

Comments and Quotations on Evolution

TAKE NOTE: Many of these quotations on this page have not been independently verified by the author of this website. Should you find any quotation that is inexact, please notify the Administrator and it shall be reviewed and, if it is found to be inaccurate it will be removed.

"The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination."—Dr. Fleischman [Erlangen zoologist].

"It is almost invariably assumed that animals with bodies composed of a single cell represent the primitive animals from which all others derived. They are commonly supposed to have preceded all other animal types in their appearance. There is not the slightest basis for this assumption."—Austin Clark, *The New Evolution* (1930), pp. 235-236.

"Yet Gould and the American Museum people are hard to contradict when they say there are no transitional fossils. As a paleontologist myself, I am much occupied with the philosophical problems of identifying ancestral forms in the fossil record. You say that I should at least 'show a photo of the fossil from which each type of organism was derived.' I will lay it on the line—there is *not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument.*" (Patterson, Colin, letter 10 April 1979, in Sunderland L.D., "Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems," [1984], Master Book Publishers: El Cajon CA, Fourth Edition, 1988, p89) (emphasis supplied). Dr. Colin Patterson was, during his lifetime, the Senior Palaeontologist of the British Museum of Natural History, London, England.

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ could not have been formed by numerous successive, slight modifications my theory absolutely would break down. Charles Darwin. *Origin of Species*, p.189 1st ed.

If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking most closely all the species of the same group together must assuredly have existed ... Consequently, evidence of their former existence could be found only amongst fossil remains.

Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, p. 179 1st ed.

If numerous species belonging to the same genera of families, have really started into life all at once, the fact would be fatal to the theory of descent with slow modification through natural selection. Charles Darwin *Origin of Species*, p. 302 (1st ed.).

A major problem in proving the theory has been the fossil record. This record has never revealed traces of Darwin's hypothetical intermediate variants. Instead species appear and disappear abruptly, and this anomaly has fueled the creationist argument that each species was created by God. Mark Czarnecki, McLean's January 19, 1981 p. 56

Why, if species have descended from other species by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? But as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?

Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, p. 172 1st ed.

The point emerges that if we examine the fossil record in detail, whether at the level of orders or of species, we find over and over again no gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another. Derek Ager Proceedings of the British Geological Association Vol 87, p. 133.

You can with equal facility model on a Neanderthaloid skull the features of a chimpanzee or the lineaments of a philosopher. These alleged restorations of ancient types of man have very little if any scientific value and are likely only to mislead the public. Earnest Hooten Up From the Ape, 1931, p 332

"When evolution is said to be a fact, not a theory, what is actually meant? That now-living things have descended from ancestors, with modification, over time? Or that the modifications came by chance, not by design? Or, in addition, that all living things ultimately had the same ancestor? Or, still further, that the 'first living thing' had as its ancestor a nonliving thing? Context indicates that when evolution is asserted to be a fact, not a theory, the view actually being pushed includes that of common origin, ultimate inorganic ancestry, and modification through nonpurposive mechanisms: a set of beliefs that goes far beyond the mountain of fact that is actually there, which consists largely of fossils that demonstrate some sort of relationship and some sort of change over time." (Bauer H.H., "Scientific Literacy and the Myth of the Scientific Method," [1992], University of Illinois Press: Urbana and Chicago IL, 1994, p.65).

"The hypothesis that life has developed from inorganic matter is, at present, still an article of faith."—J.W.N. Sullivan, The Limitations of Science (1933), p. 95.

"Where are we when presented with the

mystery of life? We find ourselves facing a granite wall which we have not even chipped . . . We know virtually nothing of growth, nothing of life."—W. Kaempffert, "The Greatest Mystery of All: The Secret of Life," New York Times.

"I think, however, that we must go further than this and admit that the only acceptable explanation is creation. I know that this is anathema to physicists, as indeed it is to me, but we must not reject a theory that we do not like if the experimental evidence supports it."—H. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," Physics Bulletin, 31 (1980), p. 138.

"I am not satisfied that Darwin proved his point or that his influence in scientific and public thinking has been beneficial . . . the success of Darwinism was accomplished by a decline in scientific integrity."—W.R. Thompson, Introduction to *Charles Darwin's, Origin of the Species [Canadian scientist].

"One of the determining forces of scientism was a fantastic accidental imagination which could explain every irregularity in the solar system without explanation, leap the gaps in the atomic series without evidence [a gap required by the Big Bang theory], postulate the discovery of fossils which have never been discovered, and prophesy the success of breeding experiments which have never succeeded. Of this kind of science it might truly be said that it was `knowledge falsely so called.' "—David C.C. Watson, The Great Brain Robbery (1976).

"The hold of the evolutionary paradigm [theoretical system] is so powerful that an idea which is more like a principle of medieval astrology than a serious twentieth century scientific theory has

become a reality for evolutionary biologists."—Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 306 [Australian molecular biologist].

"The particular truth is simply that we have no reliable evidence as to the evolutionary sequence . . . One can find qualified professional arguments for any group being the descendant of almost any other."—J. Bonner, "Book Review," *American Scientist*, 49:1961, p. 240.

"It was because Darwinian theory broke man's link with God and set him adrift in a cosmos without purpose or end that its impact was so fundamental. No other intellectual revolution in modern times . . . so profoundly affected the way men viewed themselves and their place in the universe."—Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 67 [Australian molecular biologist].

"I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning, consequently assumed it had none, and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption . . . The philosopher who finds no meaning in the world is not concerned exclusively with a problem in pure metaphysics; he is also concerned to prove there is no valid reason why he personally should not do as he wants to do . . . For myself, as no doubt for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our sexual freedom."—*Aldous Huxley, "Confessions of a Professed Atheist," *Report: Perspective on the News*, Vol. 3, June 1966, p. 19 [grandson of evolutionist Thomas Huxley, Darwin's

closest friend and promoter, and brother of evolutionist Julian Huxley. Aldous Huxley was one of the most influential liberal writers of the 20th century]. National center of Scientific Research in France].

"As by this theory, innumerable transitional forms must have existed. Why do we not find them embedded in the crust of the earth? Why is not all nature in confusion [of halfway species] instead of being, as we see them, well-defined species?"—Charles Darwin, quoted in H. Enoch, *Evolution or Creation* (1966), p. 139.

"`Creation,' in the ordinary sense of the word, is perfectly conceivable. I find no difficulty in conceiving that, at some former period, this universe was not in existence; and that it made its appearance in six days . . . in consequence of the volition of some pre-existing Being."—Thomas Huxley, quoted in *Leonard Huxley, *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley, Vol. II* (1903), p. 429.

"The theory of evolution suffers from grave defects, which are more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge."—Albert Fleishmann, Zoologist.

"I argue that the `theory of evolution' does not take predictions, so far as ecology is concerned, but is instead a logical formula which can be used only to classify empiricisms [theories] and to show the relationships which such a classification implies . . . these theories are actually tautologies and, as such, cannot make empirically testable predictions. They are not scientific theories at all."—R.H. Peters, "Tautology

in *Evolution and Ecology*," *American Naturalist* (1976), Vol. 110, No. 1, p. 1 [emphasis his].

"Scientists have no proof that life was not the result of an act of creation." Robert Jastrow, *The Enchanted Loom: Mind in the Universe* (1981), p. 19.

"In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to 'bend' their observations to fit in with it."—H. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin*, 31 (1980), p. 138.

"When Darwin presented a paper [with Alfred Wallace] to the Linnean Society in 1858, a Professor Haugton of Dublin remarked, 'All that was new was false, and what was true was old.' This, we think, will be the final verdict on the matter, the epitaph on Darwinism." Fred Hoyle and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe, *Evolution from Space* (1981), p. 159.

"The chance that higher life forms might have emerged by chance is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junkyard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein." Fred Hoyle, *Nature Magazine*, Nov. 12, 1981

"Creation and evolution, between them, exhaust the possible explanations for the origin of living things. Organisms either appeared on the earth fully developed or they did not. If they did not, they must have developed from pre-existing species by some process of modification. If they did appear in a fully developed state, they must have been created by some omnipotent intelligence."—D.J. Futuyma, *Science on Trial* (1983), p. 197.

"With the failure of these many efforts, science was left in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to postulate theories of living origins which it could not demonstrate. After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort, could not be proved to take place today had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past."—Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, (1957), p. 199.

"The over-riding supremacy of the myth has created a widespread illusion that the theory of evolution was all but proved one hundred years ago and that all subsequent biological research—paleontological, zoological, and in the newer branches of genetics and molecular biology—has provided ever-increasing evidence for Darwinian ideas."—Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1985), p. 327.

"The irony is devastating. The main purpose of Darwinism was to drive every last trace of an incredible God from biology. But the theory replaces God with an even more incredible deity—omnipotent chance."—T. Roszak, *Unfinished Animal* (1975), pp. 101-102.

"Today our duty is to destroy the myth of evolution, considered as a simple, understood and explained phenomenon which keeps rapidly unfolding before us. Biologists must be encouraged to think about the weaknesses and extrapolations that the theoreticians put forward or lay down as established truths. The deceit is sometimes unconscious, but not always, since some people, owing to their sectarianism, purposely overlook reality and refuse to acknowledge the

inadequacies and falsity of their beliefs."—Pierre-Paul de Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms* (1977), p. 8.

"The evolution theory can by no means be regarded as an innocuous natural philosophy, but that it is a serious obstruction to biological research. It obstructs—as has been repeatedly shown—the attainment of consistent results, even from uniform experimental material. For everything must ultimately be forced to fit this theory. An exact biology cannot, therefore, be built up."—H. Nilsson, *Synthetische Artbuilding*, 1954, p. 11.

"It is therefore of immediate concern to both biologists and layman that Darwinism is under attack. The theory of life that undermined nineteenth-century religion has virtually become a religion itself and, in its turn, is being threatened by fresh ideas. The attacks are certainly not limited to those of the creationists and religious fundamentalists who deny Darwinism for political and moral reason. The main thrust of the criticism comes from within science itself. The doubts about Darwinism represent a political revolt from within rather than a siege from without."—B. Leith, *The Descent of Darwin: A Handbook of Doubts about Darwinism* (1982), p. 11.

"My attempts to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for more than 40 years have completely failed. At least I should hardly be accused of having started from any preconceived anti-evolutionary standpoint."—H. Nilsson, *Synthetic Speciation* (1953), p. 31.

"Just as pre-Darwinian biology was carried out by people whose faith was in the Creator and His plan, post-Darwinian

biology is being carried out by people whose faith is in, almost, the deity of Darwin. They've seen their task as to elaborate his theory and to fill the gaps in it, to fill the trunk and twigs of the tree. But it seems to me that the theoretical framework has very little impact on the actual progress of the work in biological research. In a way some aspects of Darwinism and of neo-Darwinism seem to me to have held back the progress of science."—Colin Patterson, *The Listener* [senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, London].

"Throughout the past century there has always existed a significant minority of first-rate biologists who have never been able to bring themselves to accept the validity of Darwinian claims. In fact, the number of biologists who have expressed some degree of disillusionment is practically endless."—Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis* (1986), p. 327.

"I personally hold the evolutionary position, but yet lament the fact that the majority of our Ph.D. graduates are frightfully ignorant of many of the serious problems of the evolution theory. These problems will not be solved unless we bring them to the attention of students. Most students assume evolution is proved, the missing link is found, and all we have left is a few rough edges to smooth out. Actually, quite the contrary is true; and many recent discoveries . . . have forced us to re-evaluate our basic assumptions."—Director of a large graduate program in biology, quoted in *Creation: The Cutting Edge* (1982), p. 26.

"The creation account in Genesis and the theory of evolution could not be reconciled. One must be right and the

other wrong. The story of the fossils agreed with the account of Genesis. In the oldest rocks we did not find a series of fossils covering the gradual changes from the most primitive creatures to developed forms, but rather in the oldest rocks developed species suddenly appeared. Between every species there was a complete absence of intermediate fossils."—D.B. Gower, "Scientist Rejects Evolution," *Kentish Times*, England, December 11, 1975, p. 4 [biochemist].

"From the almost total absence of fossil evidence relative to the origin of the phyla, it follows that any explanation of the mechanism in the creative evolution of the fundamental structural plans is heavily burdened with hypothesis. This should appear as an epigraph to every book on evolution. The lack of direct evidence leads to the formulation of pure conjecture as to the genesis of the phyla; we do not even have a basis to determine the extent to which these opinions are correct."—Pierre-Paul de Grasse, *Evolution of Living Organisms* (1977), p. 31.

"We still do not know the mechanics of evolution in spite of the over-confident claims in some quarters, nor are we likely to make further progress in this by the classical methods of paleontology or biology; and we shall certainly not advance matters by jumping up and down shrilling, 'Darwin is god and I, So-and-so, am his prophet.'"—Errol White, *Proceedings of the Linnean Society*, London, 177:8 (1966).

"I feel that the effect of hypotheses of common ancestry in systematics has not been merely boring, not just a lack of knowledge; I think it has been positively anti-knowledge . . . Well, what about evolution? It certainly has the function of knowledge, but does it convey any? Well,

we are back to the question I have been putting to people, 'Is there one thing you can tell me about?' The absence of answers seems to suggest that it is true, evolution does not convey any knowledge."—Colin Patterson, Director AMNH, Address at the American Museum of Natural History (November 5, 1981).

"What is it [evolution] based upon? Upon nothing whatever but faith, upon belief in the reality of the unseen—belief in the fossils that cannot be produced, belief in the embryological experiments that refuse to come off. It is faith unjustified by works."—Arthur N. Field.

It seems disconcerting that many exceptions exist to the orderly progression of species as determined by molecular homologies; so many in fact that I think the exception, the quirks, may carry the more important message". (Biochemist & Evolutionist, Christian Schwabe, Medical University of S. Carolina, 'On the Validity of Molecular Evolution', Trends in Biochemical Sciences, Vol. 11, No. 7, July 1986)

&It is quite obvious that modern man could not have arisen from any ape, let alone monkey, at all similar to those of today ... it is ridiculous to describe man as a 'naked' or any other kind of ape". (Paleoanthropologist & Evolutionist, Joseph S. Weiner, The Natural History of Man, New York: Universe Books, 1971, p.33)

"If a million cortical nerve cells were connected one with another in groups of only two neurons each in all possible combinations, the number of different patterns of interneuronic connection thus

provided would be expressed by 102,783,000. This, of course, is not the actual structure, as we shall see; but the illustration may serve to impress upon us the inconceivable complexity of the interconnections of the ninety-two hundred million (9,200,000,000) nerve cells known to exist in the cerebral cortex." (C. Judson Herrick, Prof. of Neurology, University of Chicago, Brains of Rats and Man: A survey of the Origin and Biological Significance of the Cerebral Cortex, New York: Hafner Publishing Co. 1963, p.5)

"In man is a three-pound brain which, as far as we know, is the most complex and orderly arrangement of matter in the universe". (Prof. Dr. Isaac Asimov, Biochemist & atheist author, In the game of Energy and Thermodynamics You can't even break even, Smithsonian, June 1970, p.10)

"In crude terms, the human brain is a natural computer composed of 10-100 billion neurons, each of which connects to about 10,000 others, and all of which function in parallel ... Neuronal systems take about 100 processing steps to perform a complex tasks of vision or speech which would take an electronic computer billions of processing steps. (Michael Recce & Philip Treleavan, Computing from the brain, New Scientist, Vol. 118, No. 1614, May 26 1988, p. 61)

"The brain, from being an instrument fit for anthropoids, passed on to a state in which the range of feeling, understanding, and of manipulative skill, became fit for men. To ask me to believe that the evolution of man has been determined by a series of chance events is to invite me to give credit to what is biologically unbelievable." (Keith, Sir Arthur. [British anthropologist and leading Darwinist], "Replies to Critics," in

"Essays on Human Evolution," [1946],
Watts & Co: London, Third Impression,
1947, p.217)

"As one great student of paleoneurology,
Dr. Tilly Edinger, recently remarked, "If
man has passed through a
Pithecanthropus phase, the evolution of
his brain has been unique, not only in its
result but also in its tempo....

Enlargement of the cerebral hemispheres
by 50 per cent seems to have taken
place, speaking geologically, within an
instant, and without having been
accompanied by any major increase in
body size." The true secret of Piltdown,
though thought by the public to be
merely the revelation of an unscrupulous
forgery, lies in the fact that it has forced
science to reexamine carefully the
history of the most remarkable creation
in the world-the human brain." (Eiseley,
Loren C. [Professor of Anthropology,
University of Pennsylvania], "The Real
Secret of Piltdown," in "The Immense
Journey," [1946], Vintage: New York NY,
1957, reprint, pp.93-94. Ellipses
Eiseley's)

"Life cannot have had a random
beginning ... The trouble is that there are
about two thousand enzymes, and the
chance of obtaining them all in a random
trial is only one part in $10^{40,000}$, an
outrageously small probability that could
not be faced even if the whole universe
consisted of organic soup."

"If one proceeds directly and
straightforwardly in this matter, without
being deflected by a fear of incurring the
wrath of scientific opinion, one arrives at
the conclusion that biomaterialists with
their amazing measure of order must be
the outcome of intelligent design. ...
problems of order, such as the sequences
of amino acids in the chains ... are
precisely the problems that become easy
once a directed intelligence enters the
picture. (Fred Hoyle & N. Chandra

Wickramasinghe, Astronomers,
Mathematicians & Cosmologists,
University College Cardiff, Evolution from
Space, J. M. Dent & Sons 1981, and in
The Omni Lecture, :And Other Papers on
the Origin of Life, Enslow Publishers
1982, p. 27-28)

"The likelihood of the formation of life
from inanimate matter is one to a
number with 40,000 naughts after it ... It
is big enough to bury Darwin and the
whole theory of Evolution. ... if the
beginnings of life were not random, they
must therefore have been the product of
purposeful intelligence. (Sir Fred Hole,
Astronomer, Cosmologist &
Mathematician, Cambridge Un iv.)

"However, the macromolecule-to-cell
transition is a jump of fantastic
dimensions, which lies beyond the range
of testable hypothesis. In this area, all is
conjecture. The available facts do not
provide a basis for postulating that cells
arose on this planet ... We simply wish to
point out the fact that there is no
scientific evidence. (David E. Green &
Robert F. Goldberger, Biochemists and
Evolutionists, Un iv. of Wisconsin and
National Institutes of Health, Bethesda,
Maryland, Molecular Insights into the
Living Process, New York, Academic
Press, 1967, pp. 406-407)

"In fact, the probability of the formation
of a protein and a nucleic acid (DNA-
RNA) is a probability way beyond
estimate. Furthermore, the chance of the
emergence of a certain protein chain is
so slight as to be called astronomic." (Ali
Demirsoy, Kalitim ve Evrim (Inheritance
and Evolution), Ankara: Meteksan
Publishing Co., 1984, p. 39.)

"We have repeatedly emphasized the
fundamental problems posed for the

biologist by the fact of life's complex organization. We have seen that organization requires work for its maintenance and that the universal quest for food is in part to provide the energy needed for this work. But the simple expenditure of energy is not sufficient to develop and maintain order. A bull in a china shop performs work, but he neither creates nor maintains organization. The work needed is particular work; it must follow specifications; it requires information on how to proceed."
(Simpson, George Gaylord [Professor of Vertebrate Paleontology, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University] & Beck, William S. [Harvard University] , "Life: An Introduction To Biology," [1957], Routledge & Kegan Paul: London, Second Edition, 1965, p.466)

"Any living being possesses an enormous amount of "intelligence," very much more than is necessary to build the most magnificent of cathedrals. Today, this "intelligence" is called "information," but it is still the same thing. It is not programmed as in a computer, but rather it is condensed on a molecular scale in the chromosomal DNA or in that of any other organelle in each cell. This "intelligence" is the sine qua non of life. If absent, no living being is imaginable. Where does it come from? This is a problem which concerns both biologists and philosophers and, at present, science seems incapable of solving it."

"When we consider a human work, we believe we know where the 'intelligence' which fashioned it comes from; but when a living being is concerned, no one knows or ever knew, neither Darwin nor Epicurus, neither Leibniz nor Aristotle, neither Einstein nor Parmenides. An act of faith is necessary to make us adopt one hypothesis rather than another.

Science, which does not accept any credo, or in any case should not, acknowledges its ignorance, its inability to solve this problem which, we are certain, exists and has reality. If to determine the origin of information in a computer is not a false problem, why should the search for the information contained in cellular nuclei be one?"

"Through use and abuse of hidden postulates, of bold, often ill-founded extrapolations, a pseudoscience has been created. It is taking root in the very heart of biology and is leading astray many biochemists and biologists, who sincerely believe that the accuracy of fundamental concepts has been demonstrated, which is not the case."
(Grasse, Pierre-P., [editor of the 28-volume "Traite de Zoologie," former Chair of Evolution, Sorbonne University and ex-president of the French Academie des Sciences], "Evolution of Living Organisms: Evidence for a New Theory of Transformation," [1973], Academic Press: New York NY, 1977, p2)

"It was already clear that the genetic code is not merely an abstraction but the embodiment of life's mechanisms; the consecutive triplets of nucleotides in DNA (called codons) are inherited but they also guide the construction of proteins. So it is disappointing, but not surprising, that the origin of the genetic code is still as obscure as the origin of life itself."
(Maddox, John, "The Genesis Code by Numbers," Nature, vol. 367 (January 13, 1994))

"DNA cannot do its work, including forming more DNA, without the help of catalytic proteins, or enzymes. In short, proteins cannot form without DNA, but neither can DNA form without proteins."
(Klaus Dose, "The Origin of Life: More

Questions Than Answers",
Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, cilt 13,
no. 4, 1988, p. 348)

"The [genetic] code is meaningless unless translated. The modern cell's translating machinery consists of at least fifty macromolecular components WHICH ARE THEMSELVES CODED IN DNA: THE CODE CANNOT BE TRANSLATED OTHERWISE THAN BY PRODUCTS OF TRANSLATION. It is the modern expression of omne vivum ex ovo. When and how did this circle become closed? It is exceedingly difficult to imagine."
Jaques Monod (1972), Chance and Necessity, Collins London, pp 134-135
(emphasis in original)

"What's in a word? Several nucleotides, some researchers might say. By applying statistical methods developed by linguists, investigators have found that 'junk' parts of the genomes of many organisms may be expressing a language. These regions have traditionally been regarded as useless accumulations of material from millions of years of evolution. 'The feeling is,' says Boston University physicist H. Eugene Stanley, 'that there's something going on in the noncoding region.'" Junk DNA got its name because the nucleotides there (the fundamental pieces of DNA, combined into so-called base pairs) do not encode instructions for making proteins, the basis for life. In fact, the vast majority of genetic material in organisms from bacteria to mammals consists of noncoding DNA segments, which are interspersed with the coding parts. In humans, about 97 percent of the genome is junk. Over the past 10 years, biologists began to suspect that this feature is not entirely trivial." (Yam, Philip, "Talking Trash," Scientific American, vol. 272 (March 1995))

"Generation after generation, through countless cell divisions, the genetic heritage of living things is scrupulously preserved in DNA ... All of life depends on the accurate transmission of information. As genetic messages are passed through generations of dividing cells, even small mistakes can be life-threatening ... if mistakes were as rare as one in a million, 3000 mistakes would be made during each duplication of the human genome. Since the genome replicates about a million billion times in the course of building a human being from a single fertilized egg, it is unlikely that the human organism could tolerate such a high rate of error. In fact, the actual rate of mistakes is more like one in 10 billion." (Miroslav Radman and Robert Wagner, The High Fidelity of DNA Duplication...Scientific America. Vol. 299, No 2 (August 1988, pp 40-44. Quote is from page 24))

" 'Survival of the fittest' and 'natural selection.' No matter what phraseology one generates, the basic fact remains the same: any physical change of any size, shape or form is strictly the result of purposeful alignment of billions of nucleotides (in the DNA). Nature or species do not have the capacity for rearranging them, nor adding to them. Consequently no leap (saltation) can occur from one species to another. The only way we know for a DNA to be altered is through a meaningful intervention from an outside source of intelligence: one who knows what it is doing, such as our genetic engineers are now performing in their laboratories." (Cohen, I.L., Mathematician & Researcher, Member of the New York Academy of Sciences, (1984), Darwin Was Wrong: A Study in Probabilities, New York: NW Research Publications, Inc., p. 209)

"The origin of the [genetic] code is

perhaps the most perplexing problem in evolutionary biology. The existing translational machinery is at the same time so complex, so universal) and so essential that it is hard to see how it could have come into existence or how life could have existed without it. The discovery of ribozymes has made it easier to imagine an answer to the second of these questions, but the transformation of an 'RNA world' into one in which catalysis is performed by proteins, and nucleic acids specialize in the transmission of information, remains a formidable problem." (Maynard Smith, John [Emeritus Professor of Biology at the University of Sussex] & Szathmary, Eors [Institute for Advanced Study, Budapest, "The Major Transitions in Evolution," W.H. Freeman: Oxford UK, 1995, p.81)

"Biochemists and biologists who adhere blindly to the Darwinism theory search for results that will be in agreement with their theories and consequently orient their research in a given direction, whether it be in the field of ecology, ethology, sociology, demography (dynamics of populations), genetics (so-called evolutionary genetics), or paleontology. This intrusion of theories has unfortunate results: it deprives observations and experiments of their objectivity, makes them biased, and, moreover, creates false problems."

"Today, our duty is to destroy the myth of evolution, considered as a simple, understood, and explained phenomenon which keeps rapidly unfolding before us. Biologists must be encouraged to think about the weaknesses of the interpretations and extrapolations that theoreticians put forward or lay down as established truths. The deceit is sometimes unconscious, but not always, since some people, owing to their sectarianism, purposely overlook reality and refuse to acknowledge the

inadequacies and the falsity of their beliefs." (Grasse, Pierre-P., [editor of the 28-volume "Traite de Zoologie," former Chair of Evolution, Sorbonne University and ex-president of the French Academie des Sciences], "Evolution of Living Organisms: Evidence for a New Theory of Transformation," [1973], Academic Press: New York NY, 1977, p2, 2, 7, 8)

"When I began my career as a cosmologist some twenty years ago, I was a convinced atheist. I never in my wildest dreams imagined that one day I would be writing a book purporting to show that the central claims of Judeo-Christian theology are in fact true, that these claims are straightforward deductions of the laws of physics as we now understand them. I have been forced into these conclusions by the inexorable logic of my own special branch of physics." (Frank J. Tipler, Professor of Mathematical Physics, 1994, The Physics Of Immortality. New York, Doubleday, Preface.)

"From my earliest training as a scientist, I was very strongly brainwashed to believe that science cannot be consistent with any kind of deliberate creation. That notion has had to be painfully shed. "At the moment, I can't find any rational argument to knock down the view which argues for conversion to God. We used to have an open mind; now we realize that the only logical answer to life is creation--and not accidental random shuffling." (Wickramasinghe, C., Interview in London Daily Express (August 14, 1981), Wickramasinghe is Professor of Applied Math & Astronomy, University College, Cardiff, UK.)

So one is forced to conclude that there is no clear cut scientific picture of human evolution. (Dr. R. Martin, Senior Researcher Fellow at the Zoological Society of London, Man is not an onion,

New Scientist, Vol. 75, No. 1063, August 1977, p.285)

The speculations of The Origin of Species turned out to be wrong ... the scientific facts throw Darwin out. Fred Hoyle & Chandra Wickramasinghe, Evolution from Space, London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1981, pp. 96-97)

The quotation "Evolution is a fairy tale for grownups" was probably inaccurately attributed to Louis Bounoure, a French Biologist. The following quotations are probably the source of that inaccurately attributed, but nevertheless true, quotation:

"Transformism [evolution] is a fairy tale for adults." Jean Rostand, an atheist French biologist (he was a member of the Academy of Sciences of the French Academy). The precise quotation is as follows: "Transformism is a fairy tale for adults." (Age Nouveau, [a French periodical] February 1959, p. 12).

" ... evolutionism would appear as a theory without value, is confirmed also pragmatically. A theory must not be required to be true, said Mr. H. Poincare, more or less, it must be required to be useable. Indeed, none of the progress made in biology depends even slightly on a theory, the principles of which are nevertheless filling every year volumes of books, periodicals, and congresses with their discussions and their disagreements." Bounoure, Prof. Louis, *Determinism and Finality*, edited by Flammarion, 1957, p. 79. Louis Bounoure was a professor at the University of Strasbourg.

"It results from this explanation that the theory of evolution is not exact ... Evolution is a kind of dogma which its own priests no longer believe, but which they uphold for the people. It is necessary to have the courage to state this if only so that men of a future generation may orient their research into

a different direction." Paul Lemoine, a director of the French National Museum of Natural History, Encyclopedie Francaise [French Encyclopedia, circa 1950s], volume 5

"Any suppression which undermines and destroys that very foundation on which scientific methodology and research was erected, evolutionist or otherwise, cannot and must not be allowed to flourish ... It is a confrontation between scientific objectivity and ingrained prejudice - between logic and emotion - between fact and fiction ... In the final analysis, objective scientific logic has to prevail - no matter what the final result is - no matter how many time-honoured idols have to be discarded in the process ... After all, it is not the duty of science to defend the theory of evolution and stick by it to the bitter end -no matter what illogical and unsupported conclusions it offers ... If in the process of impartial scientific logic, they find that creation by outside intelligence is the solution to our quandary, then let's cut the umbilical chord that tied us down to Darwin for such a long time. It is choking us and holding us back ... Every single concept advanced by the theory of evolution (and amended thereafter) is imaginary as it is not supported by the scientifically established probability concepts. Darwin was wrong... The theory of evolution may be the worst mistake made in science." (I.L.Cohen, Mathematician & Researcher, Member of the New York Academy of Sciences and Officer of the Archaeological Institute of America, Darwin Was Wrong - A Study in Probabilities, PO Box 231, Greenvale, New York 11548: New Research Publications, Inc. pp 6-8, 209-210, 214-215..)

"With the failure of these many efforts [to explain the origin of life] science was left in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to postulate theories

of living origins which it could not demonstrate. After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort, could not be proved to take place today had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past." (Eiseley, Loren C., [late Professor of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania], "The Immense Journey," [1946], Vintage: New York NY, 1957, reprint, p.199)

One is forced to conclude that many scientists and technologists pay lip-service to Darwinian Theory only because it supposedly excludes a Creator from yet another area of material phenomena, and not because it has been paradigmatic in establishing the canons of research in the life sciences and the earth sciences" (Dr. Michael Walker, Senior Lecturer, Anthropology, Sydney University. Quadrant, October 1981, page 45)

"We have had enough of the Darwinian fallacy. It is time that we cry: 'The emperor has no clothes.'" (K.Hsu, geologist at the Geological Institute at Zurich)

"Scientists who go about teaching that Evolution is a fact of life are great con men, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution we do not have one iota of fact."

(Dr T N Tahmisian, a former U.S. Atomic Energy Commission physiologist, in 'The Fresno Bee', August 20 1959. As quoted by N.J. Mitchell, Evolution and the Emperor's New Clothes, Roydon publications, UK, 1983, title page)

"Things get rapidly worse when we use

longer messages. We will let Charlie try for a bit of Hamlet. The phrase "to be or not to be" has 18 characters, if we count the spaces as characters. The chances that our chimp will type this out are 1 in 4518, or 1 in 6×10^9 . At one try per second, it will take poor Charlie more than 1022 years to do that number of tries. Should the open model for the universe be correct, Charlie will still be typing away long after the stars have ceased to shine and all the planets have been dispersed into space through stellar near-collisions."

(Shapiro, Robert. [Professor of Chemistry, New York University], "Origins: A Skeptic's Guide to the Origin of Life," Summit Books: New York NY, 1986, p.169)

"...The "warm little pond" scenario was invented ad hoc to serve as a materialistic reductionist explanation of the origin of life. It is unsupported by any other evidence and it will remain ad hoc until such evidence is found. Even if it existed, as described in the scenario, it nevertheless falls very far short indeed of achieving the purpose of its authors even with the aid of a deus ex machina. One must conclude that, contrary to the established and current wisdom, a scenario describing the genesis of life on earth by chance and natural causes which can be accepted on the basis of fact and not faith has not yet been written."

(Hubert P. Lockley, A Calculation of the Probability of Spontaneous Biogenesis by Information Theory, Journal of Theoretical Biology, Vol. 67, 1977, p. 398)

In a popular lecture I once unflatteringly described the thinking of these scientists as a "junkyard mentality". As this reference became widely and not quite accurately quoted I will repeat it here. A junkyard contains all the bits and pieces

of a Boeing 747, dismembered and in disarray. A whirlwind happens to blow through the yard. What is the chance that after its passage a fully assembled 747, ready to fly, will be found standing there? So small as to be negligible, even if a tornado were to blow through enough junkyards to fill the whole Universe. "

(Hoyle F., "The Intelligent Universe," Michael Joseph: London, 1983, pp.18-19)

"...as biochemists discover more and more about the awesome complexity of life, it is apparent that its chances of originating by accident are so minute that they can be completely ruled out. Life could not have arisen by chance." (Astronomer Fred Hoyle, Univ. College Cardiff, UK, from his book The Intelligent Universe, as quoted in Created Evolution by Mick James, 1992, Fidonet Science Echo)

"I would say the universe has a purpose. It's not there just somehow by chance." (R. Penrose, mathematician and author, 1992, A Brief History of Time (movie), Burbank, CA, Paramount Pictures, Inc.)

"Generation after generation, through countless cell divisions, the genetic heritage of living things is scrupulously preserved in DNA ... All of life depends on the accurate transmission of information. As genetic messages are passed through generations of dividing cells, even small mistakes can be life-threatening ... if mistakes were as rare as one in a million, 3000 mistakes would be made during each duplication of the human genome. Since the genome replicates about a million billion times in the course of building a human being from a single fertilized egg, it is unlikely that the human organism could tolerate such a high rate of error. In fact, the

actual rate of mistakes is more like one in 10 billion."

(Miroslav Radman and Robert Wagner, The High Fidelity of DNA Duplication...Scientific America. Vol. 299, No 2 (August 1988, pp 40-44. Quote is from page 24))

"The doctrine of evolution is directly antagonistic to that of creation. Evolution consistently accepted makes it impossible to believe the Bible"

(The father of evolution (Darwin's Bulldog), Thomas H Huxley, in the 19th century)

" Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, which is unthinkable!"

(Sir Arthur Keith FRS, Anthropologist & Chairman of the Piltdown hoax 1920's investigation, Darwinian)

"The only competing explanation for the order we all see in the biological world is the notion of Special Creation"

(Niles Eldridge Ph.D., evolutionary paleontologist and curator of the American Museum of Natural History (friend & co-writer with Harvard's Stephen Gould) in the late 20th century:

"...I'm speaking on two subjects, evolutionism and creationism, and I believe it's true to say that I know nothing whatever about either...One of the reasons I started taking this anti-evolutionary view, well, let's call it non-evolutionary, was last year I had a sudden realization For over twenty years I had thought that I was working on evolution in some way. One morning I woke up, and something had happened in the night, and it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for twenty

years, and there was not one thing I knew about it..... That was quite a shock that one could be misled for so long...

"...I've tried putting a simple question to various people and groups of people: 'Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing, any one thing you think is true?' I tried that question on the geology staff in the Field Museum of Natural History, and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time, and then eventually one person said: 'Yes, I do know one thing. It ought not to be taught in high school.'

"...It does seem that the level of knowledge about evolution is remarkably shallow. We know it ought not to be taught in high school, and perhaps that's all we know about it...about eighteen months ago...I woke up and I realized that all my life I had been duped into taking evolutionism as revealed truth in some way."

(Dr. Colin Patterson, Senior Paleontologist, British Museum of Natural History in London, during a presentation on 5 November 1981, at New York City's American Museum of Natural History.)

Written by Charles R. Chesnutt, Sr.
Mr. Chesnutt's professional website is Chapter7-11.com
See also Biblebooks.co

[CLICK TO GO TO CreationDesign.org](http://CreationDesign.org)

THIS DOCUMENT, IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM, MAY BE EMAILED, REPRODUCED, DISPLAYED, PROJECTED, PRINTED, COPIED OR DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM THE PUBLISHER. HOWEVER, IT MAY NOT BE SOLD. ALL OTHER RIGHTS RESERVED. ©2012 CHARLES CHESNUTT