



Creation Instruction Association
www.creationinstruction.org

1770 S Overland Ave

Juniata NE 68955

402 519-0301

I do believe in Evolution!

Don't worry. I haven't fallen off of the deep end. But it is true. I do believe in evolution. If someone asked you if you believed in evolution, what would you say? My response is, "what do you mean by evolution?" Today, we throw out the term "evolution" and we automatically think of molecules mutating to man. However, the word "evolution" simply means change over time. I guess the real question then becomes what is meant by "change?" This is precisely what we will look at in this newsletter to clarify and help you defend your stand on creation.

Indeed, we cannot deny that change does take place. Cars wear out, animals shed their fur, skin etc. and babies grow up. So is this evolution? Yes. Just not the definition one normally thinks of. Therefore, to say we don't believe in evolution would be a lie. However, if we say we do believe in evolution we must clarify that it isn't the Darwinian definition. There are two terms that we need to look at: Microevolution and Macroevolution. Understanding these two terms will give you a clear understanding of many so called "proofs" of evolution that are thrown at Creationists. The term microevolution is unfortunate because, as we said, the very word "evolution" makes people think of ape turning into man. However, microevolution has nothing to do with such fairy tales, but is a scientific fact.

Microevolution is a result of random errors in DNA replication. It doesn't include genetic variations such as differing eye color or different shapes and sizes of related animals etc. It never displays increasing complexity or order, nor does it produce beneficial change.

Years ago fruit flies were bombarded with radiation to increase mutations which were to speed up the "evolutionary" processes. The results showed absolutely no NEW information, only corrupted OLD information causing crumpled, oversized, undersized or extra winged flies. In addition, they were blind, sterile, weak, diseased, deformed, or dead. The key here is that mutations do not cause new species (which needs new information) to evolve. Even Paul Grasse, a leading evolutionist, said in *Evolution, of Living Organisms* (1977), "Some contemporary biologists, as soon as they observe a mutation, talk about (macro) evolution. . . this logical scheme is, however, unacceptable: first, because its major premise is neither obvious nor general; second, because its conclusion does not agree with the facts. No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution."

Macroevolution is what is often referred to when people talk about "evolution." This requires increased complexity and NEW information to be added into a species (Something never ever seen in nature or even in a laboratory). Scientists have tried to identify a mechanism for evolution to take place. During the time of Darwin some suggested the frequent use of an appendage would cause them to get larger (the giraffe getting a long neck by stretching out all the time to get leaves in the trees). This was disproved. Now, scientists are hoping mutations would provide the mechanism for evolution. First, doesn't this seem strange to you? Why are people so upset when nuclear radiation is placed near them? Shouldn't we be excited that we can now pass on our "mutations" to our children and grandchildren to move forward in the evolutionary race? Logic

and first hand scientific evidence shows us radiation causes mutations and this is NOT beneficial. Secondly, mutations never add information, they only corrupt existing information. Macroevolution requires new additional information and mutations can not provide that. Another dead end for evolutionists.

Natural selection is often cited as a mechanism for macroevolution. Natural selection is a term used to describe how an animal may survive or go extinct usually based upon environmental changes. In other words, the ability to adapt to an environment or "survival of the fittest." This is technically what we would call genetic variation. Indeed we see "adaptations" and "survival of the fittest" in nature but does this provide the necessary mechanisms for macroevolution? NO! Natural selection "selects" existing genetic information from a gene pool that comes from an original "kind" of animal. In other words, we see two different sizes of dogs that have the same genetic information, either one dog has lost information or it has had some of it rearranged but no NEW information was added to the dog.

Many evolutionists have tried to use bacteria becoming resistant to penicillin as an example of macroevolution. This is not an example of macroevolution but of natural selection. Sometimes an undetected characteristic reappears making something look as if it were new. An example would be two black haired parents having a red-headed child where a recessive gene was selected. This "red-haired" gene wasn't new, it already existed within the DNA but was previously unused or detected. In other cases, resistant bacteria were already a variation of the same kind of bacteria but were the minority. In other words, both types of bacteria were already in existence but the resistant strain was fewer in number and harmless. As medicine was taken the "weak" bacteria was killed off, leaving the resistant ones behind to prevail (survival of the fittest). Was new information added to the bacteria? NO! As a matter of fact, we have found the same resistant varieties of

bacteria in the ice man found in the mountains showing these varieties are not new, just now more dominate because we killed the others off with penicillin.

Darwin's finches are still used as "proof" of macroevolution. However, these finches all display common genes with no NEW information. Therefore, the finches are only another example of genetic variation, not macroevolution. Natural selection may explain the extinction of the less fit and the survival of the most fit, but it DOES NOT explain the ARRIVAL of the fittest.

Dr. Royal Truman, an organic chemist states, "There is no evidence that DNA mutations can provide the sorts of variations needed for evolution... The sorts of variations which can contribute to Darwinian evolution, however, involve things like bone structure or body plan. There is no evidence for beneficial mutations at the level of macroevolution, but there is also no evidence at the level of what is commonly regarded as microevolution."

EVOLUTION IS NOT EVEN A THEORY!

According to the scientific method the systematic approach to problem solving goes like this: 1) Make an observation 2) Gather evidence 3) Make a hypothesis 4) Build models to support hypothesis 5) If the hypothesis can explain observations and make predictions without contradictions it becomes a theory. 6) A theory is "established" and agrees with all known experimental evidence. It must be falsifiable (some possible experiment that could prove the theory untrue). 7) Becomes a Law of Nature like the Law of Gravity, Biogenesis, and Motion. (These laws will disprove evolution and will be discussed in further newsletters).

Number six states that a theory must be falsifiable. For example, evolution is said to be supported by transitional fossils and by the lack of those same transitional fossils. Therefore, it is not falsifiable because both evidence, or lack of evidence, is said to support the theory. Therefore, macroevolution cannot even be a theory according to the scientific method. Not only isn't it falsifiable, but no one has been able to observe it or even build a model to support the hypothesis. Macroevolution, therefore, can remain only as a hypothesis and a poor one at that.