.
If our babies did that, their tails would be yanked.

No well-mannered monkey dictates to his teacher,
Beats up the policeman or shoots at the preacher,
Poisons the baby or kills with a gun,
And then laughs and says: “We are just having fun!”

Monkeys, my friends, have respect for each other.
We hand out no sass to our father or mother.
The picture I’ve painted you’ll agree is quite sad.
But listen, my brothers, I’m boiling mad.

For here’s what they’re taught—that miserable flunky,
That creature called Man, was at one time a monkey!
An ape just like us, and what’s more, if you please,
He claims that at one time he swung thru the trees.

Fellow monkeys, I think this is going too far.
We don’t envy their home, their wealth, or their car.
But when they will spread such a horrible rumor
It’s time for all monkeys to lose their good humor.

So, come, you must help me prepare a big sign,
Protesting that man’s no descendant of mine,
If evolution be true, then boys, we are sunk;
For I’d sooner be father to weasel or skunk.”