

# A THEORY FOR THE BIRDS



AMBASSADOR COLLEGE Production





## TOUCAN "SQUAWKS" AT EVOLUTION!

by Jerry Gentry, Photographic Technician

The Keel-billed Toucan you see on our cover originally came from Colombia, South America. We purchased him from a local "bird ranch," which specializes in rare and exotic species of birds from around the world.

Then we built a large temporary cage of cardboard with a *glass front* for the toucan. The cage allowed for free movement of the bird. One long pole was placed through the center of the cage, horizontal to the floor and parallel to the front glass.

The pole served as a comfortable perch for the bird, keeping him on a *definite plane* for quick focus with our telephoto lens during photographing sessions.

Choosing a background — that was the next question.

As you can see, the bird's beak has various shades of green, blue, orange, red, brown, and black. What would *contrast* these colors, and give a bright, yet complimentary background?

RED! That would be a striking color for background.

Next, we set up photofloods inside the cage to provide sufficient lighting with a minimum of reflection. Tripod and camera were set up in front of the cage. A telephoto lens was used to maintain *sufficient distance* between glass and camera to avoid troublesome reflections in the final picture. (For camera buffs, the film was Ektachrome Type "B," pushed 2 full f-stops to maintain a lens aperture of f-22 and shutter speed of 1/30 second.)

A few hours of patient and steady work made it possible to catch JUST the expression we wanted — a RUFFLED toucan with an indignant SQUAWK aimed at "A THEORY FOR THE BIRDS"!!!

This Booklet is provided as an educational service by Ambassador College.

NOT TO BE SOLD

Copyright © 1967, 1968, 1971 Ambassador College

All Rights Reserved

Printed in U.S.A. by Ambassador College Press, Pasadena, California

# A THEORY FOR THE BIRDS

*Did the MIRACLE OF FLIGHT come from frayed, loosely hanging FISH SCALES? Did the myriads of birds EVOLVE from ungainly, hulking caymans and crocodiles? Evolutionists say they did. Reason, logic, common sense, TRUE science and the Great Creator God say they DIDN'T! Here's the PROOF!*

by Garner Ted Armstrong and Paul W. Kroll

**B**IRDS CAME from reptiles — according to the theories of Evolution.

The closest living relatives to modern birds, say evolutionists, are the *crocodiles*. There could be no more shocking statement than to say the closest living relatives to men are houseflies, or that the butterfly evolved from a rhinoceros!

But is there any real PROOF?

Can evolution really PROVE birds came from reptiles?

Birds are *amazing* creatures — *fantastically* designed — each for a different specific *purpose*.

## Can Jet Planes Evolve?

If we told you our modern jet airliners EVOLVED, what would you say? Would you believe it *credible* that these huge, roaring monsters of metal, with their complex, power-driven control systems, their hydraulic systems, intricate electronic navigational gear, and dizzying array of instruments just PUT THEMSELVES TOGETHER?

If you read of how, over millions of years, a “near-airplane” GREW a cabin, fuselage, fin, rudder, ailerons and navigational equipment — you’d doubt the sanity of the author, wouldn’t you?

“But,” one may answer, “that’s a man-MADE, *manufactured* piece of equipment, and we’re talking of *living creatures*.”

That’s just it!

We’re talking of LIVING CREATURES — amazingly complex creatures of FLIGHT. Little creatures with dozens of different *types* of specialized airframes, wingfoils, “rudders, ailerons, and stabilizers,” with such amazing navigational equipment a modern jet aircraft can’t COMPARE with their remarkable accuracy. We’re talking of a fantastic array of *different kinds* of “landing gear,” sea and air “search” equipment, and birds that hover

(like helicopters), take off *straight up* (like VTOL aircraft), FLY BACKWARD (like some helicopters can ALMOST do — but in nowhere near so accurate a fashion as a hummingbird), SOAR (like gliders), fly in complex formations (like military bombers), and migrate over mysterious courses for thousands upon thousands of miles to reach the SAME TINY NEST, year after year!

And all this EVOLVED?

Ridiculous! And, you will see just HOW really RIDICULOUS it is to believe the *breathhtaking* array of creatures around you could have evolved without the limitless intelligence of a CREATOR GOD, a Great DESIGNER of all life, and all living things!

## What It Takes to Fly


But what about birds themselves? What does it take to *fly*?

“Thousands of papers have been written on the AERODYNAMICS OF BIRD FLIGHT, but a bird’s wing with its many flexible moving parts which twist and bend under the pressure of the air, particularly in flapping flight, DEFIES the sort of critical analysis to which we can subject the rigid wing of an aircraft. Wind tunnels, smoke screens, streams and mathematical formulas *fail to give* us more than an INKLING of the answers. Perhaps electronic computers may someday help us define the forces acting on the wing of a bird in flight” (*The Birds*, LIFE NATURE LIBRARY, page 39).

A bird’s wing serves in the capacity of wing AND propeller. Both bird and airplane rely on the identical laws of physics. High-speed photography has shown that the mechanics of bird flight are tremendously complex. That our man-made, machine-driven airplanes and jets are rather primitive in comparison.

Let’s analyze some parts of the anatomy of





Wells — Ambassador College

the birds — their feathers, respiratory, skeletal, digestive and nervous systems — their bills and nest-building techniques. These are only a few of the marvelous aspects of bird biology.

#### The Fantastic Feather

Take a bird's flight feather. Is it complex? Is it an engineering masterpiece? Let an ornithologist answer.

"The feather is a marvel of NATURAL ENGINEERING. It is at once extremely light and structurally strong, much more versatile than the rigid structure of an aircraft's wing — and far more readily repaired or replaced when damaged.

"The *intricacy of the design* that allows this can be appreciated by putting the feather under a microscope. It will be seen that each parallel barb, slanting diagonally from the shaft, is not hairlike, but appears as a miniature *replica* of the feather itself, with numerous smaller side branches, or barbules, that overlap those of the neighboring barbs in adhering to one pattern. These in turn have tiny projections called barbicels, many of which are equipped with minute hooks that neatly hold everything in place. The single pigeon feather under scrutiny may have *several hundred thousand barbules* and MILLIONS of barbicels and hooklets.

"How did this structural marvel evolve? It

**THE HOVERING HUMMER** — Hummingbird hovers like helicopter over rose as he sucks nectar. Shot was taken in Ambassador College Photography Research Laboratory.

takes *no great stretch of imagination* to envisage a feather as a modified scale, basically like that of a reptile — a longish scale loosely attached, whose outer edges frayed and spread out until it evolved into the highly complex structure that it is today" (*The Birds*, LIFE NATURE LIBRARY, pages 33, 34).

No great stretch of the imagination? That's stretching it clear beyond the *breaking* point!

Notice! First comes a marvelous description of the intricacy and perfection of a bird's FEATHER! Then you are assured such INTRICATE MARVELS developed from a loose, hanging, frayed SCALE!

But, there ARE NO SUCH "scales" anywhere in the fossil record! And, IF ungainly creatures, slowly developing "frayed, loosely attached" half-scales and half-"feathers" dejectedly stomped to and fro over the earth — they would have been found in GREAT ABUNDANCE in the fossil record.

First — loosely hanging and frayed scales would have meant they were no longer "equipped" to *survive* in their natural habitat! Secondly, they would have been leaping to their deaths from precipices, slippery limbs, rocks and bushes, feebly fluttering their loosely attached, frayed "scales"



which were desperately trying to become “feathers.”

But notice again! It is carefully pointed out how a feather is PERFECT! INTRICATELY DESIGNED! Then you're told this is all the result of an ACCIDENT — the FRAYING of a loose SCALE!

What is the answer? Where *did* the feather come from?

There's only ONE logical answer. It was created by a Master Designer, a great God that created the bird family, and everything that exists.

Notice, how *perfectly* engineered feathers are to perform the EXACT JOB that is required of them. This isn't blind, purposeless, supposed evolution. This is great engineering, masterful design, directed *purpose* of a Creator God.

### A Marvel of Engineering

“Among the many engineering accomplishments that *birds have achieved*, the development and muscular control of feathers stands out as one of the major keys to their success. No other animals possess these remarkable structures. Feathers are both light and flexible and can be controlled with precision and agility.

“Yet, each feather possesses the strength required for the stresses imposed by flight, there being no stronger substance of equivalent size and weight in nature.

“Feathers provide smooth and streamlined body contours which are essential for reduction of air friction and turbulence and, when properly groomed, are completely waterproof. They form one of the most efficient types of insulation known, because of the profusion of dead air spaces that they enclose, and thereby aid in maintaining the bird's high body temperatures. Feathers also play important roles in courtship and sex recognition”

“In most birds only a few of these flight feathers are replaced at one time and the sequence of replacement is such that there is no loss of ability to fly” (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, pages 17, 18, 22).

We asked the question at the beginning: What does it take to fly? Can the cabin of an airplane fly? Can its tail fly? Can any part of an airplane fly by ITSELF?



Of course not.

But further. Each part has to be engineered in a particular fashion to take *its part* in one giant machine we call an airplane.



Wells — Ambassador College

Photos at right show assortment of bird bones. Notice porous and hollow characteristic of bones — making them lighter, and more useful for easier flying.

## POROUS BIRD BONES!










# BIRD FEATHERS—Creative Handiwork of God

*Wells — Ambassador College; Below, Eisenbeiss — Photo Researchers*





What's the point of all this?

Simply this.

Evolutionists would have us believe that birds developed the parts they need to fly — *piece by piece!* It's rather inane to think this way about an airplane. No airplane can fly unless each piece is engineered properly so that the *whole unit is airworthy.*

But some have gullibly swallowed this idea when they are told such notions about *birds.*

Notice what evolutionists say about the evolution of feathers.

"During their evolution from reptiles to their modern form, birds became warm-blooded. Then they needed something other than scales to provide a covering. With the evolution of feathers they had a cover that kept them warm, and in some cases, dry. This cover was also so light in weight that it wasn't a burden while they were improving their ability to fly. Their original scales were too heavy for flight" (*Birds*, Robert Allen, page 7).

Now, how did they *know* they ought to fly? How did they *know* they needed a covering? Did they reason all this out? How did they "become" warm-blooded? What does this "change" involve?

We never foolishly assume an improvement is made unless a man REASONS out the process. He comes to understand there is a problem and figures out or "engineers" the solution.

Do birds — or rather did "near-birds" think?

And do *extreme* changes in environment "force" animals, fish, birds to "change"? Or are they merely *killed?*

We need to open our eyes and THINK about some of the statements we accept from others.

But feathers are only the first necessary step. If reptiles are to become birds, a transformation in the whole respiratory system is necessary. Notice, how ornithologists reason about this "development."

### Respiratory System

"Birds and mammals have the *ability* to maintain a very stable body temperature in spite of highly variable internal and external environmental conditions.

"Because of the increased oxygen supply and greater capacity for heat regulation required by their high body temperature, *birds have evolved* a respiratory system that is perhaps more highly developed than in any other group of animals" (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, page 32).

Now, what were birds doing before they "evolved" a highly developed respiratory system? Were they *freezing* to death as they flew? Did they die of suffocation? How many hundreds or

thousands of "near-bird" generations died because they hadn't "discovered" the secret of transforming their respiratory system?

Get the point?

But feathers and respiratory systems are still only PART of the problem. In order to fly and be a bird, you have to have a SKELETAL system that is unique. Remember, all this must be "developed" at the *same time*, if a "near-bird" is to survive.

Here's what ornithologists admit:

"AFTER birds branched off from the reptilian family tree most of the modifications in their skeletal structure *became directed toward* the airborne life. Their bones *became hollow*, like dry macaroni, and some of the larger bones even *evolved* internal struts for reinforcement.

"Since flight demands a rigid air-frame, the body box — the rib cage case and especially the backbone — *became rigid*, with some of the bones fused" (*The Birds*, LIFE NATURE LIBRARY, page 35).

Oh, so it was AFTER birds had already branched off. Supposedly, they were already flying and feathered. But they still hadn't developed a bird-like skeletal system to match.

Now how are we to imagine this took place?

Evolutionists tell us.

"There *followed* a loss of certain bones and a fusion of others to insure maximum rigidity and compactness. Increased porosity and a penetration of bones by air sacs has further lightened the skeleton as a whole.

"The evolution of the wing of birds has been marked by the *extensive fusion* of some bones and the *loss* of others resulting in a remarkably strong yet lightweight structure" (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, pages 24, 25).

Can your mind envisage this?

Here are *remarkable engineering feats* — tossed off in a few statements. How are bones lost? By what method do others come together? How do bones make *themselves* porous? How did new methods of locomotion originate?

How did harmony result from two stress-resisting systems? Remember, evolution has no purpose, no plan, is not necessarily heading in any one direction — say evolutionists.

Again, there is only ONE ANSWER. A Creator God created birds in the same manner that an engineer will plan out, design and construct a modern airplane.

But feathers and respiratory systems are still not enough. In order for a reptile to become a bird, his whole DIGESTIVE system would have to be revamped.



Again, we quote from an associate curator and renowned ornithologist.

### Digestive System

“An apparent dilemma posed by the demands of flight upon the avian digestive system is the need for increased fuel consumption on the one hand and economy of weight on the other.

“Unnecessary overloading of the body is avoided to some extent by a selective diet consisting of a minimum of indigestible material. Then, foodstuffs actually ingested are digested rapidly and efficiently, followed by immediate elimination of wastes” (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, page 34).

Large storage capacity of the esophagus, unique division of the stomach, no bladder and a cloaca for rapid elimination of waste! — how could all these digestive marvels be “developed” gradually and independently?

Now how did the “near-birds” know they were in a dilemma? Did they reason out the fact that they needed more fuel? Who told them what diet to select?

Does an airplane “decide” to learn what type of fuel it will use? Has any airplane, jet or rocket decided to overhaul its motor to keep up with advances in technology — changes in environment? Ridiculous!

But still we aren't at an end. For reptiles to become birds we need a REWIRING JOB — a new nervous system.

### Nervous System

“Among the various organ systems of birds, not the least influenced by the demands of flight has been the nervous system. This influence has been exercised directly in the case of a need for coordinating and positioning the body in flight, and indirectly with regard to sensory perception in behaviour patterns that have been modified by flight” (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, page 34).

Some of these differences are optic lobes of the brain — larger than even man's, disproportionately large eyes, a uniquely shaped eyeball.

But WHICH CAME FIRST?

Remember, without feathers, so PERFECTLY designed and engineered, fused bones, hollow bones, and “new” bones, wings are no good. Without air sacs, rapidly beating heart, totally different respiratory system, the wings can't be flapped so rapidly — and without complete redesigning of all body muscles, the creature can't even BEGIN to try to fly.

But even with new muscles, new bones, perfect feathers, air sacs, rapid heartbeat and

speeded-up metabolism, birds need NAVIGATIONAL EQUIPMENT! They need larger eyes (almost filling up the cranium), and a coordinating system to OPERATE all these complex systems.

Let's understand.

You can have an entire plane — but rip out the controls and instrument panel and the plane will be of no value. Now, if you ONLY have the controls and instrument panel but you lack an airplane — it won't fly either.

It's either everything or nothing, black or white, one hundred percent or nothing. These things didn't evolve. They couldn't. They had to be CREATED TOGETHER!

But let's go further.

What about a “simple” apparatus — the bird's bill or beak?

### Bird Bills

Why do birds that are primarily insect feeders have short, thin bills which they use as forceps in picking food from vegetation? Why do woodpeckers have chisel-shaped bills with which they remove wood in search of insects? Why is their tongue built to penetrate deep into bark to ferret out insects?

Why do fish-eating birds have serrations along the edge of the bill — just what they need to firmly grasp their food? Why do herons and kingfishers actually have spears to jab food with? Why do skimmers have their bills arranged in such a manner that they can scoop up fish? The lower mandible acts like a plow as they skim across the water scooping up fish.

Why do carnivorous birds have strong beaks for tearing flesh?

Notice what a “mechanical marvel” the beak is.

“A bird's beak serves it for knife, fork, and spoon, as well as for hammer and chisel in many species. Its chief use is in connection with procuring food, so that we find, among birds as a whole, an EXTREME VARIETY of shapes of bills, adapted for gathering various kinds of food” (*Birds and Their Attributes*, Glover Allen, page 78).

Now did this fantastic array “develop” gradually? If evolution is blind chance, how did these highly developed tools come to be?


For example, take the KEEL-BILLED TOUCAN, pictured on our cover. He's one of 37 species ranging from southern Mexico southward to Paraguay and northern Argentina.

Scientists are puzzled — and speculate wildly — as to why the many toucans have such large, cumbersome and gaudily colored beaks.

Many theories are postulated.

For example, some think it MAY have been





**SCARLET  
MACAW**

Angermayer — Photo Researchers



## A BILL FOR EVERY NEED

developed for eating some peculiarly soft fruit (long since extinct, of course!). Or, perhaps it was for capturing a strange insect.

Perhaps it served some DEFENSIVE purpose in the long ago, say some. Yet, today the beak does very little to deter weasels and hawks, biggest predators of toucans.

Still another author postulates: "Perhaps the toucan's bill has *no particular adaptive function!*"

Yet the same writer admits "the bill is an EFFICIENT fruit-picking tool and a WONDERFUL piece of *structural engineering*. It is amazingly light in weight, for inside its outer horny sheath it is *trussed with a honeycomb of stiff cellular fibers* that impart strength with lightness." (*Birds of the World*, by Oliver L. Austin, Jr., page 189.)

Amazing!

The toucan's beak is PERFECTLY fitted for eating fruit, the mainstay of his diet!

But how DIFFICULT it seems to be for some to see this simple fact!

GOD CREATED the toucan with a beak *perfectly fitted* to do the job intended. And at the same time He gave this bird a very beautiful, yet strange and perplexing LOOK to confuse postulating theorists.

But more staggering than all this—is the fantastically variable factor of NEST building. Just a superficial study is enough to stagger the imagination.

### Nest Building

We quote again from a well-known ornithologist. Notice carefully the statements made.

"Though the location of the nest, its form, and the techniques and materials required for its construction are *extremely diverse* among different species, the completed nest is REMARKABLY UNIFORM among the members of a single species.


"This uniformity is all the more remarkable when one realizes that many nests represent the work of young birds that have had NO PREVIOUS TRAINING or experience in nest construction" (*Biology of the Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, pages 127-128).

Ah, did you notice?


How did birds, with no previous training build the *same nest* as the other members of its species?

Why are nests so diverse among DIFFERENT species, yet so uniform among a SINGLE species? Again, there simply is no answer apart from a great Creator God that *built in* the "computerized" information necessary for particular birds to act in a special fashion.


It's the true and only really logical answer.



**WOODPECKER**  
*Wood Chisel*



**FLAMINGO**  
*Mud Strainer*



**HUMMINGBIRD**  
*Nectar Sipper*




# A Nest For Every Bird

Every variety of bird builds its own unique kind of nest. But every bird within a variety — without previous experience — builds the same kind of nest. To the right, each with its own type of nest, are long-billed curlew (top) and water ouzel and barn swallow (bottom left and right). On this page, top, belted kingfisher nest; bottom left, ovenbird; bottom right, prairie warbler nest.

*Photos on this page: Austing — Photo Researchers. Right-hand page: McHugh — Photo Researchers (bottom right); Erwin — National Audubon Society*









There is tremendous variety among the birds as to *where* they build nests, *how* these nests are constructed, and *from what* materials they are put together.

Some don't build nests. The Piping Plover simply makes a slight depression in the sand and lines it with bits of shells. Waterfowl pluck the down feathers from the female and make their nests. The Fairy Terns lay and hatch their eggs on bare branches. The Chimney Swift builds its nest of twigs. It uses its own sticky saliva as glue.

The South American ovenbird uses mud. The Crested Flycatcher uses a convenient cavity in a tree. The Downy Woodpecker excavates his own nest. The Blue-gray Gnatcatcher uses lichen to cover and camouflage its nest.

And still — all this is only the beginning!

To study, and study CAREFULLY, the nesting habits of just ONE BIRD would stagger the imaginations!

But that's not all.

The breathtaking marvels of actual FLIGHT, as caught by a fast camera lens are beautiful and inspiring to see! The imagination-defying trips of the many *migratory* birds — with FAR more accurate and dependable navigational equipment BUILT INTO those tiny brains than can be placed in the multimillion dollar jet aircraft of today — those mysterious trips are MARVELOUS to study!

To show you the marvelous homing and migratory ability of birds, let's see what happens to a *human* when he becomes lost.

### A Case History

"Call the police!" shrieked Timmy's mother. So the police came. A neighborhood search was launched immediately, with several dozen policemen in patrol cars, and on foot, participating.

Timmy, age 4, had been missing from home.

His playmate, across the street, said he saw him go down the street about 3:00 p.m. None of the neighbors had seen him since 3:00.

It was now 5:30.

Timmy's father arrived home from the office — frightened, distraught. He had received his wife's worried call an hour earlier, and grown more and more fearful as he battled the heavy freeway traffic home. It was now 5:45.

And then, a police car pulled up at the walk.

A big policeman got out, carrying a small, whimpering child in his arms.

Later, the parents found Timmy had wandered down unfamiliar alleys, stopped to pick grapes from a backyard vine, and had chased a yellow puppy for several blocks. Walking along, kicking at rocks, picking up sticks to rattle against the picket fences,

Timmy was unaware he was walking further away from home.

He realized he was lost when he came to the big boulevard with the red light, and the stores on both sides of the street.

He began to cry.

A service station attendant took Timmy into the station office, and called the police.

Lost — and only seven blocks from home, in an unfamiliar direction.

Overhead, the faint noise of a mournful goose wafted down through the cool autumn skies. A flock of geese, in a long, perfect formation, flew majestically southward.

Within another two weeks, the big flock would set their wings for a final landing at their wintering grounds near Port Arthur, Texas. They would have flown, unerringly, for thousands of miles — all the way from Northern Manitoba along the shores of Hudson's Bay, to this wintering ground on the Gulf of Mexico.

Timmy was lost, hopelessly, only seven blocks from home.

But these migrating birds *always* manage to arrive at the *precise* spot, season after season. The following year, young geese would fly, never having seen or learned the route, the same "Mississippi Flyway" with the same mysterious, unerring accuracy!

WHY? How?

How is it that a HUMAN being can be completely turned around inside a city — hopelessly lost in a small forest — *without* sense of direction only blocks from home, when tiny birds, bees, butterflies, eels, salmon, and many other migrating creatures can travel THOUSANDS of miles in adverse weather conditions, and ALWAYS ARRIVE AT THE PRECISE SPOT?

### The Mystery of Migration

Bird migration is one of the great, unanswerable MYSTERIES of what man likes to call "nature." Bird biologists continually speak of the great, unsolved MYSTERIES of migrating birds — of the MYSTERY of their complex navigation methods.

As one authority said, "There is no more fascinating way of arousing interest in flight than having your child catch a sight of migrating birds — perhaps a flight of geese in military formation,

Top: Robert Hermes — National Audubon Society  
Bottom: Douglas Aircraft Photo

### WHAT IT TAKES TO FLY —

OPPOSITE PAGE, TOP, shows the Arctic tern, one of the most amazing migrating birds. BELOW, cockpit of modern jet plane. Yet, even the most elaborate jet aircraft, with their vast array of sophisticated equipment cannot match the navigational prowess of tiny birds! And it's all crammed into their tiny brain.










GOLDEN PLOVER



GREAT SHEARWATER



BOBOLINK

## THE MARVEL OF MIGRATION

Above are four examples illustrating the marvel of migration. The Golden Plover makes an 8,000-mile trip entirely on its own. The Great Shearwater commutes from the tiny island of Tristan da Cunha to the North Atlantic — and back to this tiny dot of land. The Bobolink is the top migrator among land birds, averaging 7,000 miles in its jaunt from Canada to Argentina. The Arctic Tern is the champion long-distance migrator — which has been known to travel 14,000 miles.


Animals and their travels form one of the great wonders of our earth. Scientists know that eels, elephants, bats, turtles, plankton, whales — among many others — migrate in some form.

Locusts migrate sporadically. Every few years lemmings migrate. Horseshoe crabs migrate periodically into shore. Even ladybird beetles migrate. Monarch butterflies migrate hundreds of miles — south in the fall, north in the spring. Adult eels swim downstream. King Salmon may migrate 1000 miles up the Columbia River. Toads and frogs hop their way around the world. Big turtles migrate hundreds of miles through the ocean.

But the best-known migrators are birds. Ornithologists still must speak of the "mystery of migration." It has been estimated that about one third of all bird species migrate. In the diagrams above are the routes of four of them. Below are listed twelve more migrators.

Bird	Migration Path	Distance in Miles
KIRTLAND WARBLER	MICHIGAN, U.S.A. — BAHAMA ISLANDS	1200
BLUE GEESE	NORTHEASTERN CANADA — LOUISIANA, U.S.A.	1700
LESSER YELLOWLEGS	MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.A. — MARTINIQUE, W. INDIES	1900
SHINING CUCKOO	NEW ZEALAND — SOLOMON ISLANDS	2000
SEMI-PALMATED SANDPIPER	MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.A. — VENEZUELA	2400
BLUE-WINGED TEAL	QUEBEC, CANADA — GUYANA	3300
MANX SHEARWATER	VENICE, ITALY — WALES, ENGLAND (BY WATER)	3700
BLACKPOLL WARBLER	CANADA — BRAZIL	4000
BRISTLE-THIGHED CURLEW	TAHITI — CENTRAL ALASKA	5500
WHITE STORK	GERMANY — SOUTH AFRICA	8000
BARN SWALLOW	NORTHERN CANADA — NORTH CENTRAL ARGENTINA	9000
WILSON'S PETREL	ANTARCTICA — NORTH ATLANTIC	9000





ARCTIC TERN

or a close-massed flock of grackles racing like a dark wind-blown cloud. *Even after years of research and experiment*, scientists speak of the 'MYSTERY' of bird migration, for they still do not completely understand it." (*Illustrated Encyclopedia of Animal Life*, Vol. 1, page 17.)

Another authority admitted, "For centuries men have wondered at the marvel of migration, and while much has been learned in recent years, the *real mystery is still unsolved*."

"The GREATEST MYSTERY about bird migration is the ability of many birds to move over the same route, year after year, arriving each spring in the same nesting locality and spending each winter in the same place" (*Birds*, Robert Porter Allen, page 9).

But WHY do birds migrate?

What strange compulsion CAUSES these tiny brains to "decide" it's time to begin a tortuous journey over the vastness of oceans, over the broad expanse of whole continents?

What strange, mysterious "sense" causes them to KNOW when to leave? How do they arrive with absolute predictability — right on time, year after year? *How* do tiny birds (MANY, MANY species migrate!) return year after year to the SAME NEST AREA — after a flight THOUSANDS of miles, through all kinds of weather?

How DO THEY NAVIGATE? How do they find their way?

These questions present really gigantic difficulties to evolutionary theory. Some attempts to rationalize them out of the way are almost humorous.

Says one evolutionary authority about migrating birds, "One of the questions most frequently asked of an ornithologist is: 'Why do birds migrate?'. . . WE CAN ONLY SPECULATE as to what these factors [causal factors of migration] may have

been, for it is *impossible to substantiate* these theories with experimentation" (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, pages 68, 69).

Why do birds migrate? *When* did bird migration begin? How did bird migration begin? The evolutionists answer, "WE DON'T KNOW!" WE CAN "ONLY SPECULATE!"

And NO WONDER they call it a mystery!

### The "Homing" Instinct

The amazing ability of birds, fish, insects, and many kinds of animals to return to an exact mating or nesting spot is a fantastic story.

How FAR TO GO is the birds' big question. WHEN DOES A BIRD KNOW TO STOP? For instance, it was found by extensive banding of swallows that young nestlings on the European continent slightly south of the latitude of London wintered in Africa — in the northern and equatorial part — and on the Azores. Yet, the *same kind* of swallows nesting in Britain, only slightly farther north in breeding range, flew clear to SOUTH AFRICA, a distance TWICE as long as the European nesters.

The EXACT area where a bird was hatched is usually selected on its return migration. For instance, a swallow returned to nest on the *same beam* in a Pennsylvania barn for three years in succession.

Thousands upon thousands of such cases are observed, almost casually, by large segments of humankind. Yet these *marvelous* and *fathomless* testimonies to the great MIND OF GOD go unheeded, unnoticed by most.

Have you heard about the first three ruby-throated hummingbirds ever banded? They were extremely young babies when the tiny bands were placed on their legs. Astoundingly, they were found using the same feeding station their parents had used, after a flight of at least FIVE THOUSAND MILES clear to the tropics and back. And here they were, nesting within 30 feet of where they had been hatched.

CAN science explain it?


DOES evolution have any answers? COULD these MYSTERIOUS patterns have "evolved" GRADUALLY?

*Think*, and think deeply and logically about some of the breathtaking MYSTERIES of life all around you. Think of the countless MIRACLES you are privileged to witness each day — *ponder* them — be *amazed* by them, and give GOD THANKS for them.

Think about the Golden Plover. This one bird presents insurmountable difficulties to evolutionists, for his migratory patterns are so "*illogical*," seemingly *unnecessary*.

The Golden Plovers nest along the shores of





Ambassador College

The four major flyways of the Western Hemisphere used by many species of birds. Why these four routes? What determines the route to be followed? Read the amazing answer.

the *Arctic Ocean*, clear above the vast northern Canadian tundra — up in the land of permafrost and lichens, of Caribou and Musk Oxen. Then, after raising their young, the Golden Plovers set out on one of the most awe-inspiring migrations of all. Winging their way southward, they fly an elliptical course of more than SIXTEEN THOUSAND MILES.

First, they are seen flying through Labrador, to the tip of Nova Scotia. Then they fly over the Atlantic, completely bypassing the United States, clear to their vast wintering area between Rio de Janeiro, in Brazil, and Buenos Aires, in Argentina! When migrating northward, they cross the Andes Mountains, fly across Panama and Central America, up the Mississippi Valley, and on to their home in the vast, remote Arctic!

But WHY? How? What CAUSES such an extensive migration?

No one knows. Think of the problems involved. First, the Plovers *leave* their nesting area just when the available food reaches its PEAK. The insect population, the tiny crustaceans, the various forms of Arctic plant life are in greatest *abundance* at this time. Yet, the birds depart, mysteriously, for their wintering grounds.

Do they fly toward *warmer* climates? But WHY? The most pleasant time of the year in the Arctic is precisely when they *leave*.

Evolution supposes there are several reasons *why* birds migrate. But *none* of their supposes *work*.

For instance, it is assumed by some that birds

migrate because of failure of food supply in their nesting and breeding areas — winter scarcity of food. But we find the many different varieties of birds leaving LONG BEFORE their food supply is scarce — in some cases when it is MOST ABUNDANT!

Some suppose the *cold weather* causes their migrations. But not so. We may observe species after species leaving the northern United States in JULY or EARLY AUGUST, right in the HOTTEST time of the year, long before the heat of summer is over. There are also many cases of migrations *within the tropics*, having nothing to do with cold weather.

Others suppose the birds anciently began migrating in the face of advancing glaciers during the Pleistocene “ice age.”

This is perhaps the most humorous of all the supposes, possibly’s, maybe’s, perhapses, and “we have come to believes” that you’ll read about bird migration.

Besides — glaciers normally move rather slowly. Any bird, dwelling along the advancing edge of a glacier, and being subjected to frequent winter blizzards, could simply turn into a snowshoe rabbit, or perhaps an ice worm — or perhaps become a seal, and return to the Arctic sea. After all — since evolutionists tell us crocodiles are the “closest living relatives” to birds — *these* changes would be just as feasible as the complex migration patterns.

Some evolutionists have postulated the birds are, in actuality, returning to their “ancestral home” in the tropics. But this doesn’t work, either — since by no means do all of them “return” to the tropics — many migrations take place within



the tropics, from one area to another, and some birds fly right across the tropics to another cold region.

### The Greatest Globetrotter of All

The Arctic Tern, cousin to the seagull, completely baffles ornithologists.

Arctic Terns nest from northern Alaska to northern Greenland — and many nest as far south as Massachusetts. But from northern Europe to Asia, and from the Aleutians to Hudson Bay and the Atlantic coast, observers have seen and heard the nesting Terns.

Their annual migrations are so vast, so complex, and so improbable they are a great MYSTERY to bird watchers.

For example, the Terns nesting in the Cape Cod area (much farther south than most) fly clear across the Atlantic Ocean to offshore Spain, continue along the western coast of Africa, across the Atlantic again to the easternmost tip of South America, and along the South American coast to Antarctica! Some birds cover as much as 22,000 miles on a round trip that takes them in an elliptical path right back to the same gravel bed, the same creek, or lakeshore, or rocky coast, they had departed.

Says the *National Geographic School Bulletin* for March 6, 1967, "How birds navigate over such distances is a mystery. Scientists believe they may somehow steer their course by the sun and stars."

And they *do* — as experiments tend to prove.

But how? The stars appear to "rotate" in the sky each night — the earth constantly orbits, and the moon orbits around it. The "southern cross" becomes visible south of the equator, and the sky looks *totally different* to the Terns in the southern hemispheres than when they're in the northern part of the earth.

Scientists are still baffled. They have no definite answers.

Blue-winged Teal, well-known birds to the waterfowl hunter, are among the fastest long-distance fliers in the world. One bird, banded near Quebec, along the St. Lawrence River, flew to Guyana (formerly British Guiana), covering 3,300 miles at an average minimum travel of 122 miles each day. Ducks, however, frequently stop to rest and feed — and the Teal are among the fastest of the ducks.

But it seems the smaller the bird, the faster he migrates! The Semi-palmated Sandpiper, weighing only 15 *grams*, or ONE HALF OUNCE, flew 2,400 miles from Massachusetts to Venezuela in twenty-six days, at an average speed of 92 miles each day!

The stories about bird migrations are so awesome, so incredible, it's no wonder evolutionists

can only use the word "MYSTERY" when trying to explain *how* such marvelous things could have "just happened."

Still — scientists would have us believe much of this happened by CHANCE — as the result of natural selection and mutation!

### A Tale of a Terrified Tern

So let's go back, back, back in time. Back to the VERY FIRST BIRD MIGRATION!

After all — birds DO MIGRATE. This, we know. And they had to START sometime — this, we also know.

So, there had to be a *very first* migration.

Let's think about a little Arctic Tern. Here he is, huddled on his nest, up in the northernmost part of Canada. It's summer. He has plenty of food. He's happy. He fans out his feathers, yawns prodigiously, and sleeps.

August, September passes. The cold weather begins to set in. The Tern grows restless. He's cold. He's also hungry — since all the insect population seems to have disappeared, and the fish and tiny crustaceans he feeds on are all frozen solid, under the ice — or have long ago left for the warmer waters.

He decides to leave. But, alas, he hasn't stored up any body fat for the journey. He didn't know he should! After all — he's never "migrated" before!

So he turns southward, looking for warmer climates. But he's never done this before — he's a complete novice. So, halfway across the Atlantic Ocean, he "runs out of gas" (body fat) and plummets down into the sea, and drowns.

Homing flights of Albatross. Birds captured on Midway Island were transported to various points. The majority returned to their nests at Midway. The trip from the Philippines to Midway was 4,120 miles — covered in 32 days of flight.

Ambassador College





Or, if evolutionists would say this is impossible — since there *are* still Terns with us today — and somehow they *have* survived in SPITE of their migrations — let's assume he DIDN'T drown.

Let's assume he just became hopelessly lost, and has become known as the "great circle" bird. A strange creature that keeps flying around and around and around in "great circles" in the middle of the Atlantic.

But this would be preposterous, might the evolutionist say — no bird would be that crazy. But why, then, didn't the Terns *stop* when they found warmer climates? Why did they keep right on going, to the *frigid shores of Antarctica* to "winter" there?

Some have speculated it's because they like the sunlight. But why didn't the Tern just turn into a Ptarmigan (there are such birds in the high Arctic tundra!) and stay where he was?

But let's assume the very first Tern overcame ALL these many obstacles.

When he arrived in Antarctica (a feat even a modern jet, with its vast array of electronic instruments must be very careful to achieve) — how did he know *when to return* to the north?

What if the first birds had left the north too late — and froze before they left?

What if they became hopelessly confused, and migrated to the Hawaiian Islands instead?

And, anyway, why couldn't a Tern turn before he arrived in Antarctica? EIGHT THOUSAND MILES, JUST TO TURN AROUND? That's getting ridiculous!

Obviously, migrations CANNOT be the result of "natural selection."

First, if the birds didn't migrate until they HAD to, then they only migrated when conditions involving wind, weather, food and habitat FORCED them to. And if that's true (which it isn't) they didn't need to migrate anywhere NEARLY so far, over such DIFFICULT routes — NOR DID THEY EVER NEED TO RETURN.

If all birds are only seeking pleasanter habitat — then all birds must live ONLY in the temperate zones, and be found nowhere else! But that isn't true, either.

And, after all — why migrate?

Why not just become a penguin, and quit flying altogether?

#### Where Is Natural Selection?

When speaking of migration, evolutionists use such words, as "mystery," "out of man's grasp," "said to be," "ornithologists believe," "according to the theory," "other ornithologists believe," "no single solution," "other theories proposed," "no adequate answer."

One dashing quote admits: "ALL THEORIES

FAIL when offered as the one solution to all migration." (*Science News Letter*, page 191, September 22, 1962.) But we also saw that EACH theory in itself was *not* a possible answer.

If birds migrate because the food supply gives out, why do they leave BEFORE the supply is exhausted? If they migrate because of cold weather, why do they wing away BEFORE it gets cold?

It would have to be one of these two reasons IF — as evolutionists claim — birds "learned" to migrate due to necessity.

Thus, there is no *apparent need* — or at least there wasn't in the "birds' minds" concerning migration. Else why did they "learn" to leave before food and shelter gave out?

Where is natural selection then? Yet, we *must have it* to fulfill the requirements of the evolution theory.

One author frankly states:

"If natural selection has been responsible for the evolution of the adaptedness of behavior in an animal, then the way that animal is behaving right now must *obviously contribute to its survival*. This is why studies of the survival value of behavior are not only important in their own right but are also required for an understanding of evolution." (*Animal Behavior*, Niko Tinbergen, LIFE NATURE LIBRARY, page 174.)

#### Why Migration?

Another quote reveals that ornithologists, in spite of the obvious contradictions, still believe evolution is responsible for migration.

"What started migration . . . there is no question that the process HAS BEEN AN EVOLUTIONARY ONE." (*The Birds*, Roger T. Peterson, LIFE NATURE LIBRARY, page 106.)

But, the theories fail to answer *why* birds migrate.

We have already seen that birds leave BEFORE THE FOOD supply is exhausted. They leave BEFORE the cold sets in.

Now, if many (how many?) perished in attempts to migrate — when did they begin surviving? Did all those with "migratory mutated genes" perish? In how many generations did they learn to "make it"?

But WHY MIGRATE AT ALL? When in many cases it would be much easier, much safer, much wiser — IF birds evolved this behavior on their own — to STAY where they were.

Yes, why take the *chances of migrating*? And how did the first migrating birds ever make it? How did birds time their departure and arrival to correspond so beautifully with the climate and food supply at the other end?

If migration started as a response to the en-



vironment, why do birds migrate that *don't have to*? Why have BOTH migratory and nonmigratory birds survived? And the migrators seem to do rather well!

But the amazing factors of bird migration are *not yet exhausted!*

### Variety of Migratory Patterns

Different bird species have DIFFERENT migratory patterns. How does one explain this *difference* on the basis of evolution? Here is one attempt.

"A bird's migratory behavior is as much an adaptation to its environment . . . it *probably evolved independently during various periods in evolution and in response to a number of different selective processes*. The result has been a variety of kinds of migrations among birds today, each of which represents an adjustment to a different set of environmental conditions." (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, page 67.)

Oh, now we are asked to believe that the mathematically impossible has occurred *hundreds* of times — since each bird species has his OWN migration patterns.

It's clear that the "natural selection causes migration" idea is a woefully incomplete, illogical and untrue explanation for bird migration.

Scientists admit that the factors of migration are so complex as to swirl the heads of analysts. Long-distance migrants must have systems for food storage. This involves the whole *metabolic system* of the birds. It has also been proven that there is even a *correlation* between wing form and migration habit.

Then, when we talk about the evolution of migration, we're talking about the *evolution of the skeletal, respiratory, nervous, digestive* — and other systems of the birds, along with an evolution in behavior.

Then we have to consider that various birds migrate in different fashions and that each seems to respond to a different stimulus. All this then had to evolve *TOGETHER!* We're talking about mathematical odds which would be impossible.

Then how do birds, without the benefit of landmarks — cross vast oceans and find their way? How can birds return to the same few acres of ground after migrating hundreds of miles?

The feeble answer?

"Perhaps" they have stored up visual landmarks over generations. The author weakly says: "*How else can we explain such journeys.*" (*The Birds*, Roger T. Peterson and editors of *Life*, page 107.)

They could be explained very simply — and the only way! By the existence of a Great

Creator God that designed each migratory bird to do exactly as he does. There is no other answer.

### Unusual Migratory Patterns

Here are a few other paradoxes about bird migration. If birds must migrate in order to survive, why do some species NOT migrate — and yet evidently survive very well?

There's one bird that is amazing in his adaptability. Let a well-known ornithologist tell us the unusual story.

"The seasonal changes of temperature in the northern United States commonly range over 100° F.; yet a few birds, such as the Ruffed Grouse, live there the year round, adapting themselves in various ways to a summer heat of over 90° F. and a winter extreme of -40° F. The Ruffed Grouse, for example, adapts to the very low temperatures by spending nights and mornings under the snow, coming out to feed during a few hours in the afternoon." (*Fundamentals of Ornithology*, J. Van Tyne, page 183.)

If migration is the answer, the poor Ruffed Grouse is rather behind the times.

Why are some other bird species only *partially* migratory? If they HAD TO MIGRATE in order to survive — how come NON-migrators of the SAME species are still around today?

Again, you simply can't explain it on the basis of evolution. Then, evolutionists must face the problem of "individual migration."

"Among many birds we find what Thomson called 'individual migration'; . . . Briefly, it appears that some individuals of a species stay through the winter on their breeding grounds, *whereas others migrate* — in some instances to distant countries.

"Thomson, studying British Gannets, found that first-year birds made a long migration, second-year birds a shorter migration, third-year-and-older birds apparently did not migrate at all." (*Fundamentals of Ornithology*, J. Van Tyne, page 196.)

Another unusual factor is that birds of different ages do not always migrate together. As a matter of fact, in many cases the youngest birds begin first.

Here is a paradox, the older ones *following* the younger ones. The ones with least — or most likely *no experience* in migration go first.

"A further remarkable feature of the migrations of many species is the fact that *birds of different age groups migrate separately*. In several species of sparrows, finches, and warblers, the young begin the southward migration BEFORE THE



# The First Migrator



Migration-Schmigration! Why didn't we just stay where we were and evolve into penguins?

Ambassador College



ADULTS, and in these and other species, the young birds seem to have a stronger migratory tendency." (*Bird Migration*, Donald Griffin, page 44.)

### Other Enigmas

The greatest paradox of all is "homing." Here a bird with no previous experience can find its way from an UNFAMILIAR location, over UNFAMILIAR territory at a time when he DOESN'T have the migratory urge—right back to his home!

How can this be explained on the basis of adapting to environment over the course of millions of years?

There are other birds that don't migrate except up and down slopes. These seem to have taken "the easy way out."

"Many species that live in mountainous regions adjust to the changing seasons with a minimum of migratory effort by making an altitudinal migration. These altitudinal migrations are, of course, usually downward to lower altitudes and milder climates in winter, with a return to the higher breeding ground in spring." (*Fundamentals of Ornithology*, J. Van Tyne, page 195.)

Now lets leave migration and notice one other amazing fact that haunts evolutionists.

### Birds and Insects

Evolutionists tell us that there was a time when birds did not exist—except as disgruntled reptiles.

Well, now, let's suppose there were no birds? Could this earth *survive*? Let a scientist tell us.

"Today, a countryside without birds would be *unimaginable*. And this is as it should be, for without birds HUMANITY WOULD FACE DISASTER.

"We have only to note how many different kinds of injurious insects are being continuously and tirelessly destroyed by birds, to see what part the latter play in saving our field and orchard crops from *destruction*, as so many kinds of birds are entirely insectivores.

"Equally effective is the help of birds in man's fight against moles, mice, rats and other rodents which not only destroy the harvest in the fields, but also constitute a danger to human health as carriers of infectious diseases. These are *only a few of the helpful roles played by birds in maintaining NATURE'S EQUILIBRIUM*" (*Strange and Beautiful Birds*, Josef Seget, page 5).

But notice, what scientists tell us about the *arrival time* of birds and insects.

"Flying insects became a reality about 50 million years *BEFORE* the reptiles and birds took to the air, and for those 50 million years the *only* flying creatures were insects." (*Insects*, Ross Hutchins, pages 3, 4.)

But could the earth survive?

Let's say it was only 50 million years, perhaps 25 million years, maybe 5 million years of difference. How about a *thousand* years? Would you believe a hundred?

Let's see what would happen to a "birdless" earth!

"The descendants of a PAIR of houseflies, if they all lived and did well from April to August, would total 190,000,000,000,000,000 individuals. Fortunately, the *balance of nature*, in the form of natural controls, limits such population explosions among insects just as it does among other animals and among plants" (*Insects*, Ross Hutchins, page 9).

Granted, that insects eat other insects. Perhaps the earth would not be covered with 40 feet of insects in one year.

But be sure that the earth **COULD NOT SURVIVE** unless birds and insects were **CREATED TOGETHER** to form that fantastic balance in nature, that man is just coming to understand.

Why don't evolutionists *think* about the ecological implications of their theories for a change?

No, evolution has *no answer* for bird migration or how birds came to be such awe-inspiring creatures—just as they have no answer for the origin of **MATTER**, or the origin of **LIFE**, or the *purpose* and *meaning* of life!

It's time you saw the real fallacies of evolution—time you faced squarely the **ONLY ALTERNATIVE**, that **GOD DOES EXIST**, and you can prove it!

### Evolution Admits How Improbable It Is


The famed evolutionist, Julian Huxley, seemed to believe the more fantastically improbable—the more incredibly unbelievable was some "chance" occurrence—the more logical was its "possible occurrence."

Mr. Huxley explained how "natural selection" *can* keep protective coloration up to the mark, such as turning moths black in industrial areas, and how it produces resistance to pesticides and chemicals in bacteria and insects; **BUT**, he asks, "What about really *elaborate* improvements? Can it [natural selection] transform a reptile's leg into a bird's wing, or turn a monkey into a man? How can a blind and automatic sifting process like a selection, operating on a blind and undirected process like mutation, produce organs like the **EYE** or the **BRAIN**, with their almost



*Linthicum — Ambassador College*

**COULD THIS EVOLVE?** No scientist in his right mind would claim that the color television camera — with all its intricate wiring — or the complex clock on the wall could evolve by themselves! Then how could an infinitely more complex eye, hand, or brain evolve?



incredible complexity and delicacy of adjustment?”

This famous evolutionist quite plainly states some of the great DOUBTS involved in the theory of evolution. He asks HOW CAN the processes of evolution cause such intricate, marvelous mechanisms as we see all about us — and *with* which we see, and think?

His answer? Notice it carefully! “How CAN *chance* produce elaborate design? In a word, *are you not asking us to believe too much?* The answer is NO: all this is not too much to believe, *once one has grasped the way the process operates.*”

Remarkable, isn't it?

Evolution admits over and over again the “way the process operates” the “HOW” of evolutionary thought is a vast MYSTERY!

Yet, after informing us as to the *utter* improbability of such a marvelous mechanism as a bird's wing, or a man's brain, or the eye ever having evolved — we are simply told to BELIEVE IT. Once, that is, *we* have “grasped the way the process operates.”

But evolutionists do NOT “grasp” the way the process operates — not at all!

Notice this further admission of the utter

incredibility of any ACTUAL evolutionary process taking place.

The evolutionists themselves admit the mathematical impossibility of this happening by “chance.” For instance, the “chances” that such “evolutionary” steps really *could* have occurred are said to be ONE “chance” in A THOUSAND TO THE MILLIONTH POWER! But even *this* is only an arbitrary figure, seized upon and utilized, rather than actually *proved*. One chance in a thousand to a millionth power? What that means is staggering.

Said the evolutionist, “A thousand to the millionth power, when written out, becomes the figure one with three million noughts after it: and that would take *three large volumes* of about five hundred pages each, JUST TO PRINT! Actually this is a meaninglessly large figure, but it shows what a degree of improbability natural selection has to surmount, and CAN CIRCUMVENT [GET AROUND!!]. One with three million noughts after it is the measure of the unlikeliness of a horse — the odds against it happening at all!”

How would you like to “bet” against such “odds”?

“No one would bet on anything so improbable



happening," said the evolutionist, "AND YET IT HAS HAPPENED." Or so we are told!

But what CAUSED such a phenomenal occurrence as a horse? Did GOD ALMIGHTY CREATE it? Not so — claim the evolutionists, "It has happened, thanks to the workings of NATURAL SELECTION and the properties of living substance which make natural selection inevitable!" (*Evolution in Action*, Julian Huxley, p. 42.)

### Intricate Creation

So intricate, so complex, so unerring, so organized is behavior in the animal world — of which bird migration is a *chief example*, that even foremost evolutionists such as George Gaylord Simpson must exclaim:

"We feel, almost instinctively, that there is a *pattern*.

"There is or seems to be, an *essential order or plan* among the forms of life in spite of their great multiplicity. There seems moreover, to be PURPOSE in this plan. The resemblances and differences among a fish, a bird, and man are meaningful.

"It is a habit of speech and thought to say that fishes have gills in order to breathe water, that birds have wings in order to *fly*, and that men have brains in order to think.

"A telescope, a telephone, or a typewriter is a complex mechanism serving a particular function. Obviously, its manufacturer had a PURPOSE IN MIND, and the machine was designed and built in order to serve that purpose. An eye, an ear, or a hand is also a complex mechanism serving a *particular function*.

"It, too, looks as if it had been *made for a purpose*." (*This View of Life*, George Gaylord Simpson, pages 190, 191.)

So the evolutionist is forced to admit that there *is* a purpose, a design, a pattern in the structure and BEHAVIOR of all life.

But then — in spite of the obvious — the believer in evolution must go on to combat those who would bring up this objection to his theories.

"*But now that we know that evolution is a FACT*, we can no longer accept his [Sir Charles Bell's, anti-evolutionist] SIMPLE SOLUTION of the problem of adaptation as reflecting the purpose of a creator. . . .

"Whether or not we can explain the evolution of adaptation has no necessary bearing on the *truth of evolution*." (*This View of Life*, George Gaylord Simpson, page 193).

Here is a classic example of sidestepping the issue.

How does the author "know" evolution is a

"fact"? He doesn't — as we saw in the case of bird migration.

The FACT of the vast array of structure and behavior in the earth is not answered. *The issue is evaded* by saying this "adaptation" has no bearing on the issue — when it *IS* a crux issue that MUST be answered.

### The "FAITH" in Nothing

Such faith in "natural selection" which seems almost "godlike" in evolutionary thought is found continually in evolutionary books.

First, you are told of the brain-defying, imagination-defeating, incomprehensible, unbelievable, impossible proportions of such a thing occurring *at all*, and then you're told you MUST BELIEVE it, or you are "UNINFORMED"!

Notice another salient quotation — illustrating the kind of "intellectual pressure" to which the average layman is subjected, "No informed persons doubt any more that the many animal types that inhabit the earth today are the results of a long process of evolution" (*Animal Behavior*, LIFE NATURE LIBRARY, Niko Tinbergen, pages 171-172).

*How can evolutionists be so POSITIVE?*

Listen! "To understand HOW this evolution has happened is one of the major tasks of biology. The course which evolution MUST HAVE TAKEN has been deduced mainly from the study of fossils." (*Ibid.*)

But how much do evolutionists *really know* about these UNBELIEVABLE processes from their study of fossils? Listen again, "Fossils provide the student of animal structure with a kind of direct, although very fragmentary, historical documentation.

"Unfortunately, fossils do not behave, and so WE HAVE NO DIRECT KNOWLEDGE of the course behavioral evolution has followed in the past." (*Ibid.*)

How about that?

The course evolution MUST have taken (though improbable to the chances of one in one with three million noughts after it) are "deduced" from the study of FOSSILS.

But fossils are only very "FRAGMENTARY" evidence. Therefore, evolutionists admit they have NO DIRECT KNOWLEDGE of the course evolution has followed.

And when you study the fossil "history" of a given animal — you find *no such thing* as evolution in the commonly accepted form.

You'll see that demonstrated on the next page when you read about *Archaeopteryx* — the supposed "first" bird.



Yet evolutionists remain CONVINCED EVOLUTION DID OCCUR!

That's FAITH for you. Faith in fragmentary, *missing* "evidence." Faith in NOTHING.

But not all biologists have such empty faith. Said one, Edwin Conklin, "The probability of life originating from accident is comparable to the probability of the unabridged dictionary resulting from an explosion in a print shop!"

But GOD says you CAN have faith in WHAT YOU CAN SEE! He says LOOK at the physical creation all around you, and thereby UNDERSTAND about the "invisible" things of God!

### The Faith IN BILLIONS OF TONS OF EVIDENCE!

God says only the FOOL has said in his heart, there is no God! There is NO EXCUSE for believing in evolution — and there is NO EVIDENCE whereby it may be proved!

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who HOLD BACK [margin] the truth in unrighteousness; because *that which may be known* of God is manifest in them; for God hath *shown* it unto them.

"For the invisible things of Him [God's INVISIBLE power, HIS LAWS, HIS PURPOSE being worked out here below] from the *creation* of the world [looking at the material creation] are CLEARLY SEEN [evidence; measurable, tangible, obvious PROOF!] *being understood by the things that are made* [by observing the heavens, the solar system, the earth, the vastly different, myriads of creatures with their interdependency on each other, their life cycles, their habits, their unexplainable instincts!], even His Eternal power and Godhead; so that they ARE WITHOUT EXCUSE" (Romans 1:18-20).

Creation stands PROVED! The warmth, humor, love and kindness of God is *all around us, known* by being alert to observe the myriads of creatures He has so carefully designed. Known by studying the breathtaking MARVELS of His great creation — being in AWE of it, gasping in *amazement* at the many little creature habits we take so casually for granted.

The evolution theory has placed *blind*ers over the eyes of millions — made them see only blind, senseless, purposeless, directionless accident, caprice, in this marvelous world of ours — and even in our own personal existence!

Evolutionists *claim* to deal in "knowledge." They *claim* to stand for only what they can PROVE. They say they use the "tools" of science — those of observation, measurement, experiment. But, in

reality, they wish the layman to leave all the questions to *them*, saying in effect, "You needn't bother yourself about worrying about evolution — *we* have all the facts: *we* know it's true!"

But actually, they admit they DON'T KNOW! Then *still* they say you're UNINFORMED if you don't have the same blind faith in LACK OF EVIDENCE *THEY* have!

But evolution does not stand the test of truth. Millions are the TONS of positive, incontrovertible, incontestable, unanswerable, PROOFS of the existence of your God — and you can have FAITH in that!

### A Fabulous "Link" to Reptiles!

Universally heralded as the one great "link" between all birds and reptiles is *Archaeopteryx*. The extinct genus is comprised of two fossilized, bird-like creatures, found in stratified rocks in Bavaria, Germany. *Archaeopteryx* means, simply, "ancient wing."

But what is so unusual about *Archaeopteryx*?

The creature has characteristics that are strangely like those of reptiles, say the evolutionists — though *also* possessing the appearance of a *bird*.

Here is how evolutionists imagine *Archaeopteryx* may have been preserved as a fossil.

Imagine, says an ornithologist "a strange bird-like creature the size of a crow" gliding over an ancient Bavarian lake.

"Or was it more reptile-like? *We cannot be sure,*" continues the story — for "it appeared to have some of the features of both reptiles AND birds."

"Suddenly," goes the dramatic tale, "our bird-like creature, with its feeble powers of flight, was unable to cope with a sharp gust of wind and fell into the shallow waters below and drowned." (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley Lanyon, page 1).

This is the layman's introduction into bird biology — the imaginary story of how something MIGHT have happened to preserve two fossil finds of *Archaeopteryx* in Bavaria; ones which claim to link birds with reptiles.

What a tragic end to a short flight!

If, of course, the bird EVER FLEW.

### The Missing Evidence

Evolutionists readily admit the paucity of fossils to *substantiate* such a theory — but insist their theories are "clear" "IN SPITE OF THE PATCHINESS OF THE EVIDENCE"!

You are about to see, with your own eyes, another example of the classic "FAITH" of evolution!



Because evolution, after all, IS A FAITH! It is a dogmatic assertion that certain changes DID occur, and an almost religious-like CLINGING to that notion, IN SPITE OF all logic, contradictory evidence, or rational thought!

Now notice the strange faith ornithologists have in their theories.

"IN SPITE OF the patchiness of the evidence *it is clear* that birds are closely related to the reptiles. The older forms have many characters in their skeletons that *suggest* their derivation from that group" (*Fossil Birds*, W. E. Swinton, 1965, p. 2).

### Speculation Necessary

Evolutionists *admit* they must SPECULATE about the origin of birds. But they insist that the layman *need not even question* the validity of their theories!

Notice! "In *attempting to reconstruct* the early evolutionary history of many groups of animals a *certain element of judicious speculation* . . . may be a valuable weapon" (*Evolution*, ed. by De Beer, p. 321).

Granted, evolutionists say such conclusions must be "constantly checked and tested with reference to such fossil types as *may be known* and to such characters of modern forms as *may have a bearing* on the subject." But if a certain fossil type, COMPLETELY UNIQUE, and *totally developed* has NO known fossil or modern counterpart, then *how*, we might ask, can "constant checking" and "testing" ever occur?

In most books on the subject, authors first admit they are making "educated guesses," and then follow with a broad, all-inclusive, sweeping statement that such and such DID POSITIVELY OCCUR!

They have already decided, on sheer faith, that birds evolved from reptiles!

Said the same author, "The reptilian ancestry of birds is so self-evident and so universally recognized by zoologists that it can be taken as axiomatic in any discussion"! (*Evolution*, ed. by De Beer, p. 322.)

So they seem to imply: "Even though *I* must guess, imagine and speculate — YOU must assume my theory is SO CORRECT that you needn't bother even thinking about it!"

### No Intermediate Stages Found

But *if* our myriads of birds evolved from slimy reptiles, is there any REAL fossil EVIDENCE of a part-bird, part-reptile? Is there such a thing as a HALF-scale, HALF-feather found?

Think of it this way. In any motion picture sequence, in order for your eye to see a man walking from one side of a room to another, it necessitates many *separate frames*. Each is, actually, a "still" picture, snapped in a mere fraction of a second. *Two* of these frames would be all that is necessary for you to see the man, first at one side of the room, and then at the other. But in order to "see" him make the transition, you must view ALL the many frames IN BETWEEN!

The fossil "record" concerning the hazy hypothesis that supposes birds came from reptiles is much like dozens of feet of missing film! *Where are* all the many HUNDREDS of VERY DIFFERENT creatures which would have represented the INTERMEDIATE stages of development?

And remember, IF these notions of evolution could possibly be true — these "intermediate" stages would be NOWHERE NEAR so well equipped to *survive* as the "fully developed" ones. That means that if it took only a "sharp gust" to bring down *Archaeopteryx*, his imaginary ancestors would have been falling out of the skies like bricks! And the fossil record, therefore, would contain FAR MORE "INTERMEDIATE" species than it does of the ones which were supposedly "better equipped" to *survive*!

But there ARE no "intermediate" species!

### Simple Deduction?

Notice what scientists admit. "The origin of birds is largely a matter of *deduction*. There is NO FOSSIL EVIDENCE of the stages *through* which the *remarkable change* from reptile to bird was achieved" (*Biology and Comparative Physiology of Birds*, edited by A. J. Marshal, 1960, p. 1).

Here is a similar admission:

"We shall see shortly how the first birds appear to have arisen from reptilian ancestors, but the *transition* from reptilian *scale* to the quite differently constituted and arranged *feather* of the bird IS STILL A MYSTERY!" (*Fossil Birds*, W. E. Swinton, 1965, p. 4.)

Ah, yes!

No tangible proof — but we assume it happened anyhow.

Scientists are *confused* about *Archaeopteryx*. They claim this creature is part "reptile" and part "bird." Yet, in order to *substantiate* this claim, evolutionists would have to submit positive *proof* of intermediate forms!

But there *are* no such intermediate forms.

Listen to this striking admission, "A certain amount of *educated guesswork* has been necessary to reconstruct how this ancestral bird *must have*



looked and behaved" (*Biology of Birds*, Wesley E. Lanyon, 1963, pp. 2-3).

Notice it! Not only is *guesswork* necessary to reconstruct how this bird must have looked, but scientists readily admit they are guessing about how it *behaved*.


But in SPITE OF all the difficulties, ornithologists seem bent on INSISTING that *Archaeopteryx* is the "link" between BIRDS and REPTILES! Such is their *faith*. In any modern book on the subject, you'll probably find artists' reconstructions of *Archaeopteryx*. Then will follow elaborate discussions about how this and that "might have" occurred, and how this and that change "gradually" took place.

To simply call *Archaeopteryx* another of the many UNUSUAL creatures, and place it in a SPECIAL classification, has apparently never occurred to

---

**ARCHAEOPTERYX FOSSIL** — (Berlin specimen is pictured, formerly called *archaeornes*). Paleontologists claim this fossil provides evidence that birds evolved from reptiles.

*American Museum of Natural History*



evolutionists. Rather, it is seized upon as a *connecting link* between birds and reptiles.

### Really a "Link"?

One theory speculates ancient reptiles first climbed trees, and gradually extending their leaps, began to glide (by the help of scarred, broken, "half-formed" "feathers") from branch to branch.

Another theory (take your pick) supposes they first began to run along the ground, and finally flew.

Science does *not* claim that all birds share *Archaeopteryx* as their common ancestor — believing that some of the flightless birds of today *may* have come from an even more ancient "ancestor" of *Archaeopteryx*.

But notice this admission! "...it would be naïve for us to assume that the accidental drowning of *Archaeopteryx*... marked the beginning of the evolution of birds. It *seems probable* that similar and *possibly* other kinds of primitive reptile-like birds *had already existed* for some millions of years" (*Biology of Birds*, Lanyon, 1963, p. 9).

But even though science *admits Archaeopteryx* does NOT mark the beginning of the IMAGINED "evolution" of birds — the evolution of birds IS NEVERTHELESS BASED ON ARCHAEOPTERYX!

### Most Valuable Evidence

*Search* the writings of ornithologists on the subject, and you find them REPEATEDLY citing *Archaeopteryx* as their MOST VALUABLE SINGLE PIECE OF "EVIDENCE."

And what a STRANGE theory. To suppose that the amazingly complex and wonderfully constructed creatures of FLIGHT came from the lumbering, ungainly CREEPING creatures of earth — this is STRANGE!

As evolution admits, "STRANGELY, few people would suspect that the closest living relatives of the birds are crocodiles"! (*Ibid.*, p. 8.)


True — FEW PEOPLE WOULD EVER suspect such a STRANGE thing — because all the combined powers of observation, comparison, deduction, reason and logic put together with the actual EVIDENCE would PROVE OTHERWISE!

*Archaeopteryx* was a *strange creature*. But nowhere near so strange as the theories about his *place* in the fossil record.

Scientists really DO NOT KNOW what *Archaeopteryx* was.

It does not *fit* the rigid classifications of known creatures — but then, neither do many KNOWN creatures. Look at the duckbill platypus, for example. Appearing to be part duck, part





## Bird To Reptile?

Evolutionists claim birds came from reptiles. But a quick look at the skeleton of each shows this is impossible. Each creature is designed with the skeleton it needs to survive.

Gentry, Wells — Ambassador College

otter, part beaver, this strange creature *lays eggs*, and then suckles its young, like mammals! What kind of ridiculous picture would an artist conjure up if a platypus had been discovered as a FOSSIL form of life?

But the platypus is not a fossil. He's merely an extremely UNUSUAL creature — therefore "difficult" for evolutionists to "classify." But he's FULLY developed, PERFECTLY formed, and completely "adapted" to his environment, because he was MADE that way.

Listen to this admission!

### Archaeopteryx "Unstable"

"There is no justification for making *Archaeopteryx* the progenitor of all subsequent birds," says one scientist, "for it would be an extreme coincidence if the most ancient bird, so inadequately represented in the geological record, were indeed so fortunately placed in the evolutionary picture. The preservation of *Archaeopteryx* is almost certainly *due to its instability*," continues the amazing admission — and please PAY CAREFUL ATTENTION TO THAT FACT — "to the fact that, having left the shelter of its trees in a high wind, it was borne over the Solnhofen lake and was drowned in the comparatively quiet waters near the shore" (*Biology and Comparative Physiology of Birds*, edited by A. J. Marshall, 1960, pp. 11-13).

But carefully consider *this!* If *Archaeopteryx*, a "fully developed" species, having clearly defined FEATHERS, was admittedly downed by a "sharp gust" and so preserved as a fossil form, then how about the dozens and dozens of INTERMEDIATE

species NOWHERE NEARLY so "equipped to fly" as *Archaeopteryx*?

To simplify matters, let's go back in our imaginations (since the whole story of evolution is purely imaginary, anyhow) and make up a story about the first, "almost" *Archaeopteryx*. Our little creature — let's call him "Archy" for short — since he's not yet developed into a full-fledged, feathered *Archaeopteryx*. Archy is tired of sitting on his perch, a swaying limb, to which he had laboriously struggled with his claws and beak.

Up to this point, neither Archy nor any of his relatives had been successful in flight. Archy remembers dear old Uncle Willie, and all his brothers and sisters, and so many other relatives who had been leaping to their deaths from cliffs, pinnacles, towering rocks, trees, and shrubs. And then there was dear old Aunt Martha-opteryx (meaning, "Winged Martha"), who, when she attempted to flutter through the tightly woven limbs of a thorn tree, lost all her feathers, and had been wearing an old discarded snake skin ever since. (We're kidding of course!)

But Archy is undaunted. In spite of repeated failures, he knows he is destined, somehow, to fly! He's never SEEN anyone fly, mind you. His feathers aren't long enough, and his "reptilian-like" bony structure is too heavy, and he's aerodynamically unsound. But fly he must — or so science guesses.

So, as a steady gust shakes his limb, he stretches out his ancient, bedraggled (bedraggled, since he's been dragging them along the ground, up through mazes of brush and trees, and has never



used them in actual flight) feathers, and with an ancient "CROAK!" of triumph leaps into the air!

FLOP! FLUTTER! THRASH! CRASH! RIP! TEAR! STRUGGLE, STRUGGLE, STRUGGLE! AAAAaaaaaaggh! Serene quiet. Archy is dead.

He died of broken wings, a sprained back, a broken neck, crushed skull, and fractured feet.

Actually, Archy never existed! He couldn't have — since his ancestors weren't "equipped" to survive!

But let's go back to the admissions of scientists about *Archaeopteryx* — and his poor powers of flight! It makes MUCH more sense and is FAR MORE LOGICAL that, just as *Archaeopteryx* MAY HAVE BEEN downed by a gust — HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS of his more POORLY EQUIPPED ANCESTORS broke their necks, drowned by the thousands, fell by the ten thousands, and piled up in veritable massive, fossil graveyards in their disastrous, feeble, futile efforts to fly!

And if true — the fossil record would ABOUND with such evidence.

#### Where Are the Feathers?

You would see fossil lizards with just a TINY HINT of a feather, growing from one elbow. You'd see dozens of other strange creatures, with feathers growing from their tails, their knees, and their heads. There would be broken, sprained, bedraggled, water-soaked feathers ALL THROUGH the fossil record — since evolution would have you believe the development from scales to feathers took MILLIONS and MILLIONS of years!

But why not look at it in REVERSE? What if, as the first "feathers" made their appearance on lizards, they were UNWELCOME?

How would YOU feel about a feather growing from your body?

Probably — a little weird! Probably, you'd PLUCK IT OUT! (After all, people shave and shave and shave — and still the hair grows back — and people burn, and electrocute, and shave, and pluck, and even remove whole patches of skin, just to get rid of unsightly body hair.)

How would *any* self-respecting, slithery lizard feel when he suddenly found FEATHERS on his forearms? Think of what kind of feathers they'd be, with him dragging them in and out of holes in the rocks, over logs, into lakes and rivers, up thorn bushes, and across sandy deserts!

He'd probably tear the things out with his teeth in sheer frustration!

Then the evolutionary process (which has not been proved) would have been halted at this ridiculous "stage," and to this day, you would

observe dejected lizards, pulling at broken "feathers," or trying to rub them off against brush and rocks.

No — evolutionary thought just DOES NOT HAVE THE ANSWER for the true origin of flight!

The fantastically complex, beautiful, inspiring species of birds around us, with their breathtaking ability, their almost incredible migratory powers, and their SPECIALLY built bodies just CANNOT BE EXPLAINED by millions of tons of MISSING EVIDENCE!

#### Vast DIFFERENCE Between Birds and Reptiles!

Certainly, many creatures lay eggs. Crocodiles do. Birds do. But so do duckbill platypuses, and so do insects.

But here, the similarities stop!

Reptiles, as a whole, have huge, powerfully built, scaled and armor-plated bodies, with their gigantic jaws, their meaty, bony, powerful tails, and weathered, wrinkled, thick leather-like hides. These are about as FAR from being the "closest living relatives" to our birds as they can be! Then, of course, other reptiles are *smaller* and more fragile than some birds.

Think of it!

Many birds have tiny, fragile, porous AIR-FRAME skeletal structures. They have air sacs through their bodies, which act as "extra lungs." They have a *rapid* heartbeat, with *rapid* metabolism. Others, have ponderous huge skeletons — and *cannot* fly. They have a myriad of *different kinds* of beaks, claws, wings, and heads — each for a SET, SPECIFIC and very SPECIAL PURPOSE!

Man will stop at nothing — no matter HOW preposterous it seems — in his attempt to explain the marvelous CREATION without a great and Wonderful CREATOR!

One of the GREAT PROOFS OF GOD is DESIGN! It is FAR more logical to point to egg-laying, bony frames, and various similarities in characteristics in ALL creatures, as proof of ONE GREAT DESIGNER, who utilized ONE GREAT MASTER PLAN in His Creation, than to say one "evolved" from the other!

When you view a row of similar buildings, you observe they were designed by the SAME ARCHITECT — you don't reason the little ones "evolved" from the big ones.

And when you see the similarities in "nature" you are seeing the SAME SELF-EVIDENT TRUTH! One GREAT ARCHITECT designed ALL LIFE — CREATED IT — PUT IT ON THIS EARTH FOR A GREAT PURPOSE!

What a truly breathtaking study it would be if, throughout ornithology, the wondrous, warm,



loving, and oftentimes HUMOROUS wisdom of God were taught to our children, in place of the empty suppositions of the no-God theories of today!

In this booklet, let's just look at one more of the myriad forms of bird life — the common, but humorous, woodpecker!

**What Makes a Woodpecker Peck Wood?  
Or: How Much Wood Can a  
Woodpecker Peck?**

One of the most interesting sights you probably recall from childhood experience was a woodpecker hammering furiously against a tree.

Anyone who has spent much time in the woods in almost any part of the United States has heard the familiar rat-a-tat-tat of a woodpecker banging his sharp, stout beak against wood.

Woodpeckers have some of the most remarkable habits of all living things. They're another amazing example of *highly specialized* creatures who obtain their food in a very unusual manner.

One ornithologist told of seeing a woodpecker land on his favorite oak tree.

Seeing the blurred head as the bird furiously hacked clouds of splinters and sawdust out of his favorite tree, the man shouted at the bird, then decided to girdle the part of the tree the woodpecker had attacked with a heavy wire mesh, in an attempt to discourage it.

But the woodpecker was soon back.

This time, the man found the wire mesh in shreds, and the bird busily drilling deep into his tree!

Finally, however, after finding the going a good bit tougher through the wire, and after being frightened away repeatedly, the bird was heard by the owner of the tree drilling away on trees more distant in the forest.

Several years later, he reported, a severe storm snapped his beautiful oak tree right where the woodpecker had been drilling. Deep within the trunk, the ornithologist discovered a big colony of carpenter ants, and a labyrinth of galleries they had gnawed inside it.

It was then the man decided that, had he permitted the woodpecker to clean out that ant nest, he would still have his beautiful oak tree, only made more rustic by the familiar drilling



Goodpaster — National Audubon Society

**A MARVEL OF DESIGN** — The photo shows a red-headed woodpecker in action. Notice especially the stiff tail feathers ending in sharp spines. These are very necessary to prop up a woodpecker as he pecks. He also has viselike toes — perfect pincers for grasping bark.

These are just two of the many unusual — but necessary characteristics — that make the woodpecker PERFECTLY adapted for pecking wood!



marks of the bird families' answer to the jack-hammer, the woodpecker.

But how did the woodpecker *know* those ants were deep inside a tough old oak?

Why does a woodpecker obtain his food in the most difficult manner possible?

### Picking Up Pecking "Gradually"?

COULD woodpeckers have "evolved" gradually — learning to "survive" in the only way possible for them, pecking deep into tough trees?

There are many different species of woodpeckers. One hundred seventy-nine in the world, and twenty-two of them in North America.

They range in size from the huge pileated woodpecker (19 inches from tip of tail to tip of beak — about the size of a crow) to the tiny downy. Each species finds its food in a slightly different fashion, and feeds on different things.

The little downy feeds on caterpillars found in small twigs and tiny crevices, while the red-headed woodpecker (the one with which most people seem at least partly familiar) feeds on ants and grubs inside the trees. The gaudily decorated pileated woodpecker can strip the bark completely from a tree. One ornithologist watched a huge pileated woodpecker remove 30 feet of bark from a tree in less than 15 minutes! It had been attacked by carpenter ants, thus preventing the spreading of the ants to other healthy trees nearby.

The flicker (named because of the flash of white color on its wings in flight) feeds on or near the ground, lapping up ants with its sticky tongue.

The woodpecker is totally different from other birds.

### Unusual Anatomy

First and most obvious, is his beak. It is straight, *very* hard in comparison with most birds, and pointed. The head is constructed differently, too. The skull is much thicker than that of other birds, and the skull and beak are moved (sometimes more than 100 times a minute!) by powerful muscles. The bones between the beak and skull have their own built-in "shock absorbers," being constructed differently than those of other birds, which are usually directly joined together.

Rather, in the woodpecker family, the beak and skull are joined by connective tissue that is spongy and elastic.

Every part of the woodpecker's anatomy is specially constructed for the sole purpose of drilling into wood. Their claws are divided into two sharp and powerful toes forward, and two backward, like a pair of ice tongs, for gripping the bark. Their tail feathers act as a brace, steadying the bird on a firm tripod as it whacks away.

The tail feathers are unusually strong, and during molting season, the main propping feathers do not fall out until *other feathers have already been replaced*, and can support the weight of the bird while the bigger, stronger feathers molt.

How do they locate their food?

Once, a pileated woodpecker was observed whacking away on a tough old hickory. Ants were using a little knothole as an entrance into the tree — but the bird ignored the knothole.

Instead it began pounding on the trunk as it slowly circled the tree — tapping, then pausing.

Then it drilled its way into the very heart of the ant nest — five feet *below* the knothole the ants were using.

Ornithologists speculate the woodpeckers use their acute sense of hearing (*another* remarkable part of their anatomical structure to locate the insects either by *hearing* the insects, or else detecting the subtle differences in the sounds of the woods over insect channels, or both.

The woodpecker's tongue is perhaps its most remarkable instrument.

In most cases, it is barbed, and about four times as long as the beak. The woodpecker snakes his tongue in and out of his beak like a snake's tongue. In some species, the tongue is coated with a sticky substance, used as bait to catch ants. A woodpecker will drill into a tree, then snake out its long, sticky tongue, waiting until the ants, believing it to be a worm invader, swarm all over it. The woodpecker then whips the unsuspecting ants into his mouth.

### Unusual Studies

Three woodpeckers were being studied in a cage by ornithologists when they decided to attempt an experiment. The experimenters tried holding food above and behind the bird's heads, and were astonished when they whipped their tongues up over their heads, snatching away the food, *without looking around, or turning their heads!*

Every different woodpecker performs a *special service* in policing a balanced forest.

As an article by Peter Farb said, "Woodpeckers are the only creatures who spend most of their waking hours banging their heads against wood. They do this because of the role they seem to have been assigned in the living community: to glean insects from under the bark of trees" (*Reader's Digest*, Peter Farb, "Nature's Noisy Chiselers," September 1962, p. 239).


Yes, "seem to have been ASSIGNED," but by WHOM?

Said the article, "They are the only things able to locate and eradicate these insect hordes."




## How To Put A “Robot” Woodpecker Together

Here is some of the specialized equipment of the “common” woodpecker: 1. A powerful, heavy duty **BEAK** — perfect as a wood-boring tool. 2. Tough **NECK MUSCLES**, necessary to deliver staccato, “jack-hammer” blows with its beak. 3. A **THICK SKULL**, made flexible by tiny cross braces. 4. **SHOCK ABSORBERS** of heavy tissue between beak and skull — not found in other birds. 5. A long slender **TONGUE**, generally barbed and covered with sticky substance to “fish out” insects. 6. Short, powerful **LEGS**, unlike spindly legs of most birds. 7. Viselike **TOES**, two in front and two in back — a perfect pincer for grasping bark. 8. Stiff **TAIL FEATHERS** that end in sharp spines. These are essential to prop up the woodpecker as he excavates nesting site. Could all **EIGHT** of these specialized parts evolve at once? Impossible!



Schuler, McGuinness — © Ambassador College



## WOODPECKER TONGUE —

A woodpecker has an elastic tongue — especially adapted for penetrating deep into trees and snaking out its food. The tongue goes under the jaw, over the head — and into the right nostril. The left one is free for breathing. A remarkable example of God’s engineering creativity.

© Ambassador College



### The Very First Woodpecker

But when did the VERY FIRST woodpecker decide to PECK WOOD?

In the vague guesswork of evolution, coming to grips with such practical questions is rarely, if ever, done.

But think about it.

Let's "imagine" if we can, the very FIRST ATTEMPT of a woodpecker to peck wood. Remember, IF evolution "happened," it had to START SOMEPLACE!

What *made* that first "woodpecker" (or would-be woodpecker) decide to peck wood? Was it necessary for him to *survive*? But how could *that* be? Millions of other birds are still with us; and they obtain food on the ground, on shrubs and leaves, in the air, in the water, or, like as not, from the backs and mouths of animals! WHY PECK WOOD?

How did he *know* there was any food INSIDE a tree? He didn't *see* it, didn't yet have his highly acute hearing to *hear* it. He didn't yet have his shock-absorbing cartilage between his beak and his head. His head wasn't yet thicker than other birds' and his beak wasn't yet stronger, longer, or sharper.

His tail feathers had not yet "somehow decided" to molt in SPECIAL ORDER so he would always have his ready-made prop under him, and his tongue was just a little short thing, up inside his beak like most other birds.

But here is the poor little would-be woodpecker about to peck wood.

Pick a tree. Don't even pick a hickory (like modern woodpeckers often do); pick a *softer* tree, say, an elm.

He begins banging away. OUCH!

### Dying Would-be Woodpeckers

Can you imagine it? The forest floor littered with dead and dying would-be woodpeckers, who broke their beaks, dislocated their necks, shattered their heads, or broke their tail feathers, and were rendered unable to fly.

Perhaps others fly wildly about, in the throes of blinding, dizzying, wrenching headaches — crashing blindly into trees!

For thousands — no, millions — of years this continues. No woodpecker obtains his food from a tree — for he hasn't yet developed all the elaborately specialized equipment he needs. All woodpeckers keep dying. None survive.

They don't survive for several reasons.

First, they MUST OBTAIN THOSE ANTS AND GRUBS INSIDE OF TREES to survive! And they can't develop all their special apparatus for food-getting until they NEED to. And if they NEED to — they had

better HURRY — because birds have rapid metabolism — and must eat more, proportionate to body size and weight, than almost any creature.

But they keep killing themselves in the attempt. Some are stuck in cracks, pulling with futile struggles to free their beaks, caught in a stiff old oak. Others die of migraine headaches.

### No Survivors Left

All the rest die because they can't build nests. You see, woodpeckers build their nests inside trees.

But they don't pick "old hollow trees." Rather, they hammer out their *own* hole in a tree. Granted, the tree can be partly hollow, or have a knothole to start on, or have an ant colony inside it. But chisel away they *do* — and they had to start *sometime*.

The woodpeckers (who are not yet woodpeckers) keep dying.

None survive.

As the succeeding generations keep attempting to peck away, one little woodpecker (who doesn't exist, since none survived — since they couldn't survive if they failed to obtain their food from inside the trees) finally developed all the amazing special adaptive requirements for being a true, honest woodpecker.

Sound logical?

Is it credible? Can you believe it?

Mutations can't explain away the woodpecker. Vague ideas about birds "cleaning" their beaks on limbs, and just "accidentally" beginning to peck lightly on trees won't explain it. And remember, about 99 out of 100 mutations produce INFERIOR creatures, NOT equipped as well to survive.

No, millions of woodpeckers in the world have pecked holes in the theory of evolution.

### What Is the Truth?

It's about time you got back to the TRUNK OF THE TREE — just like the woodpecker does — and prove to yourself GOD CREATED!

Every *one* of the hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of species of life on this earth has its own special story! And every one of them should be *studied, thought* about, *pondered*.

The amazing life forms around you were *made* — made to be appreciated, *admired*, and *enjoyed*! But unless you can constantly rejoice in the LOVE, WARMTH and BEAUTY your Creator has put all around you, continually recognizing HIS great designing ability, His humor and wit, His perfect planning and great Creative power — you're MISSING OUT on some of the truly savory moments of this life God has given you.

WORSHIP God — *HE* made the earth, and every creature on it.



## MAILING ADDRESSES WORLDWIDE:

### IN THE UNITED STATES

AMBASSADOR COLLEGE PRESS  
P. O. Box 111  
Pasadena, California 91123

### IN CANADA

P. O. Box 44, Sta. A  
Vancouver 1, B.C.

OR

### IN FRENCH LANGUAGE

Boîte Postale 121  
Montréal, P. Q. H3C 1C5

### IN BRITAIN

P. O. Box 111  
St. Albans, Herts.  
England

### IN FRANCE, SWITZERLAND AND BELGIUM

Le MONDE A VENIR  
Case Postale 10  
91, rue de la Servette  
1211 Geneva 7  
Switzerland

### IN GERMANY

Postfach 1324  
(4) Düsseldorf 1  
West Germany

### IN HOLLAND & BELGIUM

Postbus 496  
Arnhem, Nederland

### IN AUSTRALIA

G. P. O. Box 345  
Sydney, NSW 2001  
Australia

### IN NEW ZEALAND AND PACIFIC ISLES

P. O. Box 2709  
Auckland 1, New Zealand

### IN THE PHILIPPINES

P. O. Box 1111  
Makati, Rizal D-708

### IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

P. O. Box 111  
Farrer, Singapore, 11

### IN AFRICA

All African nations *except* South  
Africa, Rhodesia, Mauritius and  
Malawi should write to the  
British address.

### IN SOUTH AFRICA, MAURITIUS AND MALAWI

P. O. Box 1060  
Johannesburg 2000

### IN RHODESIA

Box UA30  
Union Avenue  
Avondale, Salisbury

### IN JERUSALEM

P. O. Box 19111  
Jerusalem

### IN CENTRAL AMERICA

P. O. Box 5-595  
México 5, D. F.

### IN THE CARIBBEAN & SOUTH AMERICA

c/o Spanish Dept.  
Box 111  
Pasadena, California 91123

**THIS BOOKLET IS NOT TO BE SOLD.** It is provided as a public service in the public interest by Ambassador College — made possible by the contributions of those who, voluntarily, have become co-workers in support of this worldwide work. Ambassador College, as a separate corporation, is associated with the Worldwide Church of God, and a portion of the financial needs of the work is supplied by that Church. The publishers have nothing to sell, and although contributions are gratefully welcomed, no solicitation is ever made to the public for financial support.

If you are not yet a subscriber to the world's unique news and human-experience magazine, *The PLAIN TRUTH*, be sure to request a *free* subscription by writing to our mailing address nearest you.

Also, for further proof that God is the Creator of all life, send for the following literature: "The Missing Link . . . Found," *Does God Exist?* and *Why Were You Born?* This literature is sent *free of charge* as an educational service in the public interest.