*Evolution**

Genesis 1:26-27 (26) And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.
(27) So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.
Genesis 2:4-7 (4) These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens,
(5) And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was not a man to till the ground.
(6) But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.
(7) And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.
Genesis chapter 1 is chronological, revealing the sequential events of the creation week, whereas Genesis chapter 2 is about the generations of the same week, with special concern for man and his environment. Tho claimed in some social groups that Genesis chapters 1 and 2 contain two distinct creation-narratives, a point of fact, however, is the strictly complementary nature of the "two" accounts of the same creation week: Genesis chapter 1 mentions the creation of man as the last of a series, and without any details, whereas in Genesis chapter 2, man is the center of interest and more specific details are given about him and his setting. There are no incompatible duplication here at all and Jesus linked the two chapters as the same event in Matt 19:4 and 5. As far as evolution is concerned, there are no examples as a basis for

the theory of evolution in the Bible. It comes down to this, there are two ways to view man's beginning, God's way or Man's way. Both are faith based systems.

Creation--is the original bringing into existence of the universe by the true God.

Evolution--is a theory that every plant and animal has developed from an earlier form, every tree, grass and every creature on land and in the sea evolved out of one strand of molecular matter that evolved out of non-living matter.

In biology, one of the most widely used laws of science is the Law of Biogenesis and is composed of two words—"bio," which means life, and "genesis," which means beginning. This law deals with the beginning of life and it simply says that life comes only from previous life of its own kind. Over the years, the truthfulness of this law has been documented by many scientists, one of the most famous was Louis Pasteur. His work dealt a crushing blow to the notion of spontaneous generation, (the idea that life arises on its own from nonliving sources). Even the eminent evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson and his colleagues observed that "there is no serious doubt that biogenesis is the rule, that life comes only from other life." The fact is, evolution could not have occurred without some form of spontaneous generation. A concept proven false by science, but construed as true by science falsely so called, in other words by profane and vain babblings documented in;

1Timothy 6:20-21 (20) O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of **science falsely so called**:

(21) Which some professing have erred concerning the faith.

Evolution is "science falsely so called," because, it is lacking empirical scientific evidence. On the other hand, removing God from the creation scene is erring concerning the faith. If the foundation of faith is undermined, if there is doubt in the accuracy of Genesis, then doubt in the remaining word of God

will follow.
From; **{Rape and Evolution** by Kyle Butt, M.A.
On February 12, 1998, William Provine, a professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology at the distinguished Cornell University, took to the podium on the campus of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, Tennessee. He was invited there to deliver the keynote address at the second annual Darwin Day, a day dedicated to commemorating the life and teachings of Charles Darwin. In an abstract of that speech, on the Darwin Day Website, his introductory comments are recorded in the following words:

Naturalistic evolution has clear consequences that Charles Darwin understood perfectly. 1) No gods worth having exist;
2) no life after death exists;
3) no ultimate foundation for ethics exists;
4) no ultimate meaning in life exists; and
5) human free will is nonexistent (Provine, 1998).

Provine's ensuing message centered on his fifth statement regarding human free will. Prior to delving into the "meat" of his message, however, he noted: "The first 4 implications are so obvious to modern naturalistic evolutionists that I will spend little time defending them." *Apologetics Press***}**
Clearly, one can see cause for erring in these 5 clear consequences of naturalistic evolution. Would you be willing to risk salvation in defense of these 5 consequences of evolution? Let's briefly consider each.
(1) No gods worth having exist*; Compare this with evolutionist Huxley's categorical statement at the Chicago convocation:*
(quote) "In the evolutionary pattern of thought there is no longer need or room for the supernatural". *(unquote)*
God fearing Christians should understand what this statement means! Evolution is a complete world-view, an explanation of origins and meanings without the necessity of God who created and upholds all things. What is clearly seen is explained in;

Romans 1:19-20 (19) Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.
(20) For the invisible things of him from the **creation of the world** are **clearly seen**, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:
Hebrews 11:1-3 (1) Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.
(2) For by it the elders obtained a good report.
(3) **Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God**, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.
That my God exists is without excuse. The evolutionary god (spontaneous generation and missing links) is based on superstition and has been proven unattainable by empirical science. God can exist without you and me, but we cannot exist without him.
(2) no life after death exists; *At this point, human reason must defer completely to faith in an eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, God. God is an adequate, uncaused first Cause, to explain the existence of the universe, life and death, but nothing else is. We human beings find it very easy to live life as if we will be here forever. We occasionally come face to face with death when a friend or loved one passes away. But the essence of daily living is such that it is easy to ignore the reality of death and the certainty of existence beyond the grave. The Bible teaches that human beings are composite creatures. We possess a fleshly body that is composed of physical elements made from "the dust of the ground" (Genesis 2:7). Scriptures also teach that human beings are unlike the animals, in that humans also possess a spiritual dimension that transcends the body and physical life on Earth. Humans are designed to inherit everlasting life after death. The Bible, unlike evolution, has the answer, please turn to;*
1Corinthians 15:35 and 44 (35) But some man will say, How

are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? (44) It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.
The Bible defines "death" as "separation"—not "extinction." Jesus said concerning His Father; He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living: (Mark 12:27). *Physical death occurs when the spirit exits the body. James 2:26 notes:* "For as the body without the spirit is dead," *In other words, the separation of one's spirit from one's body results in physical death. Spiritual death, on the other hand, is separation from God due to sin. So "death" involves the idea of separation—not extinction or unconsciousness.*
(3) no ultimate foundation for ethics exists; *Evolution denighs any responsibility for an ultimate foundation of ethics. But why would anyone choose a system devoid of ethics? This is strange because ethics is a social, religious, or civil code of behavior considered correct and not harmful to others.*
If there are no ethics, what then?
{"So We Make Up Stories" About Human Evolution by Kyle Butt, Dr. Richard Lewontin is the Alexander Agassiz Research Professor at the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University. During the week of February 14-18, Dr. Richard Lewontin was invited to speak at the American Association for the Advancement of Science's annual meeting held in Boston, Massachusetts. Michale Balter, writing for Science magazine, reported briefly on Lewontin's comments that caused quite a stir in the evolutionary community. What did Lewontin say that was so noteworthy and attention-grabbing? Lewontin "led off a session titled 'The Mind of a Toolmaker' by announcing that scientists know next to nothing about how humans got so smart. 'We are missing the fossil record of human cognition,' Lewontin said at the meeting, **'So we make up stories".**}
Is this what evolution means by "no ultimate foundation for ethics exists?" In the absence of ethics, outright fraud exists. For example; In 1912, Charles Dawson uncovered some skull

fragments, a jaw, and other artifacts in a gravel pit at Piltdown, on the Sussex Weald of England. When the pieces were put together, an interesting mosaic emerged: the creature had the brain of a modern human and the jaw of an ape. But as the years went by, the Piltdown man looked less and less plausible. Finally, in the early 1950s, a battery of tests confirmed that the "discovery" had been a grand hoax. The cranium belonged to a human alright, but the jaw belonged to an equally modern orangutan. All the artifacts had been treated chemically to make them appear authentic. Why would anyone choose an evolutionary system devoid of ethics? The Bible is the only wise repository for ethics and righteous living; But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death (Rev 21:8). *This is the finality concerning; "no ultimate foundation for ethics exist!"*

(4) no ultimate meaning in life exists; *If there were no God, then there would be no ultimate meaning in life.*

Paul addresses this very thing in;

1Corinthians 15:17-19 (17) And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.

(18) Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.

(19) **If in this life only** we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.

Paul's extended meaning is, we believe that Christ is the living word of God and in Him ultimate meaning in life does exists. That faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, *as in the life of of a beggar and the regret of Mr. Rich that's recorded in;*

Luke 16:22-24 (22) And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried;

(23) And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.
(24) And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.
(5) human free will is nonexistent; *Living forever is not an option; it's an Eternal Decision! Human free will does exist! For evolutionist, human free will is nonexistent by their own free will. The excuse "human free will is nonexistent" will be a poor choice to escape judgment, turn to;*
Daniel 7:9-10 (9) I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.
(10) A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.
When an unforgiven sinner falls into the hands of the living God at judgment, then, "human free will is nonexistent."
*If one believes "**there is no God worth having**", then atheistic evolution has claimed another soul.*
*If one believes there is "**no life after death**", then atheistic evolution is robbing one of their inheritance.*
*If one believes there is "**no foundation for ethics**", then the works of atheistic evolution will follow one into judgment,*
*If one believes there is "**no meaning in life**", then the consequences of atheistic evolution is all that remain.*
*If one believes there is "**no human free will**", then atheistic evolution has interfered with your God given right of choice.*
These five consequences of evolution are a terrible foundation on which to build ones life, it is evilution; or made up stories.
Here are a few examples of 'made up stories' to consider;
Nebraska Man
The June 24, 1922 Illustrated London News presented on its

front cover a man and a woman that had been fabricated from a single tooth. The artist even incorporated into the drawings of this alleged “missing link” imaginary surroundings and clothing. Henry Fairfield Osborn, head of the department of paleontology at New York’s famed American Museum of Natural History, received the tooth and was prepared to enter it as evidence at the 1925 Scopes “Monkey” trial. However, by 1927, scientists had concluded (somewhat begrudgingly) that the tooth was that of a species an extinct genus related to the modern peccary (a wild pig). No missing link here.

Orce Man

In 1982, a team of three Catalan archaeologists, headed by professor José Gibert, were digging near the village of Orce in Spain. During their dig, they uncovered an unusual bone fragment. A year later, they announced that the fragment belonged to a human child—causing an uproar in the evolutionary community. This discovery placed humans in Europe much earlier than evolutionists had ever predicted. Based on this find, some over-eager scientists reconstructed an entire human. Orce Man, as the find came to be known, was said to represent the oldest human fossil ever discovered in Europe. Later, to the embarrassment of many, the bone was identified as the skull cap of a 6-month-old donkey! No missing link here.

Rhodesian Man

This famous skeleton was found in 1921 in a zinc mine in what was then British Rhodesia in southern Africa. The find consisted of the bones of three or four individuals: a man, a woman, and one or two children. Unfortunately, the bones were extracted from their surroundings by the mining company, not experienced scientists. After the bones reached the British Museum of Natural History, they were reconstructed and displayed prominently for many years. Unfortunately, museum employees who were unfamiliar with human anatomy reconstructed this “ape- man.” Since the hipbones were

smashed, the designers fashioned this fossil as being stooped over. It wasn't until many years later, when anatomists examined the skeleton, that it was determined to be nothing more than a modern man. No missing link here.

Java Man

This "missing link" was classified as a member of Homo erectus, the group of creatures that was supposed to have given rise to Homo sapiens (humans). Eugene Dubois had gone to the former Dutch Indies as a health officer in 1887 to search for fossils. Later, in 1890, the Dutch anatomist focused his attention on the banks of the Solo River near the village of Trinil. Excavators discovered a human-like fossilized tooth in September 1891. One month later, they uncovered the upper part of a skull. A year later, the team discovered a thigh bone in the same sandstone layers, about fifteen meters upstream. Despite additional excavations, the team did not discover anything else except one tooth. As it turns out, the leg bone and teeth were, in fact, human. However, the skullcap eventually was shown to be from a giant gibbon (a monkey). No missing link here. (Apologetics Press 2002).

Missing link, missing ethics, missing facts. "So, made up stories," should at least cause one to question the ethics of naturalistic evolution. ***Oh!*** *Evolution does not have ethics.*

{Mark Twain was a rather irreverent old gentleman, certainly no friend of the Bible. Yet he had enough insight into some of the scientific non-sense of his day to poke fun at the evolutionary speculations with which he was contemporary. In his *'Life on the Mississippi*' he wrote: 'In the space of one hundred and seventy six years the Lower Mississippi has shortened itself two hundred and forty two miles. That is an average of a trifle over one mile and a third per year. Therefore, any calm person, who is not blind or idiotic and can see that in the Old Oolitic Silurain Period, just a million years ago next november, the Lower Mississippi River was upward of one million three hundred thousand miles long and stuck out

over the Gulf of Mexico like a fishing-rod. And by the same token any person can see that seven hundred and forty two years form now the Lower Mississippi will be only a mile and three-quarters long, and Cairo and New Orleans will have joined their streets together, and be plodding comfortably along under a single mayor and a mutual board of aldermen. There is something fascinating about science. One get such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such trifling investment of fact.' Evolution verses Creation-Wayne Jackson}
So why does mankind fall for these nonsensical, made up stories at the expense of the greatest story ever known? The conclusion is; everyone will select by their own free will, the Lord's way or man's way. We implore you to choose the faith established by the Son of God while He was on earth. But what faith? How is it acquired? Faith in Christ is the effect of belief in God's word, and submission to baptism is the effect of faith. God's word is this; He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; (Mark 16:16). *The conclusion is this; only those who first believe the testimony of God, by faith repent of their sins, confess I believe Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and are baptized into His death for remission of sins, have the full and explicit testimony of pardon. This is the gospel. It's invitation is always open and you do have free will of choice. If you are not yet a Christian but believe; by faith repent, by faith confess, and by faith be baptized into Christ for remission of sin. Also if there are prayer requests for other reasons, in either case come while we persuade with song.*

This message approved by
Jack Warford
a minister for Christ

Frauds in Science by Wayne Jackson, M.A.

With a cultic-like aura surrounding them, these men and women are seen as the paragons of virtue in the intellectual community. They are a priesthood, arrayed in white apparel, tinkering with test tubes and peering through microscopes in a sophisticated "holy of holies." I am speaking, of course, of the twentieth century scientist. He is not to be questioned as he pontificates upon matters that have baffled the intellects of the ages. His dogmatic theories are sacrosanct, and never are his motives suspect. Though this is quite a common notion in today's world, it is woefully inaccurate. While it is true that there are many honest people working in the various fields of science, it also is only fair to point out that there have been, and likely will continue to be, some real charlatans in the scientific community. Consider, for example the following.

Exalted views of the objectivity of science and scientists were shattered recently when the New Scientist reported in its November, 1976 issue on the results of a survey it conducted on the subject of "Cheating in Science." Out of 204 scientists replying to the journal's questionnaire, 197 reported they were aware of cheating by their colleagues. They judged that 58% of the cheating was intentional, and they reported that only 10% of these intentional cheaters were dismissed; most of them, in fact, were promoted (Koshy, 1977, p. 86).

Two of the more notorious instances of scientific fraud provide an interesting and valuable case study in this regard.

THE EMBRYONIC RECAPITULATION HOAX

Ernst Heinrich Haeckel (1834-1919) was a German biologist and philosopher who asserted that the entire Universe (including the human mind) was the result of solely material processes—a mere machine in motion. He was a devoted follower of Charles Darwin—so much so, in fact, that he was dubbed "the apostle of Darwinism in Germany."

Haeckel received most of his fame as a consequence of his popularization of the so-called "theory of embryonic recapitulation." This is the now-defunct notion that successive stages of individual embryonic development repeat the evolutionary stages of one's animal ancestry. The argument is entirely specious, as even evolutionists have admitted. Famed Harvard evolutionist George Gaylord Simpson wrote, for example: "It is now firmly established that ontogeny [development of the individual—WJ] does not repeat phylogeny [development of the race—WJ]" (1957, p. 352).

In any case, Haeckel had a passion for promoting the recapitulation theory, which he termed "the fundamental biogenetic law." And, as one writer has noted:

To support his theory, however, Haeckel, whose knowledge of embryology was self-taught, faked some of his evidence. He not only altered his illustrations of embryos but also printed the same plate of an embryo three times, and labeled one a human, the second a dog and the third a rabbit "to show their similarity" (Bowden, 1977, p. 128).

Haeckel was exposed by professor L. Rutimeyer of Basle University. He was charged with fraud by five professors, and ultimately convicted in a university court. During the trial, Haeckel admitted that he had altered his drawings, but sought to defend himself by saying:

I should feel utterly condemned and annihilated by the admission, were it not that hundreds of the best observers and biologists lie under the same charge. The great majority of all morphological, anatomical, histological, and embryological diagrams are not true to nature, but are more or less doctored, schematized and reconstructed (as quoted in Bowden, 1977, p. 128).

Not only did Haeckel misrepresent evidence in his own drawings, but even "went so far as to alter pictures of embryos drawn by others. A professor Arnold Bass charged that Haeckel had made changes in pictures of embryos that he (Bass) had drawn. Haeckel's reply to these charges was that if he is to be accused of falsifying drawings, many other prominent scientists should be accused of the same thing..." (Davidheiser, 1969, p. 76).

Evolutionist H.H. Newman of the University of Chicago said that Haeckel's works "did more harm than good to Darwinism" (1932, p. 30). Yet in spite of the fact that Haeckel's drawings proved to be an embarrassment to the evolutionary establishment, they still are employed in

some modern writings as a “proof” of the accuracy of the theory of evolution (e.g., see Asimov, 1981, p. 83).

THE PILTDOWN HOAX

In December of 1912, Charles Dawson, an amateur archaeologist, and Sir Arthur Smith-Woodward of the British Museum of Natural History, announced that they had discovered a man-like skull in a pit near Piltdown, England. Along with the skull was a jawbone that appeared to be very ape-like except for the teeth—which were more flattened, as would be expected in humans. Working with Dawson and Smith-Woodward was Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, a Jesuit priest in his late 20s who labored incessantly to harmonize evolution and the biblical record of creation.

Although a few scientists questioned the association of the skull with the jaw, most evolutionists were convinced that Eanthropus dawsoni (or, as he was more commonly known, “Piltdown Man”) was an authentic link in human evolution. It has been estimated that some 500 publications appeared on this subject. It is a curious thing, however, that the bones were kept under tight security—even from evolutionists. Sir Arthur Keith, an eminent British authority in this field, was allowed to view the fossils for only twenty minutes, and was forced henceforth to work with plaster casts of the originals (see Weiner, 1955, p. 121). The famous anthropologist, L.S.B. Leakey also complained that he was denied access to the fossils (Leakey, 1960, p. vi.).

By 1950, a dating method [that employed fluorine] had become available for assigning a relative age to fossil bones. In 1953, after a series of tests, it was determined that the Piltdown skull and jaw were of completely different ages. The skull was a few thousand years old (not one million as formerly alleged), and the jaw bone was that of a modern ape! As a consequence of this startling revelation, a careful study of the bones was begun. Eventually, it was discovered that the teeth had been ground down artificially to appear human—and that it had been a sloppy job at that. Abrasion marks were still evident, the surfaces were flattened at different angles, etc. Moreover, as a result of chemical tests, it was determined that the jaw bone had been stained chemically with potassium bichromate and iron salts for the purpose of making it appear ancient. Actually the “fossil” turned out to be nothing more than a human skull with an ape’s jaw attached. Someone had really been “monkeying” (forgive the pun) with the evidence.

But who was the perpetrator of this elaborate fraud? S.J. Weiner of Oxford University, who was instrumental in the exposure of the hoax, suggested (without making any formal accusation) that the weight of the evidence pointed in the direction of Dawson—although he did allow that perhaps Dawson himself was a victim of this devious scheme. The renowned United Nations scientist, A.E. Wilder-Smith, though again making no formal charge, commented:

It does strike one as remarkable that Professor Smith-Woodward allowed very few other scientists to study the original skull or even to handle it. Plaster casts were always made and the studies carried out with their aid. Plaster casts, however, do not give the very fine details needed for study, nor can one determine with their help whether a find is a fossil or not. Even more important, no one can analyze a skull chemically with only a plaster cast to work with! (1968, p. 133).

More recently, in a scholarly investigation of the available data, Malcolm Bowden concluded that Teilhard de Chardin was likely the culprit (1977). Teilhard certainly had the motive because, as far as he was concerned, all views should bow to evolution which he viewed as “the light illuminating all facts” (1963, p. 44). Moreover, he had the the opportunity, since several of the fake finds were “discovered” by him. Also, he had the technical expertise to pull off such an elaborate ruse. He had taught chemistry (a knowledge of which would be essential in staining the fossils) at Cairo University.

Perhaps as embarrassing as the fraudulent nature of the Piltdown affair, however, was the fact that a number of the world’s leading evolutionary experts were fooled by the hoax for over 40 years. Dogmatic, sweeping statements that had been made with an air of absolute confidence ultimately required public retraction. Such was the concern in England that a motion was made

(and tabled) in the House of Commons “that the House has no confidence in the Trustees of the British Museum...because of the tardiness of their discovery that the skull of the Piltdown man is a partial fake” (see Bowden, 1977, p. 8). Duane T. Gish no doubt expressed the sentiments of many when he wrote: “The success of this monumental hoax served to demonstrate that scientists, just like everyone else, are very prone to find what they are looking for whether it is there or not” (1973, p. 92).

There is an important lesson that many Christians need to learn from situations such as these. There is no need to be intimidated by the so-called “discoveries” of an unbelieving world. Not all these discoveries are fraudulent, of course, but they nevertheless are subject to the interpretation placed on them by the discoverer. This, at the very least, should suggest caution in accepting the claims that evolutionists make from time to time.

REFERENCES

Asimov, Isaac (1981), “The Genesis War,” Science Digest, 89[9]:82-87, October. [NOTE: This is a written debate with creationist Duane T. Gish.]

Bowden, Malcolm (1977), Ape-Men: Fact or Fallacy? (Bromley, England: Sovereign Publications).

Davidheiser, Bolton (1969), Evolution And Christian Faith (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed).

de Chardin, Teilhard (1963), Saturday Evening Post, October 12.

Gish, Duane T. (1973), Evolution: The Fossils Say No! (San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers).

Kosh, George (1977), A Challenge to Biology (Minneapolis, MN: Bible-Science Association).

Leakey, L.S.B. (1960), Adam’s Ancestors (New York: Harper & Brothers).

Simpson, George Gaylord (1957), Life: An Introduction to Biology (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.).

Weiner, S.J. (1955), The Piltdown Forgery (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press).

Wilder-Smith, A.E. (1968), Man’s Origin: Man’s Destiny (Wheaton, IL: Harold Shaw).

The Creation Worldview and the Scopes Trial by John D. Morris, Ph.D. *

Evidence for Creation

In these pages we often identify evolution as the scientific justification for an anti-Christian mentality. This long war against God was on full display at the famous Scopes Monkey Trail in 1925, where humanistic forces gathered to strike a blow against God and the necessity of submitting to Him in life's choices.

The whole affair was the inaugural case of the newly founded American Civil Liberties Union, which decided to use this opportunity to begin its long campaign against Christianity's influence in America. It openly advertised for any teacher who would be willing to be arrested for violating the Tennessee injunction against teaching human evolution. John Scopes was not a science teacher, but agreed to discuss evolution with one student in a staged meeting. The case brought national attention. Famous lawyers lined up on both sides. The verdict actually came down in favor of the creationists, but was later overturned on a technicality.

Well-known scientists prepared to bring evidence for evolution, but the law had obviously been broken and the judge refused to turn the case into a scientific debate. In a bizarre and unprecedented turn of events, the lawyer defending the creation law agreed to be a witness. He was tricked by the ACLU lawyer into defending creation and the entire Bible on the witness stand. Unfortunately, he himself had already compromised with long ages and local flood concepts, and couldn't give a consistent defense of either creation or biblical inerrancy. Through it all, biblical doctrine and Bible believers were mercilessly ridiculed in the press, an assault which continues today.

The end result? Christianity largely retreated underground and withdrew from the public arena. Interestingly, all the scientific evidences supposedly supporting evolution that were slated for use in the trial, and which were picked up in the surrounding media blitz, have been thoroughly discredited today. Even evolutionists no longer use them. Consider, among others:

Neanderthal Man—a fully human people group, with art, music, agriculture, weapons, etc.

Piltdown Man—an embarrassing scientific forgery; an ape's jaw coupled with a human skull-cap

Nebraska Man—touted as an ape-man, but represented by nothing more than a fossilized pig's tooth

Embryonic recapitulation—forged drawings of embryos that supposedly show humans related to the animals

Peppered moth—mere color shifts in a population that have now shifted back

Vestigial organs—thought to be evolutionary leftovers, but now known to be functional1

These discredited evidences are still repeated in school textbooks today. When confronted, evolutionists admit the faulty claims, but insist they still be used since there are no better claims that are so effective in teaching evolution. And so millions of American schoolchildren each year are indoctrinated in a false worldview.

Nevertheless, truth will win out. Christians are attempting to regain lost ground in the political, educational, and religious arenas. Interest in creation still flourishes today, spawning thousands of creation scientists, hundreds of creationist organizations, and millions of creation believers. Polls taken in America consistently show a majority of people hold to some form of creation, especially young-earth creation.

Things are not what they should be, but neither are they as bad as before. What a wonderful time to be a Bible-believing Christian/creationist recruit in the Lord's army.

The message 'Evolution' Revised; 052016
This message presented to; BaronOk-Aug2011/