

Science Supports Literal Genesis

Joseph Mastropaolo, Ph.D.

Abstract. Natural science indicated that Adam and Eve were created fully human and genetically perfect whereas all so-called ape-men were frauds or forgeries. Claims for evolution found in biology textbooks were based 12% on superstitions, 74% on frauds, and 14% on forgeries.

Methods to determine the age of the Earth were tested scientifically for objectivity, validity, reliability, and calibration. The indirect methods of the 19th and 20th centuries failed those tests whereas the direct historical method passed all tests. Therefore, scientists are obliged to accept $6,800 \pm 850$ years as the age of the Earth.

Natural science supported religion in general and particularly the literal reading of Genesis. The conflicts were between religion and the anti-science, evolution, and between natural science and the anti-science, evolution.

I.

Introduction. Until the Galileo affair, biblical scholars read Genesis literally. After Galileo and the public relations setback, deserved or not, theologians became circumspect and willing to compromise Scripture in deference to natural science. As evolution gained prominence, there was a corresponding movement in the churches to read Genesis allegorically, but to insist that whenever man arose from the lower animals, assuming that he did, God was there to give him his soul.

Recently, the creation science movement provided evidence that evolution did not happen.¹ More recently, the intelligent design movement provided scientific evidence that evolution was incapable of its claims.² Most recently, devolution, the exact opposite and excluder of evolution, has been proven the ruling physical principle of the entire universe, viable and nonviable realms alike.³

If natural science has excluded evolution from the entire universe, particularly from the viable realm, then a major reason to read Genesis allegorically has vanished. The Earth may be old, or that concept may have emanated from the evolution imperative for a long time line. If the latter, then another reason for reading Genesis allegorically has vanished. If devolution and a

¹ John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood, The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications*, (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1961), 33-35, 54, 86-88, 200-211, 326-453, 489;

Henry M. Morris, *Scientific Creationism*, (San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1974), 92-101;

² Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*, (New York: Touchstone Simon & Schuster, 1996), 252-253.

³ Joseph A. Mastropaolo, *The Rise and Fall of Evolution, A Scientific Examination*, (Huntington Beach: Joseph Mastropaolo, 2003), 13-22;

Joseph Mastropaolo, *Biology for the 21st Century and the Life Science Prize Tested Devolution, Evolution, and Genesis*, (Huntington Beach: Joseph Mastropaolo, 2005), 2-4;

Joseph Mastropaolo, "Life Devolves, Life is a Devolving, Dynamically Engineered Invention of Vast Originality," Hearing on Teaching Evolution, European Parliament, European Union, Brussels, October 11, 2006, 1-18, at 2-4, 8, 9, 16.

young Earth are true, then the reading of choice for Genesis would be literal again. The critical factor, therefore, seemed to be a clear scientific assessment. Which is true, evolution or its opposite, devolution? Both cannot be true. Which is true, an old Earth or a young Earth?

II.

Definition of the Problem. To begin, let us define terms. Evolution is the development of an organism from its chemicals or primitive state to its present state.⁴ Contrarily, devolution is the sequence toward degeneration or greater simplicity or disappearance.⁵ Evolution is generative whereas devolution is degenerative. For evolution, the finger of time points upward whereas for devolution the finger of time points downward.

Can an organism in its lifetime, or the lifetime of all its individuals and generations to extinction, express both devolution and evolution? Not likely. As individuals, all organisms age and die. Therefore, as individuals, all living things devolve to permanent biological death. We also know that as populations many have become extinct and all of those extinctions have been permanent. So, individuals and populations devolve to permanent extinction. No one has ever observed an organism arise from its chemicals or from a primitive state to its present state. And no one has ever demonstrated evolution experimentally.⁶

⁴ Mastropaolo, 2005, op.cit., 2.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid., 3-11.

The sun evidently devolves about 4.5 million tons per second of its mass to radiant energy.⁷ The planets devolve radioactive isotopes that produce mantle and volcanic heat that also is lost to outer space.⁸ Therefore, natural science clearly proclaims that the universe unanimously devolves, viable and nonviable realms alike.

III.

The Adam and Eve Controversy. Yet, we are aware that biology textbooks say that evolution is true. One of the evidences offered is ape-men. One of the first to appear in the literature was the so-called speechless ape-man, *Pithecanthropus alalus*. The primitive male, female, and child were shown in an artistic rendering. Examination of the claim revealed that it was pure fiction. There was not one bone as a basis for the claim or the picture or the Latinized name.⁹

Another early example of ape-men was *Eoanthropus dawsoni*, the dawn man. There was a sculpted rendering of the creature, which looked like a cross between a chimpanzee and a human. It was in the biology textbooks from 1912 to 1952. The rendering was based on a

⁷ John R. Gribbin, *White holes: Cosmic Gushers in the Universe*, (Frogmore, St Albans, Herts AL 2 2NF: Granada Publishing Limited, 1977), 102.

⁸ Guillermo Gonzalez and Jay W. Richards, *The Privileged Planet, How Our Place in the Cosmos Is Designed for Discovery*, (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2004), 63, 92,131, 158.

⁹ H. Wendt, *From Ape to Adam, the Search for the Ancestry of Man*, (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1972), 82-83.

jawbone and a skull fragment. Piltdown man, as it was known for where it allegedly was found, was a deliberate forgery because the skull fragment was human and the jawbone was from an orangutan. Both bones were dyed the same brown color with acid dyes to resemble aging and the teeth were artificially abraded to resemble human flat wear.¹⁰ There were at least five books written on the Piltdown forgery.

Another example was *Hesperopithecus harold cookii*, the Nebraska man. The artistic rendering showed a man, a woman, primitive flora and fauna. All of that was imagined from a single tooth that was not a human tooth, nor an ape tooth, nor a monkey tooth, but rather a pig's tooth.¹¹

The pattern in all of these frauds was to invent a Latinized scientific name and elaborate with an artistic rendering that was pure fiction. Such a pattern of fraud may be termed anti-science because science, like the law, depends on the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.¹²

In 1975, a statistical analysis on fossil bones demonstrated that human bones were significantly different from all animal bones.¹³ In 2002, an anatomical correlational study confirmed that human bone was dissimilar compared to monkey (baboon) and ape (chimpanzee)

¹⁰ J.E. Walsh, *Unraveling Piltdown: The Science Fraud of the Century and Its Solution*, (New York: Random House, 1996), 124, 125, 279.

¹¹ Francis Hitching, *The Neck of the Giraffe, Where Darwin Went Wrong*, (New York: Tichnor & Fields, 1982), 178-179, 202–214.

¹² Mastropaolo, 2005, op.cit., 4.

¹³ C.E. Oxnard, "The place of Australopithecines in Human Evolution: Grounds for Doubt?" *Nature* 258 (1975): 389-395.

bones. Compared to human bone, the study also found that chimpanzee bone was even more dissimilar than monkey bone, the biology textbook claims notwithstanding. These studies illuminated why all so-called ape-men had to be frauds or forgeries. There are no mosaic characteristics common to humans and animals. There was no common ancestor.¹⁴

Thus, the Adam and Eve controversy collapsed because there was not one genuine example of an ape-man. By default, Adam and Eve must be depicted as fully human like modern human beings. Biological science also led to that conclusion because there are at least 145 repair genes that protect the integrity of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA).¹⁵ No ape or ape ancestor could beget any creature approaching a human because the DNA repair genes would not permit it. And no human could beget anything except a human because the DNA repair genes would not permit it. Every life form is fixed because of the arrays of repair genes that protect DNA integrity. That recent discovery of biological science obliterates the evolution fantasy.

By default because of no ape-men, and by biology because DNA repair genes provide an insurmountable inter-life-form barrier, Adam and Eve had to be fully human and all their offspring had to be fully human. The question remaining is how did they come into existence and for that there is only one possible answer that natural science can provide. Adam and Eve must have been created because natural science admits no alternative. To the subsequent question, was

¹⁴ Joseph Mastropaolo, "An Objective Ancestry Test for Fossil Bones," *The Physiologist* 45 (2002): 343; *TJ, The In-Depth Journal of Creation* 16 (2002): 84-88.

¹⁵ R.D. Wood, M. Mitchell, J. Sgouros and T. Lindahl, "Human DNA Repair Genes," *Science* 291 (16 Feb 2001): 1284-1289, Supplement 2/28/05; http://www.cgal.icnet.uk/DNA_Repair_Genes.html.

the creation brand-new or was it with the genetic defects observed in modern human beings, an examination of the evidence from the epidemiology of new genetic disorders might be helpful.

IV.

Genetic Disorders, Adam and Eve. In 1966, a catalog was initiated by collecting and reporting all known genetic disorders. The total at that time was 1,487. In subsequent years, the new genetic disorders reported in peer reviewed medical journals were added to the catalogue with revisions as necessary from new knowledge. The list increased in an accelerating pattern to 19,880 by the end of 2008 thereby confirming the principle of devolution.¹⁶ Going forward in time, extinction may be forecast¹⁷ whereas a retrospective extrapolation would yield no genetic disorders.¹⁸ From medical science, the answer to the subsequent question is that Adam and Eve most probably were created genetically perfect, i.e. brand-new. Consequently, the origin-of-man part of Genesis must be read literally, for natural science admits no alternative.

¹⁶ V. A. McKusick, *Mendelian Inheritance in Man: a Catalog of Human Genes and Genetic Disorders*, Vol. 1, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), xiii – xviii; <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Omim/dispupdates.html>.

¹⁷ Joseph Mastropaolo, “Evolution Is Lethal Antiscience,” *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 38 (2001): 151-158;

Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 57, 58, 142, 143;

Mastropaolo, 2006, op.cit., 4.

¹⁸ Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 53, 57;

Mastropaolo, 2005, op.cit., 4, 7, 8.

The retrospective view from the medical evidence destroyed evolution. Going backward in time we saw fewer and fewer genetic disorders until by inference they disappear and we find a genetically perfect couple. That was a disaster of the greatest magnitude for evolution because of the strenuous efforts for centuries, even millennia, to completely discredit the credibility of religion, particularly the Bible. In other words, instead of the evolutionist's hallucination of a pregnant swamp, we find instead from science the genetically perfect Adam and Eve in an environment of genetically perfect plants and animals with pristine air, water and earth where life expectancy is 900 years and intermarriage cannot produce any genetic disorders. Medical science specified Adam and Eve in a paradisiacal Garden of Eden and early Earth. Thus, the epidemiological and teratology evidence confirmed the famous secondary historical evidence of Gn 1: 26, 27: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."¹⁹ "In His own image" means genetically perfect, with no genetic disorders. Given that genetic perfection, the intermarriage of the children of Adam and Eve would not have concentrated genetic disorders because there were none. The patriarchs would have lived 900 years because there was nothing in the environment to accelerate the mutation of their genetically perfect DNA. Given the scientific confirmation of Genesis and the Primordial Law of Biology, *minor vita ex vita*, life arises only from life and always with less vitality, then God is the mega-intelligent mega-engineer, the only origin and uninterrupted source of life from its beginning to the present. The probability of that being true was more than $10^{4,478,296}$ (a 1 followed by more than 4,478,296

¹⁹ *The Holy Bible*, (Oxford: University Press, 1836), 5,6.

zeros) to less than 1.²⁰ To write more than 4,000,000 zeros would require a stack of books more than one foot high. For belief, a scientist needs evidence that would be true 95 times to 5 or less. For a scientist, the believability of Genesis at $10^{4,478,296}$ to 1 cannot be more certain.

V.

The Rise of Evolution to Dominance of Biological Science. Genesis speaks of the rest of the biosphere and although the findings on humans imply creation for all life forms, direct evidence would be desirable, particularly on the claims made by evolutionists. In 2003, there was a detailed analysis of the claims for evolution as found in biology textbooks. There were no true claims found, but there were 117 fraudulent claims made for evolution, 65 of them in high school and university textbooks. Of the 65, 12% were superstitions, 74% were frauds, and 14% were forgeries.²¹ A brief history of evolution may illuminate how this inversion of reality achieved its present domination of science.

About 2,500 years ago, Anaximander invented the evolution (known then as vitalism) and devolution concepts. The evolution contributions of Anaxagoras, Empedocles, and Aristotle gave it a form that still may be discerned in modern biology textbooks. Those Greek philosophers imagined that the Earth began as a molten primeval planet and subsequently developed a primitive fluid that spawned life from the vitalism in the Earth. That primitive life inhabited the sea and by small vitalistic steps became all of the terrestrial plants and animals. Our

²⁰ Joseph Mastropaolo, "Evolution Is Biologically Impossible," *Acts and Facts*, 28 (1999): i-iv, <http://www.icr.org/pubs/imp/imp-317.htm>.

²¹ Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 63-78.

ancestors were fish, they said, and it was struggle (currently termed natural selection or survival of the fittest) that exterminated prior inferior life. The feather was the homologue of the fish's scale and the human embryo was like the chick embryo. Soma (body) seeds were altered by the vitalism of the Earth, were inherited, and were the mechanism for the advancement to higher life forms.²²

Until 1852, that concept was known as vitalism because it depended upon the supposed inherent vitality of the Earth to originate then to advance all forms of life to the currently observed diverse and advanced states. The traditional vitalism evidence was the supposed vitalistically generated maggots on putrefied meat, then their vitalistic advancement to flies. When asked why large animals were no longer generated, the answer was that the Earth's vitality was fatigued and it was only able to perform with insects and lower animals. Dr. Francesco Redi, M.D., investigated many of the vitalism claims and proved with experiments valid to this day that vitalism was based on ignorance of the growth and development from the egg to the adult. His most famous experiment proved that the maggot hatched from the egg of the same kind of fly that hatched from the pupa of the maggot. The overlooked egg, not the meat (he tried many different kinds of meat), generated the larval maggot then the pupa then the adult. The larval maggot was the hyperplasia means to transition the single cell of the egg to the many cells of the

²² Will Durant, *The Story of Civilization, the Life of Greece*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1939), 139, 339, 526, 529, 530, 669.

adult. Life, by means of egg and larva and pupa, begets life. Accordingly, the vitalism concept collapsed in 1668.²³

In 1852, Herbert Spencer gave vitalism a new name, evolution, and began a counter current to science, dubbed here anti-science, that presently dominates biology.²⁴ The imagined origin of life was from the vitalism “in some warm little pond.”²⁵ The transformations to other life forms were from the vitalism of the Earth, now called the environment. The hereditary mechanism at first went from the environment to the body of the parent then to the offspring, although it was known for thousands of years that body wounds in parents were not inherited. Subsequently, it was modified with Aristotle’s idea that body changes would create imaginary blood particles that would cause imaginary alterations in the genetic material of the gonads and thereby be inherited.²⁶ The imaginary intermediaries of blood particles and altered gonads notwithstanding, it was still old-fashioned vitalism, for Mother Earth (Gaia according to Greek theogony of circa 500 B.C.) was still the creator and propagator. If Redi’s experiments are still true, and they have never been overturned in 3.4 centuries, then vitalism in its present cloak, evolution, is anti-science and all of its alleged evidence must be as false as the superstitious ignorance on which vitalism was based originally.

²³ Francesco Redi, *Experiments on the Generation of Insects*, 5th ed., 1688, trans. M.A.B. Bigelow, (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1909; New York: Kraus Reprint Co., 1969), 22, 23, 27-33.

²⁴ Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 3.

²⁵ F. Darwin, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. 1, (London: John Murray, 1888), 83.

²⁶ Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 6.

In 1859 for his *Origin of Species*, Darwin used Lamarck's concept of the inheritability of alterations of the body²⁷ that was disgraced scientifically 40 years earlier and known to be false for thousands of years before that. Subsequently, Darwin plagiarized Aristotle's concept of body alterations creating imaginary blood particles that altered the hereditary material of the gonads²⁸ and called it, pangenesis.²⁹ About a century later, evolutionists decided to use mutations as the mechanism to generate new and better life forms and they called it neo-darwinism. Let us examine this latest attempt to justify vitalism.

A search of biology textbooks uncovered only one mutation that was claimed a biological advantage, the sickle cell trait. For example, "The sickle cell allele confers an unexpected advantage in Africa,"³⁰ and "Why is sickle cell anemia so common in some regions . . . The answer to that question is a surprising lesson in evolution . . . That mutation conferred an advantage wherever malaria was common, and thus it was favored by natural selection."³¹ However, an examination of the medical literature indicated that the sickle cell mutation was the exact opposite of a biological advantage because it maimed organs, it gave infants fatal anemia,

²⁷ Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species: Or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*, (London: 1859), Chapter V, Laws of Variation, Effects of Use and Disuse.

²⁸ Durant, op.cit., 529.

²⁹ Charles Darwin, *The Variation of Animals and Plants Under Domestication*, (New York: Judd, 1868), 428-483.

³⁰ G. B. Johnson, *Biology, Visualizing Life*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1998), 183.

³¹ K. R. Miller and J. Levine, *Biology*, (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2000), 233.

and it accounted for 75,000 hospitalizations of 6.1 days with significant mortality.³² It was morbidity and mortality genetic disorder #141,900, an eventual or immediate killer.³³ If students with sickle cell trait intermarried because the textbook taught they had a biological advantage, then on average one-quarter of their children would die in infancy of sickle cell anemia.³⁴ Such untrue, irresponsible, criminally leaning instruction may be termed, anti-education or anti-science, not science and not education. Thus, the medical literature clearly condemned labeling the sickle cell trait a biological advantage and that left vitalism, later called evolution, and most recently dubbed neo-darwinism, without any mechanism to improve life. Let us explore beyond the lethal sickle cell mutation to see whether the other human mutations, 19,880 according to McKusick, are biologically advantageous or biologically disastrous.

The other mutations include Alzheimer disease, muscular dystrophy, and more than a dozen types of cancer including several kinds of leukemia. Obviously, these cause significant morbidity and mortality. We also find cataracts, color blindness, cretinism, cystic fibrosis, Down syndrome, dyslexia, and emphysema. These conditions also are the opposite of what any scientist would call a biological advantage. These thousands also include hemophilia, familial hypercholesterolemia, hypothyroidism, Lou Gehrig disease, multiple sclerosis, pituitary dwarfism, rheumatoid arthritis, Tay Sachs disease, thalassemia, deafness, blindness, ventricular hypertrophy, microcephalus, and anencephalus. They are debilitating. They are life threatening.

³² A. Ashley-Koch, Q. Yang, and R.S. Olney, "Hemoglobin S Allele and Sickle Cell Disease", *American Journal of Epidemiology* 151(2000):839-845.

³³ McKusick, op.cit.

³⁴ D.L. Hartl and A.G. Clark, *Principles of Population Genetics*, (Sunderland, MA.: Sinauer Associates, Inc., 1997), 251.

They are lethal. Not one biological advantage can be found. The analysis indicated 19,880 medically reported mutations cause debilitation, morbidity, or death and zero provide a biological advantage. From the medical literature, the evidence supporting the neo-darwinian version of evolution was zero and the evidence supporting the exact opposite, devolution, was 19,880. Obviously, vitalism-evolution-neo-darwinism was in fact the exact opposite of the truth, an anti-science.

VI.

Other Vitalism-Evolution-Neo-Darwinian Beliefs. The Greek vitalist philosophers imagined a primitive fluid that spawned life from the vitalism in the Earth. Darwin called the fluid “some warm little pond.”³⁵ Ernst Haeckel claimed that scrapings of the sea bottom uncovered “monera.” That was the name he gave to a class of primitive single-cell organisms composed of homogeneous protoplasm devoid of a nucleus or organelles or any internal structures. These monera allegedly were the “missing links” between the nonviable chemicals of the primeval sea and the single-cell animals and plants we know today. Haeckel gave his alleged discovery the scientific name *Protamoeba primitiva* and fraudulently showed it reproducing in his 1868 monograph.³⁶ This missing link, this monera, this *Protamoeba primitiva*, was actually a

³⁵ F. Darwin, op.cit.

³⁶ Ernst Haeckel, *Naturliche Schopfungsgeschichte*, 1868, 144, Figure 1, in N.A. Rupke, “A summary of the monera fallacy,” in *Scientific Studies in Special Creation*, W.E. Lammerts, ed., (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1971), 170.

globule of sulfate of lime, which of course was not alive and could never reproduce.³⁷ This hoax was exposed in 1872,³⁸ Haeckel refused to admit he forged the drawings,³⁹ and the monera concept was carried uncorrected in biology textbooks until 1995.⁴⁰ This dishonesty, so rampant in vitalism-evolution-neo-darwinism, is the antithesis of science and richly deserves the appellation, anti-science.

An experiment shown currently in virtually every biology textbook⁴¹ was designed and published by Stanley Miller.⁴² The schematic showed a glass apparatus containing a reducing atmosphere of methane (CH₄), ammonia (NH₃), water vapor (H₂O), and hydrogen (H₂), which was circulated, heated, sparked by means of a Tesla coil, and the resultant compounds trapped and analyzed. After a week, there were trace amounts of two amino acids, glycine

³⁷ Ibid., 176.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., 178.

⁴⁰ K.R. Miller and J. Levine. *Biology*. (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1995), 327.

⁴¹ K.R. Miller and J. Levine. *Biology*. (Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2006), 424;

C.P. Hickman, L.S. Roberts and A. Larson, *Integrated Principles of Zoology*, (Boston: Mc Graw Hill, 2001), 30;

G.B. Johnson, *Biology, Visualizing Life*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1998), 193.

⁴² Stanley L. Miller, "A Production of Amino Acids Under Possible Primitive Earth Conditions," *Science* 117 (May 15, 1953): 528-529.

($\text{NH}_3\text{CHCO}_2\text{H}$) and alanine ($\text{NH}_3\text{CHCO}_2\text{CH}_3$). Miller alleged that the Earth's early atmosphere was composed of methane, ammonia, water, and hydrogen with zero oxygen. The textbook authors stated, "This and other experiments suggested how simple compounds found on the early Earth could have combined to form the organic compounds needed for life." The equations were not given in the textbook, therefore it was not apparent to the student that the NH_3 part of each amino acid came from the NH_3 of the ammonia that was put into the apparatus. Similarly, the CH part of each amino acid came from the CH_4 of the methane. The C of the CO_2 part came from the methane and the O_2 from the electrolysis (by means of the electrical sparks of the Tesla coil) of the water, H_2O . The H in the glycine came from the hydrogen, H_2 . The CH_3 of the alanine came from the methane, CH_4 . In other words, all of the amino acid elements came from the chemicals that were put into the apparatus in the first place. Further, the atmosphere of the early Earth was not a reducing atmosphere. It had oxygen. With oxygen the experiment failed completely, could even explode, and the relevance to the origin of life vanished.⁴³ Done with a realistic atmosphere, the experiment failed to produce any amino acids.⁴⁴ Even with the unrealistic gases, the apparatus could not produce the 90% of the missing amino acids needed for a simple protein nor could it produce their chirality nor their order nor the polypeptides nor the three dimensional folding nor the hundreds of other proteins needed for a cell with a membrane of many controllable apertures, organelles, cytoskeleton, DNA, and so on.⁴⁵ The logic of the

⁴³ Hubert P. Yockey, *Information Theory and Molecular Biology*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 234.

⁴⁴ Jonathan Wells, *Icons of Evolution, Science or Myth? Why Much of What We Teach About Evolution Is Wrong*, (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2000), 18.

⁴⁵ Mastropaolo, 1999, op.cit., at i, ii.

Miller experiment and others like it would be like putting some iron ore, coal, sand, and sap from a rubber tree in a volcano and suggesting to students that the trace amounts of steel, glass and rubber that subsequently may be found could have combined to form an automobile on the early Earth. The text and teacher would suggest that the steel would have made the coach, the frame, the suspension system, the axles, cylinders, pistons, crankcase full of oil, automatic transmission, power steering, disk brakes, hydraulic systems, electric wiring, doors, windshield wipers with their electric motors, and a gas tank full of gasoline. The glass would have made the windows, headlights and taillights. The rubber would have made the steel-belted radial tires, seat cushions, and windshield wiper blades. This automobile to be analogous to a living cell would need an automatic way of starting, stopping, navigating through traffic, and refueling. It would also need systems to repair itself and, before its lifetime expired, to reproduce itself several times.

The volcano automobile analogy underestimates because, given all human knowledge aggregated, a living cell is impossible to synthesize whereas automobiles are created on assembly lines by the millions, although in less advanced form than described above. Such an analogy cannot be given by these anti-science textbook authors because it would convince students that such origin of life experiments are based on the old vitalism superstitions that a living cell is merely a sac of homogeneous plasm⁴⁶ devoid of organelles, cytoplasm, cell membrane, and the myriad arrays of molecular machines.⁴⁷

A simpler and much more honest experiment would be like the one described by

⁴⁶ J. Assmuth and E.R. Hull, *Haeckel's Frauds and Forgeries*, (New York: P.J. Kenedy & Sons, 1915), 76.

⁴⁷ Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler, 1986), 263, 264.

Jonathan Wells in Lee Strobel's book.⁴⁸ A unicellular organism, like a paramecium, is introduced into a sterile test tube containing a solution to optimally keep it alive. A second test tube is prepared in the same way, except the cell membrane of the paramecium is pierced with a needle, the cell's contents leak out, the cell dies and never reconstitutes itself in spite of the fact that all of the proteins, organelles, DNA, and other necessary parts are present in the correct amounts and under optimum conditions. The ruptured cell devolves to its constituent chemicals while the cell in the first test tube thrives. This experiment proves that even under ideal, controlled conditions with all the constituent parts in close proximity, the parts will devolve to chemicals and never evolve to a living cell. Therefore, the Miller experiment and the textbook advocacy of it were deliberate anti-science.

Certain proteins may be recognized in a variety of animals and sometimes even in plants. For example, the respiratory protein, hemoglobin, is found in insects, worms, clams, sea cucumbers, snails, squid, lamprey, carp, frogs, chickens, kangaroos, and humans. The hemoglobin molecule in these various life forms is not exactly the same because there are some differences in the sequences of the amino acids. The evolutionists have seized upon these differences and allege that they are evidence for evolution. They claim that there was a common ancestor and the differences in amino acids from that ancestor will be directly proportional to the evolutionary distance from that ancestor. Their claim is that the greater the magnitude of the differences in amino acids, the longer the time since evolving from the primitive ancestor. The evolutionists have alleged that the molecular differences will be a relative molecular clock that will confirm other evolutionary clocks, like those in the fossil record or in the DNA, which

⁴⁸ Lee Strobel, *The Case for a Creator, a Journalist Investigates Scientific Evidence That Points Toward God*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 2004), 39.

makes the protein.⁴⁹ The alternative to that speculation is not mentioned at all. If there is no evolutionary sequence in the molecular differences, then that confirms that each organism's protein was mega-engineered as a special creation to suit its own particular dynamic needs for life and survival.⁵⁰ In other words, if the molecular differences illustrate a simple to complex progression, then that would be evidence for evolution and if not then it would be evidence for special creation. Let us abstract from the literature a sequence of molecular differences, from small to great, for the hemoglobin molecule.⁵¹ The sequence is lamprey (an invertebrate fish), human, carp (a vertebrate fish), kangaroo, chicken, frog. Obviously, there is no evolutionary sequence and the molecular differences in hemoglobin suggest special creation. Another common protein is cytochrome c. The sequence for that protein is bacterium, horse, pigeon, tuna fish, silk moth, wheat, and yeast.⁵² Obviously, there is no evolutionary sequence and the molecular differences in cytochrome c also suggest special creation. The number of nucleotides, the genetic building blocks, in the DNA molecule also may be sequenced in ascending order for

⁴⁹ Hickman, Roberts and Larson, op.cit., 34.

Johnson, op.cit., 322.

Miller and Levine, 2006, op.cit., 455.

California Department of Education, *Science Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*, (Sacramento: California Department of Education, 2003), 29.

⁵⁰ Mastropaolo, 2006, op.cit., 5-7.

⁵¹ Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, (Bethesda, Maryland: Adler & Adler, 1986), 284.

⁵² Ibid., 281.

various life forms.⁵³ If evolution is true, then we should find the fewest nucleotides in the simplest life forms, like the unicellular organisms, and the greatest number in the life forms composed of trillions of cells, like human beings. If we begin with the amoeba, a unicellular organism, then the sequence was amoeba, drosophila (“fruit fly”), human, paramecium (a unicellular organism), and amoeba, the unicellular organism seen so often at the bottom of the evolutionary tree. The amoeba had 670 billion nucleotides compared to the drosophila fly with 180 million nucleotides in its DNA, which was less than the human with 3.4 billion, which was less than the single-celled paramecium with 8.6 billion, which was less than the 670 billion of the single-celled amoeba again.⁵⁴ The amoeba at the bottom of the alleged evolutionary tree by evolutionist convention was also at the top with nearly 200 times the nucleotides of human beings. Obviously, there was no evolutionary sequence. The number of nucleotides of the DNA may suggest special creation but never evolution. In summary, no matter which common protein was selected, the molecular differences absolutely refuted the evolution notion of a molecular clock and instead consistently suggested the mega-engineering of special creation.

According to evolutionists, the evidence from dinosaurs allegedly supported the vitalism-evolution-neo-darwinian concept. For example, a television program, *Dinosaurs of the Goby*, included an animated scene of a velociraptor dinosaur sprinting across the primeval landscape toward a cliff and at the decisive instant sprouted wings and flew away with the élan reminiscent of that monkey-to-human parade in many biology textbooks. The bearded disciples of Charles Darwin from the American Museum of Natural History then sagely explained that the

⁵³ W.-H. Li, and D. Graur, *Fundamentals of Molecular Evolution*, (Sunderland, Massachusetts: Sinauer Associates, Inc., 1991), 209.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

similarities in their sternums proved that birds evolved from the velociraptor dinosaur. However, on their chart of evolutionary time they showed that the oldest specimen of bird was eighty million years older than the oldest specimen of velociraptor: the evolutionary child was older than the parent. This slight difficulty in their logic was explained away with the greatest of ease by drawing a dotted line from the oldest velociraptor to an era millions of years earlier than the oldest bird and marking that spot with an “X.” Here, they authoritatively informed us, a velociraptor was bound to be unearthed in the Goby Desert because there was no possibility for error in the scientific fact of evolution. This attitude, that contrary evidence be damned because evolution cannot be wrong, bears on another recent dinosaur case.

In 1998, Chinese diggers glued a fossil bird to a fossil dinosaur and sold the concoction to the *National Geographic* for \$80,000. Models and artwork showed the “dino bird” in living color and lifelike action. Looking at the pictures on the cover of *National Geographic* and in the extensive article within one could easily imagine its primeval screams. This forgery was hailed as one of the greatest confirmations of evolution by the *National Geographic* and was immediately included by Miller and Levine in their biology textbook.⁵⁵ After the forgery was exposed, the *National Geographic* in an obscure article two years later entitled, Fossil Trail, quietly told how they had been fooled, whereas Miller and Levine made no such admission.⁵⁶ It was a case of the purveyors of evolution fraud in the textbook, journal, museum, and film industries being victimized by more cunning purveyors of evolution fraud. Just as the confidence game cannot succeed without a greedy victim, so evolution frauds cannot succeed without

⁵⁵ J. Ackerman, “Dinosaurs Take Wing,” *National Geographic* 194 (1998): 74-99.

Miller and Levine, 2000, op.cit., 722.

⁵⁶ L.M. Simons, “Fossil Trail,” *National Geographic* 198 (2000): 128-132.

evolution anti-scientists grasping for any plausible forgery. The swindlers were swindled and in that there seemed a modicum of poetic justice.

In 1959, Kettlewell wrote an article in *Scientific American* entitled, “Darwin’s Missing Evidence.”⁵⁷ This article claimed to show that the mechanism for evolution, natural selection, really worked. It also claimed that the environment could instigate mutations and heredity would propagate them to new life forms. To substantiate these false claims, Kettlewell made use of the two varieties of peppered moths, *Biston betularia*, the light and the dark strains. The article showed a dark tree trunk with mainly dark moths on it and he said that in the sooty, industrialized parts of England the dark strain survived because birds could not see them against the dark background. Then he showed a light tree trunk with mainly light moths on it. This supposedly demonstrated that the light moths survived better on the light color of these tree trunks in the non-industrialized areas of England because they were less visible to bird predators than the dark strain. He also said the eyes of these moths could see their own color and their little brains would be unhappy, there would be a “contrast conflict,” until they landed on a tree trunk that matched their wing color. He did not present any evidence to substantiate this claim either.

Kettlewell called this article an experiment, yet the data were incomplete and of course there were no analytical statistics used to analyze such incomplete data. For his design, the statistic of choice would have been a chi-square (X^2) analysis to indicate whether or not his results were statistically significant. It was not possible to do a chi-square analysis because he reported numerically only three-fourths of the data. He said of the rest, “. . . we recaptured proportionately twice as many of the dark form as the light.” It seemed strange that he would go to the trouble of reporting all the other numbers then suddenly end verbally. It also seemed

⁵⁷ H.B.D. Kettlewell, “Darwin’s Missing Evidence,” *Sci. Amer.* 200 (1959): 48-53.

strange that the editors allowed the article to be published not only without a statistical treatment but also without complete data. No responsible science journal would do either one. It also seemed strange that the article contained the old superstition that a black environment would cause a life form to mutate to a black color. It was also strange that the moth's tiny brain was credited with matching its wing color to the tree trunk color. It was also strange that a dark form was considered a mutation given that there are so many domesticated animals, like cats and dogs, which have pure black or pure white forms as a result of selectively breeding from the enormous variability to be found naturally in any life form. Strangest of all was the fact that this moth does not land on tree trunks. It roosts in the canopy of trees. Then the truth came out that the moths were captured, killed and glued to the tree trunk of the same color to falsify the findings. The peppered moth story found in virtually every biology textbook in the chapters on evolution⁵⁸ were a forgery and *Scientific American* collaborated with this forgery. This "classic case of industrial melanism" by H.B.D. Kettlewell called "Darwin's Missing Evidence," was a thoroughly planned fraud.⁵⁹ Like Darwin's original so-called evidence, this example of the missing evidence also was a forgery. This was understandable, but not excusable, because any

⁵⁸ Hickman, op.cit., 12;

Johnson, op.cit., 182;

Miller, 1998, op.cit., 297, 298;

California Department of Education, *California Science Framework for K-12 Public Schools, Biology/Life Sci Gr 9-12*, (Sacramento: California Department of Education, 2004), 241.

⁵⁹ J.A. Coyne, "Not Black and White," *Nature*, 396 (11/5/1998):35-36;

T.D. Sargent, C.D. Millar and D.M. Lambert, "The 'Classical' Explanation of Industrial Melanism, Assessing the Evidence," *Evol. Biol.* 30 (1998): 299-322.

evidence for the non-existent evolution ghost must be fraudulent. The only way to substantiate the existence of the imaginary evolution was with unanimous falsified evidence and apparently that was all evolutionists had.

One of the most impressive and most widely reproduced frauds in biology is the drawing of embryos allegedly mimicking evolution as they progressed through their stages of development. It was called, ontogeny (development of the embryo) recapitulates phylogeny (the evolution of the animal's ancestors). Note the scientific ring to it. The original drawings were plagiarized then grossly falsified⁶⁰ to make them appear as if going through similar evolutionary stages. The fraudulent concept was that the embryos go through the worm stage, the fish stage, the amphibian stage, and the mammal stage. Each stage was made to appear as if summing up the evolution that came before.⁶¹ The falsified drawings of fish, salamander, tortoise, chicken, pig, cow, rabbit, and human were usually shown. This gross fraud was exposed in 1868, 1875, and 1908,⁶² yet was still in biology textbooks with complete arrays from fish to human in 1990, 1996, then with fewer animals in 1998 and fewer yet in 2006.⁶³ One of the latest exposures was

⁶⁰ Assmuth and Hull, op.cit., 10,11, Plate I.

Hitching, op.cit., 205.

⁶¹ Hitching, ibid., 202-205.

⁶² Assmuth and Hull, op.cit., 4,5,8.

⁶³ M.W. Strickberger, *Evolution*, (Boston/London: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, 1990), 43;

R.A. Wallace, G.P. Sanders, R.J. Ferl, *Biology*, (New York: HarperCollinsCollege Publishers, 1996), 922;

Miller, 2006, op.cit., 283;

in 1997.⁶⁴ Part of the fraud was mislabeling the pharyngeal pouches of the human embryo as gill slits like those of the fish.⁶⁵ In that fashion, abortionists could claim that a human embryo was not human, but was rather a fish and like a fish could be killed with impunity. The evolutionist authors of modern biology textbooks refused to let go of this “lie that won’t die,” this “one of the most famous fakes in biology,”⁶⁶ perhaps because of its utility for the abortion industry. In 1996, there were 1,366,000 abortions in the U.S.A.⁶⁷ If cost was estimated at between \$300 and \$1000, let’s say \$500 on average, then this was about a \$683 million per year industry in human slaughter and have may provided sufficient incentive to falsify biology textbooks.

Given these unanimous false findings for evolution, the conclusion was that there was not one iota of scientific evidence to support evolution whereas the entire universe, viable and nonviable alike, unanimously illustrated devolution, the exact opposite and excluder of evolution. Having shown that evolution was absolutely false and devolution was absolutely true, then the reading of choice for origins in Genesis was literal. Let us now examine the evidence for

Hickman, op.cit., 172.

⁶⁴ M.K. Richardson, J. Hanken, M.J. Gooneratne, C. Pieau, A. Raynaud, L. Selwood and G.M. Wright, “There is No Highly Conserved Embryonic Stage in the Vertebrates: Implications for Current Theories of Evolution and Development,” *Anat. Embryol.* 196 (1997): 91-106;

M.K. Richardson, J. Hanken, L. Selwood, G.M. Wright, R.J. Richards, C. Pieau and A. Raynaud, “Haeckel, Embryos, and Evolution,” *Science* 280 (1997): 983-984.

⁶⁵ Hitching, op.cit., 203.

Johnson, op.cit.,179.

⁶⁶ Elizabeth Pinnisi, “Haeckel’s Embryos: Fraud Rediscovered,” *Science* 277 (1997): 1435.

⁶⁷ Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 55,56.

the age of the Earth.

VII.

The Age of the Earth. Genesis reported the ages of the progenitors as the generations of humans unfolded from Adam and Eve to recent times. The calculated age of the Earth from these historical records were in the thousands of years as solar years are counted and recorded on calendars. However, if the Earth were only thousands of years old, then evolution would not have had time to achieve its sequence of vitalism miracles in defiance of the laws of thermodynamics and engineering. Although a very old world would mean the extinction of the entire biosphere, evolutionists nonetheless began their search for indirect indicators of an ancient Earth. They thereby were forced to add immortality of the biosphere to their list of vitalism miracles in order for their vitalism-evolution-neo-darwinism to seem plausible. These evolutionist indirect methods needed to be verified for objectivity, validity, reliability, and calibration because they did not count solar years and must be referenced to that standard. Let us see whether the historical direct method of Genesis or the indirect methods of evolutionists were objective, valid, reliable, and calibrated science to determine the age of the Earth. To do that, let us first take a simple example to illustrate the concept of reliability by means of a simple statistic called, confidence interval. Let us do it for hypothetically determining the height of a child.

Suppose the scores for measuring the height of a child in centimeters (cm) by method A were 100, 99, 101, 98 and 102. The mean was 100 and the standard deviation (SD), a measure of variability, was 1.6. Now, suppose by method B the scores were 10, 190, 1, 199 and 100. The mean was 100 but the SD was 95. Suppose by method C the scores are 0,0,500,0,0. The mean

was 100 but the SD was 224. Obviously, A was the most reliable and C the least reliable. But if we considered only the mean, they seemed the same. One way to expose the reliability of each method was to describe a range from two SD above the mean to two SD below the mean. That range, a confidence interval, would contain the true value with a 95% certainty.⁶⁸ For method A, the confidence interval was 97 to 103, for B – 89 to 289, and for C – 124 to 324. Should we reject any of these methods? Obviously, the child's height could not be negative, a height below the level of the floor, so we rejected methods B and C on the grounds of unreliability. That left only method A with a 95% probability that the true height of the child was between 97 and 103 with the best estimate, the mean, at 100 cm. Now, let us apply this objective, scientific, reliability, confidence interval test to the methods for determining the age of the Earth. Let us examine first the historical method.

For the historical direct method for finding the age of the Earth, one of the earliest records was from the Rabbinical Chronicles of about 1550 B.C. that gave a creation date of about 5,760 years ago from the present time, approximately 2000 A.D.⁶⁹ About 150 A.D., Theophilus gave the creation date as about 7,529 years ago.⁷⁰ In about 225 A.D., Julius Africanus gave a

⁶⁸ P. Blommers, and E.F. Lindquist, *Elementary Statistical Methods in Psychology and Education*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), 274, 311, 342, 456.

⁶⁹ F.C. Haber, *Age of the World: Moses to Darwin*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1959), 1, 14, 118.

Encyclopædia Britannica, (Chicago: William Benton, Publisher, 1965), 3: 650-651, 10: 777, 13: 614.

⁷⁰ J.D. Burchfield, *Lord Kelvin and the Age of the Earth*, (New York: Science History Publications, 1975), 4, 5, 17, 152, 199, 204.

date of 7,500 years ago.⁷¹ In 382 A.D., the Roman Catholic Vulgate gave a date of 7,199 years ago.⁷² In 1654, Ussher gave the date as 6,004 years ago.⁷³ For these historical data, the mean and standard deviation ($M \pm SD$) were $6,798 \pm 851$ years. If we allowed a confidence interval of plus two SD to minus two SD from the mean, as we did for the height example above, then the age of the Earth at the 95% level of confidence was between 5,096 and 8,500 years ago. There did not seem to be anything that would cast doubt on this range of dates. Therefore, objective science obligated acceptance of the direct estimate of $6,798 \pm 851$, or approximately $6,800 \pm 850$, solar years for the age of the Earth by the historical method.

For the 19th century indirect estimates for the age of the Earth, several vitalist-evolutionists of the 19th century claimed that the Earth was millions of years old. In about 1800, Buffon estimated the Earth's creation date and, from the year 2000, the date would be 75,032 years ago.⁷⁴ In 1850 from solar thermodynamics, Lord Kelvin estimated 25 million years ago.⁷⁵ From geology in 1860, Darwin estimated 100 million years ago.⁷⁶ In 1870, Lord Kelvin revised his estimate to 100 million years ago.⁷⁷ In 1897, he revised it again and this time to 40 million

Haber, op.cit.

⁷¹ Burchfield, op.cit.

⁷² Haber, op.cit.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Burchfield, op.cit.

Haber, op.cit.

⁷⁵ Helena Curtis, *Biology*, 2nd ed., (New York: Worth Publishers, 1975), 17.

⁷⁶ Darwin, 1859, op.cit., Chapter IX, On the imperfection of the geological record.

⁷⁷ Burchfield, op.cit.

years ago.⁷⁸ In 1899 from ocean salinity, Joly estimated 100 million years ago.⁷⁹ These indirect estimates by scientists in the 1800's averaged, $M \pm SD$, $60,845,839 \pm 44,747,534$. If we allow the plus to minus two SD from the mean as was done for the historical estimates, then the age of the Earth at the 95% level of confidence was between 150,340,908 years ago and 28,649,230 years into the future. Obviously, the Earth has been in existence for thousands of years and any set of data whose confidence interval estimated it coming into existence millions of years into the future must be rejected out of hand. For that reason, the indirect estimates from the 19th century had to be rejected.

The 20th century indirect estimates for the age of the Earth were determined from radioisotopes. Radioisotopes were discovered at about the turn of the 20th century and in 1921, they were used to indirectly estimate the age of the Earth. In 1921, the estimate was 1.5 billion years old.⁸⁰ In 1931, the estimate was 1.6 to 3.0 billion years old⁸¹; in 1932, 1.6 billion⁸²; in 1930 to 1940, 200 million⁸³; in 1947, 2 billion⁸⁴; in 1952, 1.6 billion⁸⁵; in 1955, 2.5 billion⁸⁶; in 1957,

⁷⁸ S.W. Woolridge and R.S. Morgan, *An Outline of Geomorphology*, (London: Longmans, Green and Co Ltd, 1963), 17.

⁷⁹ Burchfield, op.cit.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² W.O. Hotchkiss, *The Story of a Billion Years*, (Baltimore: The Williams & Wilkins Company, 1932), 49.

⁸³ R.B. Parker, *Inscrutable Earth, Explorations into the Science of Earth*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1984), 22, 34, 57.

3 billion⁸⁷; in 1961, 3.3 to 5 billion, 2.1 to 5 billion, 3 billion⁸⁸; in 1962, 2.6, 3.29, 3.4 to 5.0, 4.3 ± 0.4 billion⁸⁹; in 1963, 3.5 billion⁹⁰, 2 billion⁹¹; in 1966, 4.55, 4.75 billion⁹²; in 1968, 4.5 billion⁹³; in 1971, 4 billion⁹⁴, 5 billion⁹⁵; in 1975, 4.5 billion⁹⁶; in 1978, 4.5 billion⁹⁷; in 1981, 4.6

⁸⁴ C. Schuchert, and C.O. Dunbar, *Outlines of Historical Geology*, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1931), 16, 23.

⁸⁵ G. Gamow, *The Birth and Death of the Sun*, (New York: Mentor Books, 1952), 9.

⁸⁶ P. Moore, *The story of Man and the Stars*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1955), 16.

⁸⁷ G.G. Simpson, C.S. Pittendrigh and L.H. Tiffany, *An Introduction to Biology*, (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1957), 734.

⁸⁸ L.H. Ahrens, K. Rankama and S.K. Runcorn, *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*, (New York: Pergamon Press, 1961), 239, 240.

⁸⁹ H. Jeffreys, *The Earth, its Origin, History and Physical Constitution*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962), 275, 278, 280–282.

⁹⁰ H.H. Read, *Geology, an Introduction to Earth-History*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), 81.

⁹¹ Woolridge and Morgan, *op.cit.*

⁹² H. Faul, *Ages of Rocks, Planets, and Stars*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), 67.

⁹³ J.A. Shimer, *This Changing Earth*, (New York: Harper & Row Publisher, 1968), 18, 20.

⁹⁴ I. Tolstoy, *The Pulse of the Planet*, (A Signet Book from New American Library, Times Mirror, 1971), 19.

billion⁹⁸; in 1984, 4.8 billion⁹⁹; in 1991, 4.54 billion years old.¹⁰⁰ These data averaged, $M \pm SD$, approximately 2.61 ± 1.79 billion years for the age of the Earth. If we allowed plus to minus two SD from the mean as was done for the historical and 19th century estimates, then the age of the Earth at the 95% level of confidence for radioisotopes was between 6.19 billion years old and 971 million years in the future. Obviously, the Earth has been in existence for thousands of years and any set of data that estimated it coming into existence nearly a billion years into the future must be rejected out of hand. For that reason, amongst others, the indirect estimates from the radioisotope data of the 20th century had to be rejected.

Besides unreliability, another reason for rejecting the radioisotope data was their bias for older ages of the Earth. Note that the estimate in 1921 was 1.5 billion years old whereas the estimate in 1991 was 4.54 billion years old. These data would have us believe that in the 70 solar years from 1921 to 1991 the Earth, and everything on the Earth, aged 3.04 billion years. Furthermore, if the data were plotted and correlationally analyzed, the year of the report versus the radioisotope age of the Earth, then the correlational r was 0.833 for the 42 cases. Accordingly, if we believe that the data were biased toward an older Earth, then that conclusion

⁹⁵ R.H. Dott, and R.L. Batten, *Evolution of the Earth*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), 110.

⁹⁶ Curtis, op.cit.

⁹⁷ U. Lanham, *The Sapphire Planet*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 37.

⁹⁸ Curtis, op.cit.

⁹⁹ Parker, op.cit.

¹⁰⁰ G.B. Dalrymple, *The Age of the Earth*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 375, 401-2.

would be wrong less than one time in a thousand cases given such data. Such bias was another reason for rejecting the indirect estimates from radioisotopes.

Another reason for rejecting the radioisotope data was that they evidently were not calibrated to solar years. Radioisotopes are not clocks. They are radioactive elements that devolve to lower elements. That means that their rate of decay along with a list of assumptions, some of which are known to be false, must be referenced to the standard solar year. The standard is something known to be true. For example, if a rock originates by solidifying from the lava of a volcanic eruption and radioisotope dating is considered competent, and it is so considered, to determine the age of that rock, then the calibration is to equate the apparent age from the radioisotopes to the real age from the date of the eruption. The equation may subsequently be used to obtain real ages from apparent radioisotope ages. To my knowledge, this has been done twice. Let us see how well radioisotope years calibrate to actual calendar years.

There was a case in the literature of a rock that was known to be 10 years old having been formed in the eruption of Mt. St. Helens. It was sent in for radioisotope dating and it was dated as 340,000, 350,000 and 2.8 million years old, averaging 1.163 ± 1.42 million years old.¹⁰¹ If we construct a calibration equation by letting 1.163 million radioisotope years equal 10 actual years, then the 4.5 billion radioisotope years for the age of the Earth calibrated to 3,868 actual (solar) years for the age of the Earth. These data indicated that if radioisotopes were calibrated, then they yielded an age of the Earth that was too young because it would have meant that the Egyptians, for example, had built the pyramids in outer space more than 800 years before the Earth existed. It would also have meant that vitalism-evolution-neo-darwinism would not have

¹⁰¹ S.A. Austin, "Excess Argon Within Mineral Concentrates from the New Dacite Lava Dome at Mount St. Helens Volcano." *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* 10 (1996): 335-343.

had enough time to work even if the laws of physics were reversed and the biosphere evolved instead of devolved. Let us also note that the evolutionists said that dinosaur fossils are 65 million years old according to radioisotope dating. That would yield a calibrated actual age of 65 years in the past from the year 2000 or about 1935. Dinosaurs strolling around Times Square, or anywhere else in the world, in the 1930's would have caused quite a sensation. That also meant that the supposed age of 5.2 million years for Haile-Salassie's alleged *Ardipithecus ramidus kadabba* ape-man would have calibrated to about five years ago, a modern man, which was consistent with the geometrical, morphological, correlational analysis.¹⁰² These published data by the evolutionists themselves indicated that radioisotope dating was grossly biased, not valid, unreliable, and uncalibrated for fossils as well as for an age of the Earth or the universe.

From another rock of known age in a different study, and from the radioisotope age of that rock, the rock gave a calibrated age of the Earth of 1,314 years old compared to the 4.5 billion years by radioisotope dating.¹⁰³ This calibrated radioisotope age for the Earth was less valid than the results from the previous calibration and demonstrated again why raw radioisotope estimates must be rejected. When radioisotope dating was calibrated against an object of known

¹⁰² Y. Haile-Salassie, "Late Miocene Hominids from the Middle Awash, Ethiopia," *Nature* 412 (2001): 178-181.

Joseph Mastropaolo, "An Objective Ancestry Test for Fossil Bones," *The Physiologist* 45 (2002): 343, 2002; *TJ, The In-Depth Journal of Creation* 16(2002): 84-88.

¹⁰³ A.A. Snelling, "The Cause of Anomalous Potassium-Argon 'Ages' for Recent Andesite Flows at Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand, and Implications for Potassium-Argon 'Dating.'" Fourth International Conference on Creationism, Pittsburgh, PA, August 3-8, 1998.

age, as every competent scientist would require, then in the above two cases the results were so obviously not valid that they were rejected with absolute certainty. The unreliable nature of radioisotope dating also was revealed in the calibrations as well as in the reliability analyses. A calibrated age of the Earth of 3,868 years old was not consistent with a calibrated age of 1,314 years old. For science, calibrations with errors of 1% were considered tolerable, but not 66%. Altogether, the unreliable, biased, invalid, uncalibrated ages of the Earth from radioisotopes were obviously anti-science.

From the history of radioisotope ages of the Earth from 1921 to 1991, the method evidently was biased, invalid, unreliable, and uncalibrated which disqualified it fourfold for any scientific research. These gross, inherently unscientific characteristics made radioisotope dating scientifically useless for an age of the Earth or for the age of any fossil. Therefore for science, there was no objective, valid, reliable, calibrated, retrospective, indirect clock to estimate the age of the Earth.

The requirement for objective, valid, reliable, and calibrated scientific evidence demanded the acceptance of the historical direct estimates and the rejection of the 19th and 20th century indirect methods for estimating the age of the Earth. Therefore, 21st century science supported the historical records in solar years reported in Genesis and refuted the biased, invalid, unreliable, uncalibrated indirect methods of the 19th and 20th century. The 19th and 20th century indirect methods for estimating the age of the Earth could not prove the Earth was old whereas the historical direct method does pass all objective, valid, reliable, calibration scientific tests and did thereby establish that the Earth is young, that is $6,800 \pm 850$ years old.¹⁰⁴ Therefore based on

¹⁰⁴ Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 79-85.
Mastropaolo, 2005, op.cit., 11-15.

unanimous proof that evolution is 100% false, devolution is 100% true, and the Earth is young, then the reading of choice for Genesis was literal, not allegorical.

VIII.

The acid test that evolution is false and devolution is true. This study was executed in phases. The first phase was a scholarly search of the literature for 2,500 years. That search completely failed to find any objective, valid, reliable, calibrated, scientific evidence to support evolution. Instead, devolution, the exact opposite and excluder of evolution, was found to be the law that ruled the entire universe, viable and nonviable alike. The acid test of those findings, the second phase, was to offer evolutionists worldwide, bar none, a \$10,000 award on a continuing basis for their scientific evidence in support of evolution. Although more than 160 individuals and, by organization, more than 363,000 evolutionists altogether were invited to submit their evidence, as scientists were obligated to do, or contend with it against devolution or creation in mini-trials for unlimited \$10,000 awards, not one did. That confirmed the finding of the scholarly search of the literature that there was not now and never has been any scientific evidence to support evolution.¹⁰⁵ The third phase was to have been the mini-trials of evolution versus devolution or creation. None of the 363,000 evolutionists would contend, in spite of the fact that the \$10,000 awards could be won continuously. For example, if a mini-trial were held

¹⁰⁵ Mastropaolo, 2003, op.cit., 125, 126, 159, 160.

Mastropaolo, 2005, op.cit., 20-23, 25, 26.

Mastropaolo, 2006, op.cit., 9-14.

Also see www.lifescienceprize.org.

and won on day one and the evolutionist contended five days per week for 20 weeks, then the awards would amount to a million dollars. If each mini-trial took four hours or less, then an evolutionist could reap one million dollars for repetitive half-time work for five months. The fact that such rewards could not entice the hidden, perhaps secret, scientific evidence that supported evolution strongly suggested that it was nonexistent.

From May 5-7, 2005 in Topeka, Kansas, before the Science Committee of Kansas State Board of Education, 17 Ph.D.'s presented scientific evidence in scientific papers that proved life was intelligently designed and absolutely did not evolve. None of that evidence was disputed. Furthermore, a whole day was allotted for the evolutionists to present their scientific evidence and not one evolutionist presented anything. This confirmed that there was no scientific evidence to support evolution.

On October 11, 2006, at the Hearing on the Teaching of Evolution for the European Parliament of the European Union in Brussels, Belgium, the first paper on sedimentology and stratigraphy found no evidence to support evolution. The second paper on paleontology also found no evidence to support evolution. The third paper presented scientific evidence that the entire universe, viable and nonviable alike, had unanimously devolved and had never evolved.¹⁰⁶ None of the evidences for all three papers were disputed. That strongly suggested again that scientific evidence to support evolution or to dispute universal devolution was nonexistent.

IX.

¹⁰⁶ Mastropaolo, 2006, op.cit.

Summary and Conclusions. Genesis may be read literally, or it may be read allegorically in deference to the perceived contradictions of Adam and Eve from ape-men and the perceived contradictions of a young Earth by 19th and 20th century indirect methods that alleged the Earth was millions or billions of years old. The alleged contradictions of Adam and Eve collapsed scientifically because all alleged ape-men were frauds or forgeries, and ape and monkey bones were anatomically dissimilar compared to human bones thus belying alleged mosaic similarities and a common ancestor. Genetic science also revealed that at least 145 DNA repair genes would not permit any biological wandering from one kind of life form to any other kind of life form. The epidemiology and curvilinear rise of new genetic disorders proved devolution, predicted extinction, disproved evolution, disproved mutations as a mechanism for neo-darwinism, and permitted a retrospective extrapolation to a genetically flawless Adam, Eve, and biosphere. The other alleged scientific evidences for evolution were 12% superstitions, 74% frauds, and 14% forgeries. Evolution thereby richly earned the appellation, anti-science, because science, like the law, was based on the truth and evolution specified the exact opposite of reality. The acid test that devolution was true and evolution was false was that 363,000 evolutionists worldwide bar none had zero evidence to support evolution and had zero evidence to refute devolution, the primordial law of the entire universe, viable and nonviable alike, the exact opposite and excluder of evolution.

On the basis of natural science, theologians need no longer compromise the meaning of Scripture. Natural science supported the literal reading of Genesis. In fact, science supported religion in general. The only conflicts were between religion and the anti-science, evolution, and between science and the anti-science, evolution. Like evolution and the alleged old Earth, a

natural scientific reason for the allegorical reading of Genesis, or for any conflict with religion in general, was nonexistent.

California State University, Long Beach

Long Beach, California