Was Darwin Wrong?
I would like to personally thank you for watching the Origins program. Origins was a special program, near to the heart of my late husband, Russell Bixler.

I trust that the information in this presentation will be helpful in your study of creation science. Thank you for your prayerful and financial support of Origins... you’re making the television production of this program possible.

Norma Bixler
Was Darwin Wrong?

The evidence for evolution is overwhelming.

By DAVID QUAMMEN

Photographs by ROBERT CLARK
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volution by natural selection, the central concept of the life's work of Charles Darwin, is a theory, not a hypothesis about the origin of adaptations, complexity and diversity among Earth's living creatures. If you are skeptical of nature, unfamiliar with the terminology of science, and unaware of the overwhelming evidence, you might even be tempted to say that it's just a theory. In the same vein, relatively described by Albert Einstein as 'just a theory.' The notion that Earth evolved around the sun rather than vice versa offered by Copernicus in 1543, is a theory.
Evolution is both a beautiful concept and an important one, more crucial nowadays to human welfare, to medical science, and to our understanding of the world than ever before. It’s also deeply persuasive—a theory you can take to the bank. The essential points are slightly more complicated than most people assume, but not so complicated that they can’t be comprehended by any attentive person. Furthermore, the supporting evidence is abundant, various, ever increasing, solidly interconnected, and easily available in museums, popular books, textbooks, and a mountainous accumulation of peer-reviewed scientific studies. No one needs to, and no one should, accept evolution merely as a matter of faith.
Who is the writer of this 33 page documentary on evolution?

The article was written by David Quammen. Quammen, strangely enough, is not a biologist (or a scientist of any sort). His specialty is—literature. In an interview with him that was published in the October 27, 2003 issue of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer Reporter, he admitted to the interviewer, John Marshall: “I did my graduate work on William Faulkner. My training was all in literature, not biology. But when I couldn’t make it as a fiction writer, I turned to this. And I liked it more—I get to talk to biologists, walk through rain forests and see the world” (Marshall, 2003).
The autonomous vehicles … had trouble figuring out fast enough the significance of obstacles that a two-year-old human recognizes immediately. Sure, that toddler may not think to wipe spaghetti sauce off her face, but she already knows that when there’s a cookie in the kitchen she has to climb up to the cabinet, and that when she gets to the cookie it will taste good. She is more advanced, even in diapers, than any machine humans have devised.
Evidence #1—Horse Evolution

Darwin himself observed species of horses in successive strata. One species endures for millions of years and then makes its last appearance in, say, the middle Eocene epoch; just above, a similar but not identical species replaces it. In North America, for example, a vaguely horselike creature known as *Hyracotherium* was succeeded by *Orohippus*, then *Epihippus*, then *Mesohippus*, which in turn were succeeded by a variety of horsey American critters. Some of them even galloped across the Bering land bridge into Asia, then onward to Europe and Africa. By five million years ago they had nearly all disappeared, leaving behind *Dinohippus*, which was succeeded by *Equus*, the modern genus of horse.
Several decades ago the American Museum of Natural History assembled a famous exhibit of fossil horses, designed to show gradual evolution from "Eohippus" (now called Hyracotherium) to modern Equus. This exhibit was presented as evidence for evolution, with Equus being the "goal" of equine evolution. This story of the horse family was soon included in all biology textbooks.
Heribert Nilsson

The family tree of the horse is beautiful and continuous only in the textbooks. In the reality provided by the results of research it is put together from three parts, of which only the last can be described as including horses. The forms of the first part are just as much little horses as the present day damans are horses. The construction of the horse is therefore a very artificial one, since it is put together from non-equivalent parts, and cannot therefore be a continuous transformation series.

Heribert Nilsson

The family tree of the horse is beautiful and can be found only in the textbooks in the literature. The way of research it is put together is preferred in the study of horses. The last part are just as much literature as the present, and are horses. The construction of the family tree are a very artificial one, since it is put together from small quite different parts, and cannot therefore be a continuous set of nation series.

"The uniform, continuous transformation of Hyracotherium into Equus, so dear to the hearts of generations of textbook writers, never happened in nature."

(George Gaylord Simpson, Life of the Past (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press), 1953, p. 125, emp. added)
Evolutionists have known this for years, and as such, most textbooks have replaced horses with camels.
Evidence #2 Embryology

Embryology too involved patterns that couldn’t be explained by coincidence. Why does the embryo of a mammal pass through stages resembling stages of the embryo of a reptile? Why is one of the larval forms of a barnacle, before metamorphosis, so similar to the larval form of a shrimp? Why do the larvae of moths, flies, and beetles resemble one another more than any of them resemble their respective adults? Because, Darwin wrote, “the embryo is the animal in its less modified state” and that state “reveals the structure of its progenitor.”
Haeckel's series of fake drawings, 1874

Haeckel's famous (infamous) set of 24 drawings purporting to show eight different embryos in three stages of development, as published by him in *Anthropogenie*, in Germany, 1874.
Earnst Haeckel said the turning point in his thinking was when he read Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* in 1860.

*Creation*, March-May 1996 p. 33
Haeckel’s drawings on top.

Above, top row: Haeckel’s drawings of several different embryos, showing incredible similarity at their early ‘tailbud’ stage. Bottom row: Richardson’s photographs of how the embryos of these same animals really look at the same stage (see reference 13 for species names). Many modern evolutionists no longer claim that the human embryo repeats the adult stages of its alleged evolutionary ancestors, but point to Haeckel’s drawings (top row) to claim that it repeats the embryonic stages. However, even this alleged support for evolution is now revealed as being based on fake drawings.

Actual photos on bottom.

Creation ex Nihilo, Mar-May 1998 p. 51
Abscheulich!

Haeckel's distortions did not help Darwin.

By Stephen Jay Gould

Revolution cannot be kindly talked, nor is been gauged as a by-pass. The sight and spirit of an embalmed sentence after a passage time has elapsed to speak the immediate pen of novels, while the nation, under the name of human events, mount of prose. (From the most abscheulich Northern woods no poet, Robert E. Lee or George McClellan ever slept).

This essay draws a poignant portrait of Haeckel, the most famous of the great natural scientists caught in the embalmed forests of Darwin's Origin of Species. This tale, a moment for centuries, his first achieved a vision, passed to a life, Haeckel, an illustration on natural history. However, once we discover his likeness and supply a partial context for understanding, our admiration turns from Haeckel's room into expressions of genuine admiration for something that we, the Europeans, have long ignored. Haeckel's own words: "The man who drew the chickens and animals from the early days on earth, men and women from the early days on earth."

In front Haeckel's drawing, the early amphibians (top) of a pig, dog, monkey, and man are nearly identical.

Haeckel's theories of natural history allowed an intimate evolution among closely related species but not for significant transformation between distinct groups. Moreover, he held an important role in Darwin's misconceptions of evolutionary theory. That book shook the aged von Haeckel 20 years before in his first book, "Spontaneous Generation," and the great man—Robert Haeckel, in his book (and posthumously published) article of...
Stephen Jay Gould

“We should therefore not be surprised that Haeckel’s drawings entered nineteenth-century textbooks. But we do, I think, have the right to be both astonished and ashamed by the century of mindless recycling that has led to the persistence of these drawings in a large number, if not majority, of modern textbooks” (p. 45, emp. added).
Sir Arthur Keith

It was expected that the embryo would recapitulate the features of its ancestors from the lowest to the highest forms in the animal kingdom. Now that the appearance of the embryo at all stages is known, the general feeling is one of disappointment; the human embryo at no stage is anthropoid in appearance. The embryo of the mammal never resembles the worm, the fish, or the reptile. Embryology provides no support whatsoever for the evolutionary hypothesis.

(1932, *The Human Body* [London: Thornton and Butterworth], p. 94)
Sir Arthur Keith

It was expected that the embryo would capitulate the features of its lowest parent and not show a single trace of the highest forms in the adult. The line of development is known as the general feeling of the evolutionary stage. At an early stage it is one of the approximate kinship of the human embryo at no stage is anthropoid. There never was an embryo of the mammal. Embryologists never support whatsoever for the evolutionary hypothesis.

(1932, *The Human Body* [London: Thornton and Butterworth], p. 94)
Evidence #3--Archaeopteryx

For instance, the five-digit skeletal structure of the vertebrate hand appears not just in humans and apes and raccoons and bears but also, variously modified, in cats and bats and porpoises and lizards and turtles. The paired bones of our lower leg, the tibia and the fibula, are also represented by homologous bones in other mammals and in reptiles, and even in the long-extinct bird-reptile Archaeopteryx. What’s the reason behind such varied recurrence of a few basic designs? Darwin, with a nod to Owen’s “most interesting work,” supplied the answer: common descent, as shaped by natural selection, modifying (Continued on page 20)
FACT!
New findings show that birds are probably related to dinosaurs! Scientists in China have discovered two fossils of feathered dinosaurs.
Artist’s rendition of Archaeopteryx
Colin Patterson, while serving as senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, summed it up best when he stated that *Archaeopteryx*:

“has simply become a patsy for wishful thinking. Is *Archaeopteryx* the ancestor of all birds? Perhaps yes, perhaps no: there is no way of answering the question. It is easy enough to make up stories of how one form gave rise to another, and to find reasons why the stages should be favored by natural selection. But such stories are not a part of science, for there is no way of putting them to the test”

Evolutionary ornithologist Allan Feduccia who wrote in *Science* almost a decade ago:

I conclude that *Archaeopteryx* was arboreal and volant [i.e., possessing extended wings for flight—BH], considerably advanced aerodynamically, and probably capable of flapping, powered flight to at least some degree. *Archaeopteryx*...was, in the modern sense, a bird...

Evolutionary ornithologist Allan Feduccia who wrote in *Science* almost a decade ago:

I conclude that, Archaeopteryx was indeed a ground and volant [i.e., possessing flight and wing-like structures], considerably adapted to a terrestrial existence, and probably capable of flight. These were addicted to at least some degree. *Archaeopteryx* ... in the modern sense, a bird ...

Five Years Earlier...

In November 1999, the editor of *National Geographic*, Bill Allen, published an article that proved to be one of the worst debacles in the long and storied history of the magazine. Mr. Allen published a feature article by Christopher P. Sloan titled “Feathers for T. Rex?” The article claimed to provide “a true missing link in the complex chain that connects dinosaurs to birds” (Sloan, 1999, 196[5]:100).
FEATHERS FOR T. REX?

NEW BIRDLIKE FOSSILS ARE MISSING LINKS IN DINOSAUR EVOLUTION

Dinosaurs will never look the same. The reason: four new dinosaur fossils with stunningly birdlike bones and indications of feathers. Not enough to prove that these dinosaurs ever flew, but strong evidence that feathers were widespread among meat-eating dinosaurs—the group that includes Tyrannosaurus rex.

Three of the fossils were found recently in Liaoning Province, China, the area that produced fossils of flightless feathered dinosaurs in 1996-97. All four are theropods, or meat-eaters: a dromaeosaur, one of a family of small- to medium-size predators that includes Arizona Pk’s “raptors”; an oviraptorosaur from Mongolia with a birdlike tail; a seven-foot-long theromorph; and a creature that has the arms of a bird and the tail of a dinosaur.

Twenty years ago when John Ostrom, a
Seven months later, the October 2000 issue of National Geographic contained a five-page article by veteran investigative reporter Lewis M. Simons, describing how this incredible hoax occurred (Simons, 2000). In his National Geographic article, Simons explained how farmers in many regions of China have made a very profitable hobby of selling the fossils they find. The only problem is that these farmers realize that fossil fanciers prefer specimens assembled and suitable for display. Therefore, on occasion the farmers will “doctor” the fossils to follow basic market economics and thus increase the value of their finds. Archaeoraptor actually “evolved” in a Chinese farmhouse where homemade paste was used to glue together two completely different fossils.
Domestic Selection

The bulldog (opposite), shaped by many generations of dog breeders for bullbaiting and, later, for homely charm, differs much from its wolfish progenitors. If domestic breeding could yield such change, Darwin realized, natural selection over many millions of years could do more.

He argued that wild species diverge from common ancestors just as domestic varieties do. Using his own backyard aviary, as well as information from other breeders, he analyzed differences among fancy pigeons such as (above, clockwise from left) the English pouter, the scandaroon, and the nun. He also studied cats, horses, pigs, rabbits, ducks, and other livestock. He examined and measured specimens, alive and dead. To a friend he wrote, “I have puppies of Bull-dogs & Greyhound in salt.”
Evidence #4—Natural Selection

Domestic Selection

The bulldog (opposite), shaped by many generations of dog breeders for bullbaiting and, later, for homely charm, differs much from its wolfish progenitors. If domestic breeding could yield such change, Darwin realized, natural selection over many millions of years could do more.

He argued that wild species diverge from common ancestors just as domestic species do. Using his own backyard aviary, as well as information from others, he analyzed differences among fancy pigeons such as (above), the English pouter, the scandroon, and the nun. He also studied rabbits, ducks, and other livestock. He examined and measured the living and dead. To a friend he wrote, “I have puppies of Bull-dogs & ...
Creationists never have objected to the idea of natural selection as a mechanism for eliminating the unfit, non-adapted organisms. As a matter of fact, creationists long before Darwin were advocating natural selection as a conservation principle. Few people are aware, apparently, that natural selection was not Charles Darwin’s discovery. A creationist zoologist/chemist by the name of Edward Blyth (1810-1873) wrote about it in the years between 1835 and 1837, well before Darwin.

But we need to realize that this does not provide a mechanism for macroevolution.
When we mate two dogs, we still get a dog. Establishing that *microevolution* occurs does not prove that *macroevolution* does.

Respected Swedish biologist Sören Lövtrup observed:

“Micromutations do occur, but the theory that these alone can account for evolutionary change is either falsified, or else it is an unfalsifiable, hence metaphysical, theory. I suppose that nobody will deny that it is a great misfortune if an entire branch of science becomes addicted to a false theory. But this is what has happened in biology.... I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked the greatest deceit in the history of science. When this happens, many people will pose the question: How did this ever happen?” (1987, p. 422, emp. added).
Unfortunately, creating the fit is the one thing natural selection cannot do.

As the famous Dutch botanist Hugo de Vries put it: "Natural selection may explain the **survival** of the fittest, but it cannot explain the **arrival** of the fittest."

de Vries, Hugo (1905), *Species and Varieties: Their Origin by Mutation*, ed. Daniel Trembly MacDougal (Chicago, IL: Open Court), pp. 825-826, emp. added.
Unfortunately, creating the fit is the one thing natural selection cannot do.

As the first Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine was awarded in 1901, de Vries put it: “Natural selection cannot explain the arrival of the fittest; mutation first caused the arrival of the fittest.”

de Vries, Hugo (1905), Species and Varieties: Their Origin by Mutation, ed. Daniel Trembly MacDougal (Chicago, IL: Open Court), pp. 825-826, emp. added.
Evidence #5—Vestigial Structures

Vestigial characteristics are still another form of morphological evidence, illuminating to contemplate because they show that the living world is full of small, tolerable imperfections. Why do male mammals (including human males) have nipples? Why do some snakes (notably boa constrictors) carry the rudiments of a pelvis and tiny legs buried inside their sleek profiles? Why do certain species of flightless beetle have wings, sealed beneath wing covers that never open? Darwin raised all these questions, and answered them, in The Origin of Species. Vestigial structures stand as remnants of the evolutionary history of a lineage.
In 1931, German scientist Alfred Wiedersheim listed 180 human organs as being vestigial or rudimentary (Wiedersheim, 1931). Today, that list has been all but demolished—thanks to our advancing knowledge of human physiology.

In 1931, German scientist Alfred Wiedersheim listed 180 human organs as being vestigial or rudimentary (Wiedersheim, 1931). Today, that list has been all but demolished—thanks to our advancing knowledge of human physiology.

Vestigial tailbone, Holt Biology 1989 (human tailbone)
Vestigial Organs

Some organisms have structures or organs that seem to serve no useful function. For example, humans have a tailbone at the end of the spine that is of no apparent use. Some snakes have tiny pelvic bones and limb bones, and some cave-dwelling salamanders have eyes even though members of the species are completely blind. Such seemingly functionless parts are called vestigial (veh-STIJ-ul) organs or structures. Vestigial organs are often homologous to organs that are useful in other species. The vestigial tailbone in humans is homologous to the functional tail of other primates. Thus vestigial structures can be viewed as evidence for evolution: organisms having vestigial structures probably share a common ancestry with organisms in which the homologous structure is functional.

Holt Biology, 1989
When compared with the caecum of a horse, the caecum and appendix of humans is thought to be vestigial.
“Long regarded as a vestigial organ with no function in the human body, the appendix is now thought to be one of the sites where immune responses are initiated.”

“Its removal also increases a persons susceptibility to leukemia, Hodgkin’s disease, cancer of the colon, and cancer of the ovaries.”

*In The Beginning*

Walt Brown p. 18
“Not too long ago man was imputed to have 180 vestigies. Organs like the appendix, tonsils, thymus, pineal gland and thyroid gland were on the list. Today, all former vestigial organs are known to have some function during the life of the individual. If the organ has any function at any time, it cannot be called rudimentary or vestigial.... As man’s knowledge has increased the list of vestigial organs decreased. So what really was vestigial? Was it not man’s rudimentary knowledge of the intricacies of the body?”

Evidence #6—Viruses and Bacteria

No aspect of biomedical research seems more urgent today than the study of microbial diseases. And the dynamics of those microbes within human bodies, within human populations, can only be understood in terms of evolution.

Nightmarish illnesses caused by microbes include both the infectious sort (AIDS, Ebola, SARS) that spread directly from person to person and the sort (malaria, West Nile fever) delivered to us by biting insects or other intermediaries. The capacity for quick change among disease-causing microbes is what makes them so dangerous to large numbers of people and so difficult and expensive to treat. They leap from wildlife or domestic animals into humans, adapting to new circumstances as they go. Their inherent variability allows them to find new ways of evading and defeating human immune systems. By natural selection they acquire resistance to drugs that should kill them. They evolve. There’s no better or more immediate evidence supporting the Darwinian theory than this process of forced transformation among our inimical germs.
Evidence #6—Viruses and Bacteria

No aspect of biomedical research seems more urgent today than the study of microbial dis-

“There’s no better or more immediate evidence supporting the Darwinian theory than this process of forced transformation among our inimical germs.”

...ing to new circumstances as they arise. Their inherent variability allows them to finesse ways of evading and defeating human immune systems. By natural selection they acquire resistance to drugs that should kill them. They evolve. There’s no better or more immediate evidence supporting the Darwinian theory than this process of forced transformation among our inimical germs.
#1. First, the mutations responsible for antibiotic resistance in bacteria do not arise as a result of the “need” of the organisms. What does this mean? Simply put, bacteria did not “mutate” after being exposed to antibiotics; the mutations conferring the resistance were present in the bacterial population even prior to the discovery or use of the antibiotics.

(see the Lederbergs’ experiments in 1952 on streptomycin-resistant bacteria)
#2. While pre-existing mutations may confer antibiotic resistance, such mutations may also decrease an organism’s viability. For example, “the surviving strains are usually less virulent, and have a reduced metabolism and so grow more slowly. This is hardly a recommendation for ‘improving the species by competition’ (i.e., survival of the fittest)” (Bowden, 1991, p. 56). Just because a mutation provides an organism with a certain trait does not mean that the organism as a whole has been helped.

#3. Regardless of how bacteria acquired their antibiotic resistance (i.e., by mutation, conjugation, or by transposition), they are still exactly the same bacteria after receiving that trait as they were before receiving it. The “evolution” is not vertical macroevolution but horizontal microevolution (i.e., adaptation).

Microevolution—not macroevolution
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The evidence for Evolution is Weak & Pathetic!

By DAVID QUAMMEN
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Charles Darwin's grand theory of evolution by natural selection, tied diverse biological facts into a coherent whole. Domestication of fancy pigeons like the breeders creating pigeons was his analogy for selection in the wild. The naked mole rat suggests that mammals can evolve, like social insects, to include specialized workers and queens.
For their weight, feathers are stronger than any man-made structures. The design & functions of a feather are even more astounding.

Evolutionists claim that reptile scales evolved into feathers. Feathers have a much more complex DNA structure than reptile scales.

There is virtually no similarity between the two, nor is there any fossil evidence showing the transition from scale to feather. So how can evolutionists claim this really happened?
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