



*“If you make up a story that isn’t true,
handing it down over a number of
centuries doesn’t make it any truer!”*

—RICHARD DAWKINS

Introduction



nce upon a time there was a man who became disillusioned about God. Instead of believing that God made everything we see, he formed a theory that all this amazing order and complexity came from nothing and randomly evolved over time. As time passed, many people began to believe that this theory was actually true . . . a scientifically verifiable fact. *Evolution: A Fairy Tale for Grownups* will show you, *from the mouths of experts*, that Darwin's theory is still just that—a theory. It will shake your faith in the theory, because if you believe that Darwinian evolution is scientifically defensible, your faith is completely unfounded.

This book will no doubt be seen by some as “quote mining.” This is the practice of taking a quote (often out of its context), and using it in a way that was never intended by the author. However, every gold nugget is legitimately mined out of its context. No one seriously values the earth that encases the gold. So, when I uncover an evolutionary expert quietly admitting that he has no evidence to back up his theory, I don't see any value in the soil of his surrounding words. I merely extract what I believe is of value for those who want to discover the truth about the theory of evolution.

Many who hear about evolution often are not sure what these scientific phrases mean. So, in an effort to

broaden our understanding of the issues, here is a very short lesson on the basics. A “transitional form” is a fossil showing one form of life evolving (or changing) to create another, new form of life. Darwinian evolution (as proposed by Charles Darwin) states that mankind and primates (the monkey family) have a common ancestor. To back up the theory, some evolutionists have even created full-color illustrations of hunched apes growing taller over millions of years, then standing upright. To be very simplistic: the universe began with a “big bang” where something suddenly came from nothing, and from there water formed, primitive life appeared in the water, it came up on land, became male and female primates, then eventually evolved into modern man. In other words, simple life forms “transitioned” from one species into another until apes became men and women. However, there is a big problem for those who believe this theory. Scientists can’t find any legitimate “missing link” between apes and man in the fossil record. Fossils provide the historical record of plants, animals, and human bones that lie beneath the soil or in the rocks.

After searching and studying quotes from paleontologists, I am convinced that those who spout evolution are guilty of paleontological quackery. Most of them would put Disney “imagineers” out of work. For years I have listened to poker-faced evolutionists’ bluffing that they had a “few” transitional forms that could fit “inside a single coffin.” But after doing some research, I know that they have nothing in their hand. They are bankrupt. There are no uncontested transitional forms in the fossil record. The following quote from Indiana University’s website explains:

According to the theory of evolution, the “descent with modification” road to humans (or any other group, for that matter) is paved with a sequence of transitional fossils . . . But fortunately, *some* members of some of those groups were fossilized, and *a few of those* are found from time to time, giving us the *hit-or-miss, very spotty record* of fossils which has led us to *hypothesize* [imagine] that picture of a branched tree of being which we call evolution (emphasis added).¹

The problem is that the transitional forms in the fossil record aren’t “few,” “hit or miss,” or “very spotty.” They’re simply absent altogether. They don’t exist, except in the imaginations of those who represent this pseudo-science called “Evolution.”

I’ve also observed that believers in evolution speak the language of the founder of their faith—something I call “the language of speculation.” This dialect is made up of words such as “we believe,” “perhaps,” “maybe,” “possibly,” etc. Darwin’s *Origin of Species* uses the language of speculation around 800 times.² Modern speculations of evolution are nebulous—they are like puffy white clouds. They look impressive until you study them and see that they change with the wind.

1. Larry Flammer, “Classroom Cladogram of Vertebrate/Human Evolution” <www.indiana.edu/~ensiweb/lessons/c.bkgrnd.html>.

2. “It has been estimated that no fewer than 800 phrases in the subjunctive mood (such as ‘*Let us assume,*’ or ‘*We may well suppose,*’ etc.) are to be found between the covers of Darwin’s alone.”—L. Merson Davies, *The Bible and Modern Science* (London: Pickering and Inglis, 1953), p. 7.

In 1982 a Gallup Poll asked Americans if they believed that God created mankind. An amazing 82 percent said that they believed He did. Thirty-five years later, in 2007, the same question was asked, and 81 percent said they thought that God created man.³ So despite more than fifty years of school children and television viewers being force-fed evolution, belief in the theory increased only 1 percent. It seems that the average American isn't easily fooled.

I don't claim to be a great expert on the subject of evolution, but I have quoted well-known evolutionists who are. They reveal *in their own words* the unscientific nature of that in which they have so blindly placed their faith. So it's now up to you to make a choice about whether you are a believer or not, and then follow the implications. All I ask is that, as you read this book, you keep in mind the wise words of Richard Dawkins: "And, next time somebody tells you that something is true, why not say to them: 'What kind of evidence is there for that?' And if they can't give you a good answer, I hope you'll think very carefully before you believe a word they say."

3. "Evolution, Creationism, Intelligent Design" <www.gallup.com/poll/21814/Evolution-Creationism-Intelligent-Design.aspx>.

QUESTION 1

In what year did *USA Today* report: “Paleontologists have discovered a new skeleton in the closet of human ancestry that is likely to force science to revise, if not scrap, current theories of human origins”? The discovery left scientists confused, saying, “Lucy may not even be a direct human ancestor after all.” (A.) 2001. (B.) 1991. (C.) 1981.

ANSWER: (A.) 2001 (Tim Friend, “Discovery rocks human-origin theories,” *USA Today*, March 21, 2001 <www.usatoday.com/news/science/2001-03-21-skull.htm>).

IN-DEPTH COMMENTS:

“Paleontologists in Africa have found a 3.5-million-year-old skull from what they say is an entirely new branch of the early human family tree, a discovery that threatens to overturn the prevailing view that a single line of descent stretched through the early stages of human ancestry. The discoverers and other scientists of human evolution say they are not necessarily surprised by the findings, but certainly confused. Now it seems that the fossil species *Australopithecus afarensis*, which lived from about four million to three million years ago and is best known from the celebrated Lucy skeleton, was not



alone on the African plain. Lucy may not even be a direct human ancestor after all.”

—John Noble Wilford, “Skull May Alter Experts’ View of Human Descent’s Branches,” *The New York Times*, March 22, 2001.

“The evidence given above makes it overwhelmingly likely that Lucy was no more than a variety of pygmy chimpanzee, and walked the same way (awkwardly upright on occasions, but mostly quadrupedal). The ‘evidence’ for the alleged transformation from ape to man is extremely unconvincing.”

—Albert W. Mehlert (paleoanthropology researcher), “Lucy: Evolution’s Solitary Claim for Ape/Man,” *CRS Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 3, p. 145.

“Evidence from fossils now points overwhelmingly away from the classical Darwinism which most Americans learned in high school . . . The missing link between man and the apes . . . is merely the most glamorous of a whole hierarchy of phantom creatures. In the fossil record, missing links are the rule . . . The more scientists have searched for the transitional forms between species, the more they have been frustrated.”

—Jerry Adler, “Is Man a Subtle Accident?” *Newsweek*, November 3, 1980.

QUESTION 2

Who said it? “An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that, in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which

would have had to have been satisfied to get it going.”
(A.) Richard Dawkins. (B.) Francis Crick. (C.) Carl Sagan.

ANSWER: (B.) Francis Crick (*Life Itself, Its Origin and Nature*, 1981, p. 88). Francis Crick (1916–2004) was an English molecular biologist, physicist, and neuroscientist who is most noted for being one of the co-discoverers of the structure of the DNA molecule in 1953. He, James D. Watson, and Maurice Wilkins were jointly awarded the 1962 Nobel Prize for Physiology or Medicine “for their discoveries concerning the molecular structure of nucleic acids and its significance for information transfer in living material.”

IN-DEPTH COMMENT:

“Leslie Orgel is one of the leading figures in origin-of-life research since many years, and he is one of several researchers who independently from each other proposed in the 1960s the RNA world as a precursor of the current DNA/protein world. Gerald Joyce is also a top scientist in the field. The authors argue in a joint article published in *The RNA World*, 2nd edition (2000), p. 68, on solid chemical grounds that, because of the complex and stereospecific chemistry required, ‘the de novo appearance of oligonucleotides on the primitive earth would have been a near miracle.’... They go on to say that although the presumed RNA World should be considered a milestone and a plateau in the early history of the earth, the concept ‘does not explain how life originated’ (p.74). They conclude (p. 74): ‘One can sketch out a logical order of events, beginning with prebiotic chemistry and ending with DNA/protein based life. However,

it must be said that the details of these events remain obscure and are not likely to be known in the near future.’”

—Albrecht Moritz, “The Origin of Life,” October 31, 2006
<www.talkorigins.org/faqs/abioprob/originoflife.html>.

QUESTION 3

Fill in the blank. Well-known evolutionary paleontologist David Kitts said, “Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of ‘seeing’ evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists the most notorious of which is the presence of ‘gaps’ in the fossil record. Evolution requires _____ between species and paleontology does not provide them.”

- (A.) missing links. (B.) much more fossil evidence.
(C.) intermediate forms.

ANSWER: (C.) intermediate forms (*Evolution*, Vol. 28, September 1974, p. 467). Although faced with no paleontological way to show one species changing into another, Kitts holds on to his belief in evolution.

IN-DEPTH COMMENTS:

“Given the fact of evolution, one would expect the fossils to document a gradual steady change from ancestral forms to the descendants. But this is not what the paleontologist finds. Instead, he or she finds gaps in just about every phyletic series.”

—Ernst Mayr (Professor Emeritus, Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University), *What Evolution Is*, 2001, p. 14.

“A persistent problem in evolutionary biology has been the absence of intermediate forms in the fossil record. Long-term gradual transformations of single lineages are rare and generally involve simple size increase or trivial phenotypic effects. Typically, the record consists of successive ancestor-descendant lineages, morphologically invariant through time and unconnected by intermediates.”

—P. G. Williamson, *Palaeontological Documentation of Speciation in Cenozoic Molluscs from Turkana Basin*, 1982, p. 163.

“The majority of major groups appear suddenly in the rocks, with virtually no evidence of transition from their ancestors.”

—D. Futuyma, *Science on Trial: The Case for Evolution*, 1983, p. 82.

QUESTION 4

Fill in the blank. Evolutionist Dr. Tim White, an anthropologist at the University of California, Berkeley, said, “The problem with a lot of anthropologists is that they want so much to find a hominid⁴ that _____.” (A.) they unfortunately stretch the facts. (B.) they jump ahead of themselves. (C.) any scrap of bone becomes a hominid bone.

ANSWER: (C.) any scrap of bone becomes a hominid bone (“Hominoid collarbone exposed as dolphin’s rib,” *New Scientist*, April 28, 1983, p. 199).

4. A hominid is any member of the biological family Hominidae (the “great apes”), and includes modern and extinct humans, chimpanzees, gorillas, and orangutans.