1. There is a great lack of “intermediate” forms between major groups of organisms.

* e.g. Where is the intermediate between whales and cows?
* e.g. Where are the intermediates between reptiles and birds?
* So many organisms “created” in natural history were fabricated out of a few bones and teeth to represent intermediates
* A significant number of scientists (30 – 50 %) changed to Punctuated Equilibrium [*periods of rapid change*] from gradualism (Darwin’s theory) … Stephen Gould

1. Much of the Comparative evidence could also point to a supreme creator with a common design (rather than “common ancestry”)

* 98% of the DNA coding for amino acid sequences in monkeys is the same as humans … this allows for huge variations since proteins are made up of hundreds of amino acids in a single chain with millions of possibilities (2 % of a million accounts for 20,000 variations)
* Comparative anatomy, biochemistry, embryology, cytology could show a common design

1. Mutations are almost always harmful, yet they are a key force in evolution (genetic variation).
2. Evolution is based on random events … yet there are countless structures, systems and processes that cannot be random in nature to work.

* e.g. how did a woodpecker get its 6 g-force beak with stronger bone structure and amazing claws gradually and randomly? That development had to occur simultaneously at one time.

1. Many false concepts are propagated in textbooks that are no longer valid … is this a form of literary indoctrination or just oversight on the publisher’s part?

* “eohippus” is NOT a common ancestor of the horse
* “archeopteryx” is not a common ancestor between birds and reptiles
* many “humanoids” were found to be either humans with disorders/diseases or some kind of ape/orangutan (Neanderthal, Cro-magnon, Australopithicus)

6) The fact is: no speciation has ever been witnessed or produced … only variations within the same species (bacteria, viruses, etc.)

*The following article was written by a Darwinian Evolutionist (gradualism). The information presented is in line with typical high school textbooks that public school students would use. The large lettering is added for emphasis. The colored type represents the editor’s comments or questions about the information presented by the author.*

*The theory of evolution as presented by this author leaves much to the imagination and at times takes “quantum leaps” from one idea to another without any valid scientific substantiation. The author of the article asks a few good questions that are shown in enlarged type … but does not offer any scientific answers. However, he then proceeds to explain his theory as if factual based upon his own statements rather than on scientific evidence. The purpose of this editorial is to show some major issues with Darwin’s evolutionary theory which shows rationale for many former Darwinian evolutionists who now hold to the Theory of Punctuated Equilibrium1.*

**The universe.**

Modern science suggests that the universe was created about 13.7 billion years ago. [*The author begins by making a monumental statement, yet in the following details does NOT give scientific explanation of how this age was derived nor give a reference for further research, but rather makes more statements that are similarly monumental in scope. Based upon the remainder of the article, it is clear that the author expects that all readers need to accept his statements to understand his logic.*]

What existed before that moment? At present, we have no way of answering that question. [*The author asks an outstanding question, but does not offer any explanation. However, as is often the case in this article, we will proceed without explanation, just accepting items as factual.*] Many astronomers would say that the query is meaningless because neither time nor space existed before the creation of the universe. There was nothing. Even so, there must have been at least the possibility of something, because in this “nothingness” a sort of explosion occurred. [*Is this the so-called “Big bang”*?] Within a split second of that explosion, something did exist. The early universe was tiny and fantastically hot, a searing cloud of energy and matter, much hotter than the interior of the sun. For a trillionth of a second the universe expanded faster than the speed of light, until it was bigger than an entire galaxy. [*Monumental statements without scientific evidence or references*.] Then the rate of expansion slowed, though expansion continues to the present day.

[*How is it possible to know any of what was conjectured above*? *The author states that an explosion occurs out of random nothingness to produce meaningful chemicals, stars, etc.? This should bring a question to the reader’s mind about the validity of the statements.*]

As the universe expanded, it cooled down. After about 300,000 years, it was cool enough so that protons and electrons could combine to form atoms of hydrogen and helium. These are the simplest atoms of all. After about 1 billion years, [*Can the author substantiate his time frames? If so, he should do so before continuing his article or make reference to the scientific validity of his statements. Instead, his statements about the foundation of the universe being laid without any scientific evidence to support them must satisfy the reader.*] huge clouds of hydrogen and helium began to collapse in on themselves. As they did so, their centers got hotter and hotter. When they were hot enough, hydrogen atoms began to fuse together violently like vast hydrogen bombs. In this way, the first stars lit up. [*Wouldn’t violence like hydrogen bombs produce chaos, rather than organization? According to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, order always proceeds to disorder … this is called the Law of Entropy that all scientists hold as true. The author’s statement regarding chaos producing order, like so many other statements, goes unquestioned or unchallenged while unsupported.*] Hundreds of billions of stars appeared, gathered in hundreds of billions of clusters that we call “galaxies.” In the stars, new chemical elements were created, so that as stars lived and died, they generated the energy and raw materials needed to make new and more complex types of matter. [*How did complexity form? … no real explanation is offered; just a statement that it did.*] So it is no accident that complex objects such as planets and human beings appear near stars. [*This is another example of a quantum leap in the author’s logic without substantiation. Where is it explained how complexity is derived even to the point of creating planets and human beings? No explanation is given for chemicals like hydrogen and helium producing planets. The author then includes life forms in his statements. Where did the life come from scientifically? No explanation is offered or given, but just a statement that it is.*]

**Our galaxy.**

Our attention now turns to one tiny part of the universe. Our sun and the planets that circle around it were created about 4.5 billion years ago, so they are about one third of the age of the universe. They were created about two thirds of the way from the center of a galaxy we call the “Milky Way.” Look up at the heavens on a clear night, and the Milky Way looks like a pale creamy pathway through the stars.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Milky Way showing its central bulge and outlying disk of stars.**  National Aeronautics and Space Administration http://apod.nasa.gov/apod/ap950908.html | **Milky Way** |

Our sun is a star, and like all other stars, it was formed from the collapse of a huge cloud of gas and dust particles. [*Even though the formation of complex items from simple chemicals was never really explained, now, the author continues as if it was.*] More than 99 percent of this material went to make up the sun, but wisps of matter orbited around it at various distances. Over time, the matter in each orbit was drawn together by gravity or by violent collisions into lumps of matter that eventually formed the planets. This is how our earth was formed. [*This is another example of a quantum leap in the author’s logic without substantiation. He just stated that violent chaos forms organized or highly structured order like planets, in particular, the earth. Where is the scientific evidence supporting his conclusions? Where is the scientific explanation as to why the Second Law of Thermodynamics is violated in the logic and statements of the author?*] At first, it was extremely hot. The heavy metals within it melted and sank to the center of the earth to form its core. Lighter materials rose to the surface, and gases bubbled up to form the earliest atmosphere.

**The Earth.**

The early earth was a violent place, bombarded by asteroids, and bubbling with heat from its interior. If you visited its surface, you would have seen landscapes full of volcanoes. But you would not have been able to breathe because its atmosphere contained no oxygen. [*This should be the place where the author explains his previous statements of how complexity is derived from simplicity and how chaos produces order. Instead, we have “circular reasoning” in which statements are made without scientific support, but the next argument is based on the unsubstantiated previous statements. Is this fiction or science?*] Slowly, the number of asteroid impacts diminished, the surface cooled, and, about 4 billion years ago, water vapor in the atmosphere condensed to form the first oceans.

Eventually, the earth’s surface hardened and congealed, forming a number of thin plates that floated on the hot, molten material beneath. These plates slowly moved around the surface, and where they collided, they formed huge mountain chains. Where they moved apart they created huge tears in the earth’s surface. You can see one of these tears in Africa’s Rift Valley. Some of these huge valleys eventually filled up to form new oceans. This process, known to geologists as “plate tectonics,” means that the surface of the earth has changed continuously. As it changed so did the landscapes and weather patterns at the surface of the earth.

**Early life forms.**

Life evolved in this ever-changing environment. The first living organisms probably evolved deep within the seas. [*The word “probably” says a lot. Notice again, a statement is made that life just evolved, but no scientific evidence is given to support the statement*.] Around volcanic vents at the bottom of oceans, complex chemicals engaged in ever-changing reactions powered by the heat from these volcanoes. Those reactions led to the formation of complex chemicals that eventually created the first living organisms. [*The author makes another monumental statement of how life comes from non-life? This statement contradicts an already established scientific principle that spontaneous generation does NOT occur in science. In other words, life does not derive from non-life, but only from previous life. Yet, the theory of evolution presented by the author continues as if the premise of life coming from non-life is correct. The next statements are based on the reader accepting a false scientific principle to build further ideas.*] Did life evolve only on our earth? At present, we do not know for sure. It seems likely, however, that life has evolved many times, wherever planets appeared that are similar to our earth.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **An amoeba, a eukaryotic microorganism.**  Wikimedia Commons photo by Ralph Wagner | **Amoeba** |

The earliest living organisms consisted of single cells, as most living organisms do even today. The earliest organisms probably fed off the chemicals leaking from deep-sea volcanoes. Their fossil remains can be identified today, [Another statement made by the author without scientific evidence to support it. Where is the fossil record of amoebas and other simple organisms evolving into new species?] and the oldest of these remains can be dated to about 3.5 billion years ago. Like all living organisms, those early single-celled creatures were subject to the laws of evolution. Minor changes in organisms were passed on from generation to generation. [*The author makes the statement about gradualism (minor changes passed on from generation to generation), but gives no scientific evidence. For instance, where are the “intermediates” which show minor changes from generation to generation? There is no such fossil record (as presumed) that shows gradual changes in a particular species en route to forming an entirely new species (“speciation”)*.] Those organisms that flourished best in particular environments multiplied most successfully and left the most descendants. In this way, generation by generation, the average features of species gradually changed and diversified, eventually forming entirely new species. [*There should be an abundance of “intermediates” giving evidence for Darwin’s gradualistic evolution … but there is NOT. Therefore, many evolutionists, like Stephen Gould and Stephen Hawking, have modified Darwin’s theory to “Punctuated Equilibrium*.”] And the number and variety of different species increased. [*Based on the author’s own admission, there should be many examples of “intermediates” providing evidence that gradual evolution took place. However, no such evidence is offered and neither does that evidence exist. Textbooks usually use some outdated examples of “speciation” like Archaeopteryx, a supposed link between reptiles and birds, which eventually was proved false. It should not just be a matter of one poor example, but hundreds of thousands of “intermediates” existing in the fossil record.*]

By as early as 3.5 billion years ago, some single-celled organisms began to derive energy directly from sunlight by using the chemical reaction known as photosynthesis. [*Photosynthesis is an extremely complex and precise biochemical “system” of chemical reactions. How did such an intricate biochemical design appear on the earth in so many organisms (plant life) to sustain the animal life? The author offers no explanation or “lead in” to such complexity. The readers must accept his statements as fact and continue.*] Since then, the sun’s energy has been the main “battery” driving life on earth. Photosynthesizing organisms breathed in carbon dioxide and breathed out oxygen. [*Here is another statement given by the author without scientific evidence. Where did the photosynthetic organisms come from? The reader must assume that these organisms “All of the sudden” exist. Yet, his previous statements indicate that everything occurs gradually over many generations. Here, the author just skips ahead. Another question arises: ‘How did the oxygen breathing organism’s survive unless the oxygen producing plants were available first?’ If organisms evolved by MINOR changes from generation to generation, where are the intermediate forms between living organisms that survived without oxygen and those who survive on oxygen? These items are completely ignored in this article and in science textbooks.*] So, as they multiplied, the amount of oxygen in the atmosphere increased. Living organisms were already shaping the earth’s atmosphere. Eventually, more complicated cells appeared that could “breathe” oxygen. These are known as “eukaryotic” cells. From about 600 million years ago, organisms appeared that were made up of many individual eukaryotic cells. These were the first “multi-celled” organisms. Large, multi-celled organisms eventually colonized the land, in the form of plants, fungi, and animals. [*At least now the author is using familiar organisms and scientific terms to describe his theory. The reader does not need a stretch of the imagination to follow his logic here. However, a key opposition to Darwin’s evolutionary theory by those who now support Punctuated Equilibrium is the improper extrapolation of science. This occurs when the author makes unsupported statements which are based partly on accepted scientific facts, but then creates his own unsubstantiated “facts” based on his own logic or the logic of others whom he agrees with. One example is Darwin’s finches. Darwin discovered 7 species of finches; each with a different kind of beak adapted for eating different food sources. This adaptation reduced competition among the finches and allowed for coexistence. Darwin extrapolated that if finches could “evolve” different beaks then all organisms “evolved” gradually from a common ancestor by minor changes (like a beak) over long periods of time. Just because natural selection is true (finches adapted to form different beaks), this does not imply or prove that organisms gradually form new species over time.*]

**Animals.**

One hundred million years ago, the most flourishing land-based animals were the reptiles we call dinosaurs. About 65 million years ago, however, most of them died off in what was probably a catastrophic meteor impact. Now other types of large animals could flourish in their place. Most successful of all in the last 65 million years has been the large class of animals called mammals. [*Where is the explanation of how mammals could survive in a post catastrophic environment that destroyed the dinosaurs?*] These are warm-blooded, fur-bearing animals that nourish their young in their mothers’ wombs and feed their infants with mother’s milk. After the dinosaur calamity, mammals began to spread, multiply, and diversify, occupying many of the niches once inhabited by dinosaurs. There appeared grass-eaters, meat-eaters, swimming mammals such as whales, and even flying mammals such as bats. [*The reader might question the gradual evolution of the aforementioned mammals and wonder where the evidence is in the fossil record showing the common ancestor to swimming mammals (like whales) going on to land to become land dwellers (like cows). Where are the “whale-cow” intermediates? Where are the intermediates showing the gradual change from air to land organisms or land to air organisms? Where are the intermediates showing the gradual change from grass eating to meat eating organisms? Etc. They do not exist in the fossil record or any record yet the author continues to assume the reader understands that these non-existent intermediates were somehow present as evidence of Darwinian evolution.*]

One family of mammals, the primates, were specialist tree-dwellers. To survive in trees they needed good 3-D vision and a brain large enough to process a lot of visual information. They also needed hands that could grip things with precision. [*So much of the information presented by the author is extrapolation based on familiar concepts like 3 D vision, brain size, hands, etc. There is, however, no scientific evidence offered or available to show how these organisms evolved gradually over time. For instance, how did their hands evolve so that they could grip? Where are the intermediate primates possessing hands before and en route to the “opposable” thumb used by primates for griping?*] Our own ancestors, the hominins, belonged to a branch of the “great apes,” a group of primates that had learned to live at least part of the time on the ground. The first hominins (a term replacing the older word “hominid”) appeared about 6 million years ago, in Africa. What distinguished the first hominins from other great apes was that they could stand upright. Their brains, however, were about the size of those of modern chimpanzees. In Africa, hominins flourished, alongside many other species, and in time a great variety of different hominin species appeared.

Early hominins probably lived much like modern chimpanzees or gorillas, that is, in small, family-sized groups that gathered most of their food from plants but also ate insects and small animals. They also occasionally scavenged the meat of larger animals. From about two million years ago, some hominins, from the species known as Homo erectus, migrated out of Africa along the warmer southern fringe of the Eurasian landmass from Europe to China. During the next 2 million years, new species of hominins appeared in this huge region, some with larger brains. One of those species, known as Neanderthals, flourished in the last 500,000 years. [*Neanderthal, (along with Pilt down man, Austalopithicus, Peking man, Eoanthropus, and others) has been cited in magazines such as Scientific American, Discover, Nova, and National Geographic for decades as a “missing” link, an intermediate, between man and ape like creatures. These magazines were written for the general public and contain much erroneous and/or outdated information. Scientific journals exposed Neanderthal as a hoax over 30 years ago. Yet, it is still shown in the aforementioned magazines and many textbooks, promoting gradualistic evolution. Proponents of Punctuated Equilibrium no longer promote outdated and false evidence which supports gradualism because they modified Darwin’s theory to incorporate actual scientific evidence.*]

We can also be reasonably sure that early hominin societies were quite complex. Studies of chimpanzee groups today show that they compete for status, making complex alliances with one another to achieve higher standing. Politics of this kind require a lot of “political” intelligence. We also know that chimps care for each other. Mothers have much care for their offspring, and they appear genuinely distraught if their babies come to harm. Hominins almost certainly engaged in behaviors that were equally complex.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Our hominin ancestors used tools known as Acheulean hand axes from about 1.4 million years ago. This specimen was found in southern England.**  Dover Museum, Dover, UK photo by Ross Dunn | **Hand Axe** |
| How did our hominin ancestors live? Like chimpanzees and gorillas, our closest relatives, they were highly social animals that lived in family groups probably ranging from five or six to thirty or forty individuals. We can be pretty sure that they were smart, because chimpanzees are smart. We know they could use and make stone tools because we have found remains of those tools dating from about 3 million years ago. Modern attempts to make stone tools show how hard the work is, but they also show that using them could make quite a difference to the diets of early hominins. With sharp stone flakes, you could butcher the remains of a large animal very efficiently—as long as the other scavengers, such as hyenas, left you in peace. Using sharpened sticks, maybe hardened in a fire, you could also get at roots of plants. Some early hominins may have used fire. We have strong evidence for the use of fire by hominins living in China 500,000 years ago. Some evidence from Africa suggests that hominins were using fire even earlier than that. | |

[*By this point in the article, the author describes living patterns, fashions, etc. or ancient “man like” ancestors. As usual no reference is offered to support any of his statements. He makes the comment, “We have strong evidence for the use of fire by hominins living in China 500,000 years ago.” No reference was provided and no bibliography was provided to support his statements*.]
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