

# IN THE BEGINNING

## CREATION OR ACCIDENT? SIFTING THROUGH THE EVIDENCE

Aaron Beard  
Trussville  
Feb 15, 2008

### INTRODUCTION:

#### **A. The Bible, the word of God, opens with a very spectacular claim: In The Beginning God!**

1. Many men throughout time have searched for the answer to the questions, "Where did we come from, why are we here, and what will happen to us?" Many theories have been given to these questions – Some are absurd, some are plausible, & some just raise more questions
2. Genesis, the very first book in the Bible, begins with words of certainty answering the first of these great questions – In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth (**Gen 1:1ff; 2:1-2**)
  - a. Genesis declares that everything that this universe and all that is in it, including mankind, began with God. Thus the universe begins with an eternal and all powerful Creator
  - b. That God created everything in six days and that God created everything after their own kind... that dogs, horses, birds, & fish all began to exist within the same week of time
  - c. That God created everything in male & female pairs. That life as we know it didn't evolve from a primordial ooze or a single-celled organism, but from biological reproduction
3. These are incredible claims, esp. in light of the theories so many in the science community accept and teach... That there was an explosion then evolution, that life as we know it is an accident
4. The implications behind the controversy of Creation & Evolution reach much farther than what should be taught in school textbooks or if "God" should be acknowledged by the government...
  - a. If there is no God there is no real standard for right or wrong, we might as well live for ourselves, we are just advanced animals, there's no hope after death, this life is it
  - b. If there is a God who created us then we need to find out why, we ought to search for what His will is for our lives, and we do have hope and purpose beyond this life

#### **B. In this study we are going to examine both the evidence that is used for evolution and the evidence that backs up the Genesis account of creation. What do the cold hard facts actually point to?**

### I. LET'S BEGIN OUR STUDY BY CONSIDERING SOME OF THE GREATEST ICONS OF EVOLUTION

#### **A. The first icon, and possibly the oldest icon of evolution, is Darwin's tree of life:**

1. One of the most iconic features of Darwin's view of evolution is the "Great Tree Of Life" – In fact, a drawing depicting this idea is the only picture he included in his book, "Origin of the Species"
  - a. Darwin: "I view all beings not as special creations, but as the lineal descendants of some few beings which lived long before the first bed of the Cambrian system was deposited"
  - b. It has a universal common ancestor at the root & as "big evolution" occurred the tree grew different limbs & branches. Thus the modern species is its green and budding twigs.
  - c. He said the differences we see now occurred as natural selection brought about slight but accumulating changes that in time made major differences. Creatures were exposed to different conditions, were modified in different ways, resulting in distinct species
  - d. Thus, according to Darwin, humans & fruit flies are descended from one common ancestor
2. Darwin came up with his theory in spite of the lack of hard evidence, however, he believed that as the fossil record was further discovered, this would prove his theory to be fact:
  - a. At the time Darwin wrote "Origin Of The Species" the oldest known fossils were from the Cambrian period and they did not fit his theory at all, in fact, they contradicted it.

- b. Darwin said, "If the theory be true, it is indisputable that before the lowest Cambrian stratum was deposited long periods elapsed... the world swarmed with living creatures..." He goes on to say "several of the main divisions of the animal kingdom suddenly appear in the lowest known fossiliferous rocks." He called this a "serious" problem which "at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained" (Icons of Evolution, pg 35)
- c. He fully expected rocks to be discovered which showed the most primitive life forms in the oldest fossils progressing to the most complex life form in the more recent fossils
- 3. Since that time 150 years have passed, fossil excavations and studies have become very advanced, but the evidence to support his theory of evolution is still missing! (Cambrian – 530 m. years ago)
  - a. "The Cambrian Explosion," as it is called by scientists & paleontologists, reflects a sudden appearance of all kinds of animals from all different phylum, classes, orders, families, genus, and species. It reflects a fully evolved, or rather a fully created, animal world!
  - b. What kind of fossil remains have been discovered from before the Cambrian explosion? Some single celled organisms and just before the Cambrian explosion a few multi-cellular organisms. There's only simple and few life forms and no transitional fossils!
  - c. Wells writes, "There is no fossil evidence connecting the Cambrian animals to organisms that preceded them . The now well-documented Precambrian fossil record does not provide anything like the long history of gradual divergence required by Darwin's theory" (Icons of Evolution, page 38). This deals a deathblow to Darwin's tree of life!
  - d. With the sudden appearance of the more specific categories of life, with no trace of the evolution Darwin described, the fossil record has uprooted Darwin's tree of life!
  - e. "One could say that the Cambrian explosion stands Darwin's tree of life on its head. If any ...analogy were appropriate, it would be a lawn rather than a tree." (Icons, 42)
- 4. There are many strong evolutionists who have abandoned trying to prove Darwin's "Tree of Life" using the fossil record and have turned to molecular biology in search for evidence:
  - a. They compare the similarities & differences in the DNA of various animals to recreate the tree. Basically the organisms more closely related will have the more similar DNA
  - b. The problem is they have to start with assumptions & they've discovered that, depending on which molecules they analyze, they come up with totally different trees!
  - c. "A 1996 study using 88 protein sequences put rabbits with primates instead of rodents... A 1998 study based on 12 proteins put cows closer to whales than horses" (Icons, 51)
- 5. While the evidence contradicts Darwin's "Tree Of Life," it stands as a great witness to the creation account of Genesis 1 and God's creation of this world with everything in it: **(Genesis 1:20-25)**
  - a. The Cambrian explosion, where suddenly various forms of life appear in the fossil record, does not surprise a Christian since we believe God created it all in one week's time
  - b. Since God created every animal "after its kind" and since God created every animal "male and female" the lack of fossils showing major evolution taking place makes sense
  - c. Notice how in the creation account it says that God created "EVERY LIVING CREATURE" in the waters and the sky and "EVERYTHING THAT CREEPS ON THE GROUND" all on the fourth and fifth days. Sounds a lot like the Cambrian explosion doesn't it?
  - d. God commanded them to be fruitful and multiply and to fill the earth – Why are there so many organisms in the earth today & in the fossil record? It's not because they evolved over millions of years but because they carried out this order from God!

## **B. Another prominent icon is the experiment of Stanley Miller:**

1. In 1953, Stanley Miller and his PhD advisor Harold Urey conducted an experiment in which they tried to create the basic building blocks of life using lightning and certain gasses:
  - a. Scientists had thought that life began lightning in the atmosphere of the primitive earth could have produced the chemical building blocks of life. These chemicals then descended to the earth, dissolving into some primordial ooze, & living cells came out
  - b. Miller and Urey attempted to recreate this atmosphere in their laboratory and use an electric spark to replicate lightning – What they got were some basic amino acids!
  - c. The implications: If life can be produced outside of God, you don't need God to explain life. There's no need for the Creator if living organisms can emerge on their own!
  - d. In the minds of evolutionists, this was the certain proof they had been seeking. For many years it was featured in Biology textbooks and still holds a major place in many today
2. After some time, scientists began to question, and eventually dismiss, the concept Miller and Urey were working from – The gasses which the primitive earth's atmosphere were made of:
  - a. For their experiment to work they used methane, ammonia, water vapor, & hydrogen and created a vacuum to remove oxygen or the results would be extremely explosive!
  - b. Now scientists believe the early atmosphere contained very little hydrogen, but it probably had carbon dioxide, nitrogen, and water vapor. This is nothing like their experiment!
  - c. A 1995 edition of "Science" magazine stated that "The early atmosphere looked nothing like the Miller Urey simulation" (The Case For A Creator, page 37, Lee Strobel)
  - d. If you recreate the experiment using the right atmospheric components you wind up with Formaldehyde & Cyanide... Embalming fluid! This doesn't create life, it kills it!
3. Even if their experiment used the right materials & produced the building blocks to life "the origin of life would remain a mystery. A biochemist can mix all the chemical building blocks of life in a test tube and still not produce a living cell" (Icons of Evolution, pg. 24, Jonathan Wells).
4. Although scientists know this, a booklet published by the National Academy of Sciences in 1999, states: "Experiments conducted under conditions intended to resemble those present on primitive earth have resulted in the production of some of the chemical components of proteins" (Icons of Evolution, pg. 26). → So a myth is shamelessly perpetuated! Why?
5. This experiment reminds me of what Paul said to people who believed and worshipped idols in Athens? That in God all things live, and move, and have their being (**Acts 17:24-31**)
  - a. What does it say if scientists take a living cell, puncture it, and dump its contents into a tube... They still can't take those known building blocks of life and create a living cell?
  - b. Knowing the complexity and the delicate nature of life, is it really plausible that it all came into existence as an accident? Or does it make more sense that God was behind it?

## **C. The third icon that is often associated with the theory of evolution is Haeckel's Embryos:**

1. Almost every student in a biology class, whether in high school or college, has been exposed to the drawings of embryos by Ernest Haeckel which are used to support the theory evolution:
  - a. Haeckel drew pictures of the embryos of a fish, salamander, tortoise, chicken, hog, calf, rabbit, and human side by side... The similarity is meant to point to common ancestry
  - b. Darwin used these drawings to back up his theory – He said that "the embryos of the most distinct species belonging to the same class are closely similar but become, when fully developed, widely dissimilar." (See this relationship as a funnel upside down)

- c. Darwin also believed the embryos as they developed replicate their evolutionary past and the embryos, as Haeckel drew them, reveal what the common ancestor looked like
  - d. Personally, when I saw these images in school, I felt like this was evolution's best witness!
2. One of major problems is the misleading and even fraudulent way Haeckel presented his embryos:
    - a. First of all, he hand selected the embryos that would best suit the theory of evolution... He omitted any vertebrate that did not fit his purpose (a salamander instead of a frog)
    - b. Even worse than this is the fact that biologists have known for over 100 years that Haeckel faked some of the drawings. Embryos with vertebrate embryos never look as "twin-like" as Haeckel drew... It's widely known that he drew the images to fit the theory!
    - c. The embryos within the classes which are supposed to be most closely related by ancestry though evolution actually appear very different during their developmental stages!
    - d. Very bluntly put, Haeckel's drawings are FAKES and purposefully misleading... and yet they still appear in text books and magazines with very little said about their real nature!
  3. Another one of the problems with Haeckel's drawings is that they don't represent what Haeckel said they represented – They don't show similarities of embryos in their earliest stages!
    - a. Strobel writes, "Remember Darwin claimed that because the embryos are most similar in their early stages, this is evidence of common ancestry. He thought that the early stage showed what the common ancestor looked like – sort of like a fish" (page 49)
    - b. But the images Haeckel drew were not of their earliest stages, but at a midway point. In fact, in the truly earliest stages the embryos look very different. Then they start to look somewhat similar (though easily distinguishable) and then different again
    - c. Whereas Darwin and Haeckel said the embryos development was alike and then very different (illustrated like funnel), embryologists say they are actually very different, then somewhat alike, then very different again (illustrated more like an hourglass)
  4. Another aspect of embryos that is occasionally brought up as evidence for evolution is the appearance of "gill-like slits" in the neck of the human embryo:
    - a. A 1996 "Life" magazine shows stunning pictures of some embryos. In the article, Kenneth Miller says that human embryos "grow fin-like appendages and something very much like gills" and goes on to say these are "the legacy of a primitive fish" (Icons, pg 105).
    - b. These are called "pharyngeal folds" and are not gills. Even in fish they are not gills! In a fish they eventually do become gills; however, in a reptile, mammal, or bird they become other things. They are only "gill-like" in their superficial appearance!
    - c. **Illustration:** Feel up and down your neck. What do you feel? RIDGES! Guess what, according to evolutionists you currently have gills... Sounds absurd because it is!
    - c. Why do people refer to them as gills? Why are they called "gill-like" in some magazines and textbooks? Its because people are reading into them their preconceived ideas!
  5. Whether we are asking "How did life originate?" or the question "What must I do to be saved?" this example shows us how people so often read into the evidence what they want to believe!
    - a. When you look at these "evidences" offered for evolution, it becomes apparent that TRUTH is not the ultimate goal. Preconceived ideas are brought into the examination of evidence and the facts with their implications get twisted! **(John 9:15ff)**
    - b. Are the similarities between the embryos of humans and the embryos of various animals? Certainly! The question is does this show that humans descended from a common ancestor in the animal world or does it show that they have a common creator?
    - c. Having a common designer makes the most sense & is most consistent! **(Psalm 139:13-14)**

#### D. Probably the greatest icon used for evolution is the Ape to Human Evolutionary Chart:

1. Although Darwin mentioned very little of human origins in "Origins Of The Species," it is clear that the implications of his writings was concerning the ancestry and descent of mankind:
  - a. Darwin states, "My object is to show that there is no fundamental difference between man and the higher animals in their mental faculties." They all have "similar passions, affections, and emotions, even the more complex ones, such as jealousy, suspicion, emulation, gratitude, and magnanimity... they possess the same faculties of imitation, attention, deliberation, choice, memory, imagination, the association of ideas, and reason, though in very different degrees" (Icons, page 212).
  - b. He says the human's religious tendencies is just a higher form of a dog's love for his master
  - c. No rational person has ever objected that we share some similarities to various animals, but it's another thing to claim all we are is a modified, higher evolved, monkey!
  - d. His views of man's descent from apes have been portrayed in "line-up" style pictures showing the evolution of a monkey on all fours to a human walking upright
2. One of the most difficult problems with this icon of evolution is the lack of evidence to support it:
  - a. In 1856 the "Neanderthal Man" emerged – Initially it was thought that he was "hunched over" due to disease. Only later did evolutionists claim he was a transitional man. Now this idea is widely rejected but its results have lasted in the cave man cartoons
  - b. In 1912 paleontologist Charles Dawson found some bones and had them reconstructed... It was called the "Dawson Dawn Man." But, in 1953 Joseph Weiner, Kenneth Oakley, and Wilfrid Le Gros Clark proved it was phony!. The skull was of an ancient human but the jaw was from a modern orangutan. Its teeth were filed down to look human!
  - c. Wells writes, "The features that pointed to fraud in 1953 had been there all along" He then quotes Roger Lewin saying, "The real interest of Piltdown" is "how those who believed in the fossil saw in it what they wanted to see." (Icons of Evolution, pg. 218)
3. In recent years National Geographic magazine hired four artists to reconstruct a female from the casts of seven fossil bones along with a skull. What resulted were four extremely different looking creatures. Why the difference? They saw in the evidence what they wanted to see!
4. Are we merely animals? The evolutionists says that we are simply more highly evolved, but the Bible tells us that we are drastically different. Glorified Monkeys Or Children Of God?
  - a. We are the only part of God's creation made in His own image! **(Gen 1:26-27)** – We have a unique ability to reason, we have a sense of morality, we have an appreciation of beauty, we have a greater concern for relationships. Where did all this come from?
  - b. God has placed eternity in our hearts **(Ecc 3:11)** – Animals don't ponder about what comes after death, they aren't concerned with death, they don't have eternity in their heart
  - c. Unlike animals we have a desire to worship! Yes, dogs are loyal to their masters, but why? Because that's their food source, because they depend on their master to live? Do animals in the wild "worship" anyone or anything? We are different! **(Acts 17:22-23)**

#### E. Another icon to consider is the Archaeopteryx and other purported "missing links"

1. Remember, when Darwin wrote his book "Origin of the Species" the fossil evidence was missing to support his "macro-evolution." How'd he handle this? He spoke of "missing links"
  - a. "By the theory of natural selection all living species have been connected with the parent-species of each genus, by differences not greater than we see between the natural

- and domestic varieties of the same species at present the present day." So "The number of species must have been inconceivably great" (The Origin Of Species)
- b. In the absence of the evidence he argued that in time they'd be found, but that you really only need a couple of missing links to prove his point. With the "inconceivably great" number of transitional species, this sounds like an awfully convenient argument!
  - c. Paleontologists and others who subscribe to Darwinian Evolution greatly desire to find just one missing link. What we will see is that they desire it so much that it has led some of them to imagine what's not really there and even to create fraudulent fossils!
2. Dating back to the mid 1800's, the first fossil set forth as a "transitional fossil" was the Archaeopteryx – It was supposed to be the link between reptiles and birds:
    - a. It had wings and feathers like a bird but it also had teeth, a long reptile like tail, and claws on its wings. Since its first discovery about 10 fossils of this type have been found
    - b. The Solnhofen limestone, in which all eight specimens of Archaeopteryx were discovered, is from the geological period known as the Upper (or Late) Jurassic, about 150 million years ago. This makes Archaeopteryx the earliest known bird – or at least, the earliest undisputed bird." (Icons of Evolution, Jonathan Wells, page 112)
    - c. Paleontologist Pat Shipman says: "more than the world's most beautiful fossil... [it is] an icon – a holy relic of the past that has become a powerful symbol of the evolutionary process itself. It is the first bird." To evolutionists, it's the perfect link! (Icons, pg 114)
    - d. For over 100 years, evolutionists have considered *Archaeopteryx* the transitional form that allowed land-dwelling animals finally to get off the ground. Today, practically all evolution-based science textbooks contain a breathtaking photographic reproduction and description of *Archaeopteryx*, with genealogical lines showing the descent of modern birds from this ancient "intermediate." (<http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/473>)
  3. What is not featured in these biology textbooks is the great cloud of uncertainty that surrounds these fossils, even among those who subscribe to Darwinian evolution:
    - a. Many paleontologists now believe that the Archaeopteryx is not likely an ancestor of the modern bird, but early examples of a totally different bird that is now extinct:
      - 1) Why the doubt? There's just too many differences between it & the modern bird
      - 2) In 1996 Paleontologist Mark Norell, of the American Museum of Natural History in New York, called Archaeopteryx 'a very important fossil,' but added that most paleontologists now believe it is not a direct ancestor of modern birds.'" (Icons of Evolution, page 116). – The signs of evolution aren't there!
    - b. Some believe the ancestors of the Archaeopteryx was these bird-like dinosaurs that lived during the Cretaceous period, some 20 million years later. How can an ancestor live after it's descendents? Those who believe this say, "We just need more evidence"
    - c. There is even doubt about the shady way they've been discovered: "Reinhold Leinfelder, director of the General Museum of Natural History in Humboldt-University noted: It seems that *Archaeopteryx* findings have always been accompanied by **mysterious circumstances**. The first complete specimen discovered in Bavaria in 1861 was sold by its anonymous finder to a wealthy buyer, kept secret, and eventually sold to the Natural History Museum in London. **The tenth, and most recent, specimen is no exception.** Also **found** in Bavaria, **by an unknown person** (allegedly in the 1970s), it was sold to an unknown third party in Switzerland, ending up in a small private museum in Thermopolis, Wyoming, USA (<http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/3113>).
    - d. Quote: "So let's get this straight. We are not sure whether *Archaeopteryx*'s feathers are real. We are not sure if this creature could actually fly. We don't know if it used two

- wings or four limbs. We don't know the location or how the fossils were procured. But we are absolutely sure it is the missing link between dinosaurs and birds. That sounds reasonable." (<http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/3113>)
4. Another supposed "missing link fossil" that came up which generated a great deal of buzz among evolutionists is the fossil which turned up in China called "Archaeoraptor"
    - a. In 1999 Stephen Czerkas, for the National Geographic Society, released some incredible news... They found the missing link! Called Archaeoraptor, this fossil had feathers, the limbs of a bird, and the tail of a dinosaur. Again evolutionists were very elated!
    - b. Then in November of 1999 National Geographic ran a big article on this fossil entitled, "Feathers For T-Rex" – They stated, "We can now say that birds are dinosaurs 'just as confidently as we say humans are mammals'" (Icons of Evolution, page 124)
    - c. In March of 2000 the National Geographic had to print a retraction – The Archaeoraptor was in fact a fake! It was a simply bird fossil with a dinosaur tail cemented to it!
    - d. What happened then is what has been happening all along – Certain scientists have a theory set in mind, they then push this theory with no more evidence than cheap propaganda has, and then twist the evidence to fit their ideas! We call this science?
  5. Another possible "transitional fossil" that arose was a fossil called "Bambiraptor"
    - a. It was about the size of a chicken with a three foot long tail. It was discovered in Upper Cretaceous rocks – This makes it 75 million years younger than Archaeopteryx
    - b. Yet this bird like dinosaur was thought to be the ancestor of Archaeopteryx because it had many of the features they expected the ancestor or Archaeopteryx to have had.
    - c. At a conference, Brian Cooley, the man whose specialty was reconstructing dinosaurs from fossils presented a reconstruction of this animal. "He explained... that he set out to make Bambiraptor as bird-like as possible... using bird anatomy as his guide, and he placed the eyes in a bird-like orientation, using the same artificial eyes taxidermists put in stuffed eagles. Guessing that Bambiraptor must have been covered with "scruffy" feathers, Cooley added them to his reconstruction." (Icons, page 128)
    - d. There's a problem: No feathers were discovered with this fossil. They were made up!
    - e. One day two of this conference a team of molecular biologists reported finding bird DNA amongst Triceratops bones. One problem – it was 100% modern TURKEY DNA!
      - 1) They used this to say birds are closely related to dinosaurs after all. Yet if you compare DNA from any bird to a turkey the closest match you get is 94.5%.
      - 2) So that makes a Triceratops a closer relative to a turkey than a chicken is! Or someone dropped some turkey on the bones... But forget what makes sense!
  6. So after many discoveries, flat out frauds and misunderstood fossils, Darwin's missing link is still just that... MISSING! If Darwin expected missing links to be found to prove the validity of his theories, what does that say about his theories when the links have not been found? Why are there no transitional fossils? Because God made everything after its kind! (**Genesis 1:25**)

**F. Consider some other icons that are often used as evidences for Darwin's theory of evolution:**

1. A common picture used to promote Darwinian evolution is that of homology in vertebrate limbs:
  - a. Homology simply refers to the study of similarities in the parts of animals.
  - b. Darwin wrote, "What can be more curious than that the hand of a man, formed for grasping, that of a mole for digging, the leg of the horse, the paddle of the porpoise, and the wing of the bat, should be all constructed on the same pattern, and should

- include similar bones, in the same relative positions?" (Sir Gaven Debeer, "Homology, An Unsolved Problem," Oxford Press, 1971, page 4)
- c. Here evolutionists use circular reasoning – They first decide what has common ancestry, point to similarities in their structure, and then say that proves common ancestry
  - d. Similarity between the bone structures of animals does not prove evolution... It only proves animals have similarities! It could more easily point to a common designer!
  - e. See an example put forth by an evolutionists named Tim Berra in 1990. He pointed to the similarities between Corvettes over the years & said that showed a common descent with modification, but we know there's much designing & engineering put into them!
2. Another common icon featured when evolution is discussed is what's called "Darwin's Finches"
- a. In 1835 Darwin visited the Galapagos Islands while voyaging on the ship H.M.S. Beagle. There he collected 13 or 14 different finches. While he did not write about these finches in "The Origin of Species" and didn't write about them until after he formed his ideas, the finches are often accredited with being the foundation of his beliefs
  - b. The concept is that the finches, which had beaks of varying sizes, evolved based on their diet... that natural selection produced the different species. They believe they all originated from the same birds that came from the mainland many years before
  - c. Peter & Rosemary Grant (evolutionists) spent years at the Galapagos studying the finches
    - 1) They discovered that the finches beaks varied based on the amount of rainfall
    - 2) In 1977 there was a drought – only one inch of rain. The amount of food for the finches was scarce & 15% of the population died. The survivors tended to have larger bodies and larger beaks. They could eat the big & small seeds.
    - 3) The average beak size of the finches increased about 5%. They believed if natural selection explained beak size, it could explain the origin of the finch species
  - d. Problem: In periods where it was rainy again the finch population exploded & the average beak size diminished again, producing no net change over a long period of time
  - e. The changes in beak size certainly demonstrates the fittest do survive; however, it fails to give any evidence for Darwin's theory of macro-evolution in "The Origin of Species"
  - f. Yet this is still used in text books & other publications: A 1999 booklet published by the National Academy of Sciences says that the Grants showed "that a single year of drought on the islands can drive evolutionary changes in the finches... if droughts occur about once every 10 years on the islands, a new species of finch might arise in only about 200 years." (Icons of Evolution, page 174)
3. Finally, Darwinian evolutionists will use the example of the Peppered Moths:
- a. Experiments were conducted in 1950's by Benard Kettlewell in England on some moths:
    - 1) There were dark colored moths called "melanic moths" and lighter colored moths called "peppered moths" which were observed in a heavily polluted areas.
    - 2) Scientists had observed that the numbers of darker moths had been increasing while the number of the lighter colored moths were declining. But why?
    - 3) Kettlewell released both types of moths in daylight. They landed on tree trunks which were darkened because the pollution had killed the lichen growth
    - 4) Birds ate more of the lighter ones than the darker ones because the darker ones were more camouflaged than the lighter ones – Natural selection at work?
  - b. Kettlewell called his experiment "the most striking evolutionary change ever actually witnessed in any organism... Darwin's missing evidence." Also, famed evolutionary

biologist Sewall Wright called it “the clearest case in which a conspicuous evolutionary process has actually been observed” (Icons of Evolution, page 143)

- c. What “change” happened? Only the fluctuation in the numbers of two species of moths which already were in existence! This doesn’t prove Darwinian evolution at all!
- d. Also in other areas with heavy pollution like Manchester and Michigan the exact opposite trend was observed - The lighter colored moths increased in population . They found that as pollution decreased the number of darker moths increased in lesser polluted areas. Seems like migration of moths also played a role in the observations.
- e. Kettlewell released his moths in the daytime; however these moths fly about in the night time. He didn’t conduct his experiment using the right controls. Thus it was flawed!
- f. Finally, it is common knowledge moths simply don’t rest on tree trunks! It is supposed that they rest in the tree tops on the bottom side of limbs. Wells writes, “Since peppered moths are quite torpid in daylight, they remain where they are put” (Icons, pg 150)
- g. Why so many pictures of peppered moths on tree trunks? The answer is simple... They are faked! “University of Massachusetts biologist Theodore Sargent told a Washington Times reporter in 1999 that he once glued some dead specimens on a tree trunk for a TV documentary about peppered moths.” (Icons, page 150) – One case of many!