

The Dark Ages of Evolution:

A Modern Inquisition

Vincent Pace

March 9, 2005

### The Dark Ages of Evolution: A Modern Inquisition

Is it heresy or is it scientific truth? Not all scientists agree concerning the origin of life on the Earth and the scientific facts upon which they base their opinions. However, one opinion concerning man's origin and life on Earth tends to dominate in the educational arena. That is the theory of Evolution. Yet many parents and scientists work to get alternate theories, the science they see as opposing the theory of Evolution, included in the classrooms. These attempts are often met with much opposition from those who want Evolution to be the exclusive theory and belief system concerning man's origin taught to everyone's children. In his recent *Detroit News* article, "Evolution Proves it's Place in Schools," Dr. Rich Adler provides a good example of this bias. He claims there is no scientific basis for other beliefs about origins. He argues that competing ideas are not provable and completely dismisses any idea of scientific evidence opposing the theory of Evolution (Adler, 2005). In fact, there is an enormous amount of evidence that disproves the theory of Evolution and this evidence has been the target of much discrimination in the scientific and academic communities.

*The Oxford Dictionary* defines evolution as, "1. gradual development. 2. development of species from earlier forms, as an explanation of origins" (Oxford, 2001, p. 273). Biologically there are two types of evolution, microevolution and macroevolution. Microevolution is simply genetic changes that occur within a species or population. The major factors that affect microevolution are "natural selection, genetic drift, gene flow, nonrandom mating, and mutation." The first four of these factors are related to heredity and mating (Pellmyr, 2002). While the number of chromosomes remains the same the information on the chromosomes, allele, can vary from one generation to the next. Mendel showed in his research that this genetic information produces dominant and recessive traits. Further genetic research also found that

some traits could have incomplete dominance or may be codominant in an organism. Some genes can influence more than one trait and some traits may be influenced by more than one gene (Barnes & Curtis, 1989). Through careful experimentation Mendel also showed that "individual characteristics remain constant" (Lester, 1998). Mutations do not contribute much to microevolution. "Mutations are a critical source of novelty, but observed rates of mutation are much too low to account in themselves for observed rates of microevolution in organisms" (Pellmyr, 2002, p. 732). Examples of microevolution include different types of dogs, variation in skin or eye color, and variation in the characteristics of finches.

Microevolution has limits to which genetic variation will occur. In the many years of experimentation with fruit fly genes it has been discovered that the DNA has built in safeguards. These experiments were conducted to determine the limits of variation that could be achieved. No truly different organs, traits or abilities could be produced from these experiments. In fact, it was discovered that the DNA has a repair mechanism that corrects mutations in the chromosomes (Jeffrey, 2003). Concerning these experiments, Francis Hitching (1982) wrote,

In a remarkable series of experiments, mutant genes were paired to create an eyeless fly. When these flies in turn were interbred, the predictable result was offspring that were also eyeless. And so it continued for a few generations. But then, contrary to all expectations, a few flies began to hatch out with eyes.

Somehow, the genetic code had a built-in repair mechanism that re-established the missing genes. The natural order reasserted itself. There are also built in constraints. [...] Fruit flies refuse to become anything but fruit flies under any circumstances yet devised. The genetic system, as its first priority, conserves, blocks, and stabilizes (as cited in Jeffrey, 2003, p. 187).

In contrast, macroevolution is the idea that one kind of organism can transform into another kind of organism by the addition of genetic material (Martin, 2004). This is the Evolution with a capital "E" and is often referred to as the theory of Evolution. Unlike microevolution, macroevolution would require a change in the DNA structure. This would be an alteration in the number of chromosomes along with changes in the types of traits found on the chromosomes, and changes in the placement of the traits. For example, humans have forty-six chromosomes combined to make twenty-three pair of chromosomes. Chimpanzees have forty-eight chromosomes, amoebae have fifty chromosomes, and a goldfish has ninety-four chromosomes. In order for a chimpanzee to turn into a human the number of chimpanzee chromosomes would have to be changed from forty-eight to forty-six. This would also require some changes in the type and position of many of the traits.

Evolutionists believe that microevolution variation within a species is proof of macroevolution changes across species (Ferrell, 2001). There is, however, no evidence to support this idea. "Macro-evolution has never been observed in nature, the laboratory, or the fossil record. Micro-evolutionary changes do not add up to macro-evolutionary results (Hovind, N.D., pg. 7)." In addition, "only microevolutionary change can be observed directly by evolutionary biologists, [...] (Pellmyer, 2002, p. 732)." If macroevolution were true, then it stands to reason that it should be somewhere observable.

Evolutionists believe that the fossil record contains this evidence for Evolution. According to Evolutionary geologists rock formations in the Earth's crust are stacked up in a geologic column representing different eras of Earth's history. These eras are then subdivided into periods, sub-periods, epochs and ages (Poling, 1997). The oldest period in which fossils of complex organisms, such as trilobites, are found is the Cambrian period. Some scientists believe

this period started as long as 590 million years ago and ended about 505 million years ago.

Dinosaurs are believed to have first appeared in the Triassic period, which is believed to have begun about 248 million years ago. The dinosaurs then died out at the end of the Cretaceous period about sixty-five million years ago. Evolutionists believe man did not appear until more recently during the Quaternary period, which they believe began about two million years ago (Facts on File, 2000).

While evolutionists claim that dinosaurs became extinct sixty-five million years ago, the real archeological record tells a different story. The first problem that exists in archeology is the fact that the geologic column itself does not really exist. Often geologic layers of this column are found out of order from one another. Many times there are also missing layers of strata. This is quite different from the nicely stacked up columns of the geologic timeline found in textbooks.

Another problem is the fact that there is evidence of man all throughout the geologic timeline. In Utah, an excavation in Cambrian strata unearthed footprints from human footwear. In one of the fossil footprints are found two fossil trilobites, one in the toe and the other in the heel. Evolutionists believe that trilobites lived from 544 to 245 million years ago (Omniology, N.D.). Prints of sandals or shoes have also been found in rocks from the Silurian to Ordovician periods, in the Miocene to Oligocene epochs, and in the Pliocene epoch. In addition, human footprints have been found throughout the timeline as far back as the Devonian period. Human handprints have also been found in Permian rock in New Mexico. Human bones, skulls, and skeletons have been found throughout the timeline as far back as the Silurian or Ordovician periods. Human tools have also been found as far back as the Pennsylvanian sub-period (Omniology, N.D.).

There is also clear evidence of human and dinosaur coexistence. In Glen Rose, Texas,

there have been found almost one hundred female human footprints interlaced with dinosaur footprints. In some instances the human print is in the dinosaur print. In other places the fossil prints indicate that the dinosaur stepped on the human footprint or the prints cross over one-another (omniology, N.D.). The Ica burial stones also show evidence that dinosaurs lived at the same time as humans. These stones were found in Ica, Peru, and are believed to be linked to the Inca culture. This is due to the location of their discovery and the type of artwork found on them. It is believed by some that these stones are from a period between 500 AD and 1500 AD. A Spanish priest inquired about these stones in the year 1525, and an Indian chronicler wrote about them in the 1570's. From a collection of eleven hundred of these stones, over three hundred have different specific kinds of dinosaurs carved in them. Some of the stones depict humans riding on dinosaurs, hunting dinosaurs, or being attacked by dinosaurs (Omniology, N.D.). Ceramic figurines of dinosaurs have also been found in this region. Among the hundreds of these figurines there are depicted dimetrodons, sauropods, and triceratops. In many of them humans are shown interacting in some manner with the dinosaurs (Omniology, N.D.).

There are other places where such evidence is found. In Acambaro, Mexico, dinosaur figurines similar to those found in Ica, Peru have also been unearthed. There are twenty thousand clay figurines in the Julsrud Museum in Acambaro. Over one thousand of these are of dinosaurs. These figurines are believed to have been made between 700 BC and 200 AD (Omniology, N.D.). In the Carlisle Cathedral in England is a fifteenth century tomb that has brass engravings depicting dinosaurs. Among the engravings are different animals such as a bird, a dog, and various fish. One of the dinosaur engravings, though worn from age, appears to be a stegosaurus or an ankylosaurid. Another engraving shows long necked sauropod dinosaurs with their necks out horizontally and their tails lifted from the ground. Only recently have scientist begun to

believe that this is how sauropods should be reconstructed (Bell, 2003). There are also ancient dragon legends that fit the description of dinosaurs. An ancient Sumerian story from 2000 BC tells about the hero Gilgamesh who killed a vicious dragon in the forest. In the tenth century an Irishman reported an encounter with an animal described like a stegosaurus (Ham, 2001).

In the 1500s, a European scientific book, *Historia Animalium*, listed several animals that we would call dinosaurs as still alive. A well-known naturalist of the time, Ulysses Aldrovandus, recorded an encounter between a peasant named Baptista and a dragon whose description fits that of the small dinosaur *Tanystropheus*. The encounter was on 13 May 1572, near Bologna in Italy, and the peasant killed the dragon (Ham, 2001, p. 15).

This evidence presents two problems for the Evolution timeline. The first problem is that humans must have evolved long before evolutionists believe their "ancestors" evolved, perhaps even as long as five hundred million years ago when trilobites are said to have existed. The other problem is the possibility that dinosaurs did not become extinct sixty-five million years ago. This would invalidate the geological timeline. Either way, the theory of Evolution collapses under the pressure of geology, archeology, and history.

Evolutionary archeologists, however, believe that different stratum of rocks and different fossils show evidence of great age that would prove their theory. There are several different techniques used to date rocks and minerals. These include luminescent and radioisotope forms of dating. Luminescent dating techniques use grains of minerals. The minerals are heated, exposed to light, or exposed to gamma radiation. In response, the minerals give off light or radiation that can be measured. It is assumed by evolutionists that this radiation was gradually stored in the minerals after they were buried (Walker, 2003).

Unfortunately, there are many unknowns and many assumptions need to be made, including the amount of radiation 'stored' in the mineral at a certain time in the past, that the change in radiation has only been affected by radiation in the environment, that the radiation in the environment has remained constant, and that the sensitivity of the crystal to radiation has not changed. All these factors can be affected by water, heat, sunlight, the accumulation or leaching of minerals in the environment, and many other causes (Walker, 2003).

The method of dating rocks through radioactive isotopes is done by measuring the amount of a parent element to that of its daughter element. These measurements are then compared to the rate of decay of the parent element into the daughter element. From this data an age for the rocks are then deduced. These methods of dating rocks include Carbon 14, Thorium-uranium, Potassium-argon, and Protactinium-uranium (Walker,2003). However, when a lab tests a rock for its age, it is not the age of the rock that is measured; it is the amount of chemicals found in the rock that are measured. These dating techniques are all based on assumptions that are not provable (Wieland, 2000). These assumptions include,

- Assuming how much of a particular chemical was originally present;
- Assuming that there has been no leaching by water of the chemicals in or out of the rock;
- Assuming that radioactive decay rates have stayed the same for billions of years, and more (Wieland, 2000).

The Mount St. Helens volcano provides a good example of the problems that result from using these techniques. In October, 1980, an explosive eruption occurred at Mount St. Helens. Between then and 1986, several other eruptions occurred building a lava dome in the volcano. In



1993, with this dome only about ten years old, rock samples were removed from the lava dome. The samples were sent to Geochron Laboratories in Massachusetts to be radioisotope dated using the potassium-argon method. When the results were returned, it was discovered that these ten year old rock samples dated to be between 340,000 and 2.8 million years (Swenson, 2001).

Another example involves the volcano at Mount Ngauruhoe in New Zealand. Eleven separate rock samples were taken from lava flows that occurred between 1949 and 1975. These samples were tested using potassium-argon dating. The results of the tests varied widely. There were thirteen separate tests done. Five of the tests returned results indicating that the five samples tested are less than 290,000 years old. One sample tested at about 800,000 years old. The remaining seven tests that were conducted yielded results of at least one million years old. One of these tests indicated an age of 3.5 million years. All of the samples were less than fifty years old when the tests were run (Snelling, 1999).

While it is clear that luminescent and radioisotope-dating methods are unreliable, there is another means of dating geologic strata. This is simply done by using the fossils in the strata. In fact, *The World Book Encyclopedia* reads, "The age of rocks may be determined by the fossils in them" (Kertzer, 2004, p. 103). This now means that the age of the fossils must be determined. Again, *The World Book Encyclopedia* provides the answer: "Paleontologists determine how old a fossil is by measuring the *radioactive isotopes* in the rocks that contain the fossil (Stanley, 2004, p. 427)." There are two problems with this. The first is the circular logic of using the fossils to date the rocks and using the rocks to date the fossils. The second problem is in using the unreliable radioisotope-dating methods to test the sedimentary rocks that fossils are found. Radioisotope-dating is not used on sedimentary rock; it is used on igneous rocks from molten sources. "Fossil-bearing sedimentary rock cannot be directly dated radioisotopically" (Swenson,

2001). This means that dating rocks and fossils boils down to nothing more than guessing based on preconceived suppositions.

While all of this scientific evidence opposing the theory of Evolution exists, there is also an obvious bias in many areas of academia to censor out this type of information. While a sophomore at Emmaus High School in Pennsylvania, Samuel Chen got to experience this first hand. As the co-chair of a campus student organization, Chen made arrangements for a professor of biology from Lehigh University, Dr. Michael Behe, to give a lecture at his school. The event, scheduled for after school, was sponsored by the student organization. The title of the lecture was, "Evolution: Truth or Myth?" The presentation was to show some of the many evidences opposing the theory of Evolution (Vitagliano, 2004).

As Chen went forward with the meeting arrangements, the persecution against him mounted. Many faculty members in the science department actively opposed the lecture:

Chen said various tactics were apparently used to undercut the event, including an attempt to cancel the lecture and fold the student organization without the knowledge of Chen and other members; requiring that the necessary funds for the lecture be raised much faster than for other student events; and moving the lecture from the auditorium to the school cafeteria. [...]

'I feel that there's a dictatorship on academic freedom in our public schools now,' [Chen] said adding, 'I refer to evolution education as a tyranny. ... You can't challenge it in our schools. Kids have been thrown out of class for challenging it.'

That tyranny can be intimidating to students (Vitagliano, 2004).

Another case of such discriminatory action occurred in Washington, DC, at the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History. Dr. Richard Sternberg was the managing

editor of the journal *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington*. His trouble began when he allowed a peer-reviewed essay by Dr. Stephen Meyer to be published in the journal. The essay entitled, "The Origin of Biological Information and the Higher Taxonomic Categories," included information against the theory of Evolution and supporting one of the opposing views, Intelligent Design. As a result of this decision, Dr. Sternberg has been harshly treated and his scientific career has been placed in the racks. He has lost his office, lost access to specimens he needs for his research, has been shunned by his colleagues, and has been placed under the oversight of a curator. Questions were even raised about his religious and political affiliations (Klinghoffer, 2005). All of this, not because he wrote the article, but because he allowed it to be published when it contained contraband thought.

Concerning the incident that occurred with Dr. Sternberg, David Klinghoffer (2005) wrote in *The Wall Street Journal*, "They banish certain ideas from certain venues as if by holy writ, and brand heretics too." He latter added, "The Sternberg case seems, in many ways, an instance of one religion persecuting a rival, [...]" (Klinghoffer, 2005). This is both persecution and discrimination.

There is remarkable and clear evidence that opposes the theory of Evolution. This evidence is scientific and it is true. Many who support the beliefs of the theory of Evolution will call this evidence against Evolution nothing more than religion. They will even brand those who oppose the theory of Evolution as religious "heretics." They will claim that the scientific evidence against Evolution should be kept from public school classrooms on the grounds that it is religion. Yet, with all of the evidence that has come to light over the years that disproves Evolution, it is clear that Evolution must be believed on faith. It is for that reason that either Evolution should not be taught, or the evidence against Evolution must also be presented in the

classroom.

## References

- Adler, R., (2005, January 6). Evolution proves its place in schools. [Electronic version]. *The Detroit News*. Retrieved February 22, 2005, from NewsBank Info Web database.
- Barnes, N., & Curtis, H., (1989). *Biology* (5th. ed.). New York: Worth Publishers.
- Bell, P., (2003, September). Bishop Bell's brass behemoths! [Electronic version]. *Creation Magazine*, 25(4), 40-44.
- The facts on file Earth science handbook*. (2000). New York: Diagram Visual Information, LTD.
- Ferrell, V., (2001). *The evolution cruncher*. Altamont, TN: Evolution Facts, Inc.
- Ham, K., (2001). *What really happened to the dinosaurs?* Florence, KY: Answers in Genesis.
- Hovind, K., (N.D.). *Are you being brainwashed?: Propaganda in science textbooks*. Pensacola, FL: Creation Science Evangelism.
- Jeffrey, G., (2003). *Creation: Remarkable evidence of God's design*. Toronto, ON: Frontier Research Publications.
- Klinghoffer, D., (2005, January 28). The branding of a heretic. *The Wall Street Journal* [eastern edition], p. W11.
- Lester, L., (1998, March). Genetics: no friend of evolution. [Electronic version]. *Creation Magazine*, 20(2), 20-22.
- Martin, J., (2004). *The evolution of a creationist*. Rockwall, TX: Biblical Discipleship Publishers.
- Omniological Society's California Institute of Omniology. (N.D.). Retrieved February 25, 2005, from <http://www.omniology.com/>
- The Oxford: American desk dictionary and thesaurus* (2nd. ed.). (2001). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Poling, J., (1997). Geologic ages of Earth history. *Michigan eLibrary*. Retrieved February 25, 2005, from <http://www.dinosauria.com/dml/history.htm>
- Pellmyr, O., (2002). Microevolution. In Pagel, M., (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Evolution*, (Vol. 2). (pp. 731-732). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Snelling, A., (1999, December). Radioactive 'dating' failure. [Electronic version]. *Creation Magazine*, 22(1), 18-21.
- Stanley, S., (2004). Fossil. *The World Book Encyclopedia*, 7(F), 427.
- Swenson, K., (2001, June). Radio-dating in rubble. *Creation Magazine*, 23(3), 23-25.
- Vitagliano, E., (2004, August). Evolution's 'dictatorship' *American Family Association Journal*. Retrieved February 16, 2005, from <http://www.afajournal.org/2004/august/804chen.asp>
- Voorhies, M., (2004). Paleontology. *The World Book Encyclopedia*, 15, 103.
- Walker, T., (2003, December). The dating game. [Electronic version]. *Creation Magazine*, 26(1), 36-39.
- Wieland, C., (2000, December). The earth: How old does it look? [Electronic version]. *Creation Magazine*, 23(1), 8-13.