

Joseph D. McInerney
Director, BSCS

Dear Mr. McInerney,

I read with interest and some amusement your response to the letter from a student who was concerned about your company's stance on the theory of evolution. I must say that I was amused because not only did you resort to setting up a straw man, but that you were only able to refute this straw man with half-truths, misconceptions and lies (assuming you knew better; my guess is that science really is not your field and you were actually sincere, albeit wrong, in the comments that you made).

First, the fact of evolution—the fact that species have changed during the immensely long history of life on earth—is not in dispute among scientists. Either you have no qualms about lying to a teenager or you personally do not realize that evolution does not nearly have the universal acceptance that you have indicated in this statement. Whereas it is certainly the theory of choice for **most** scientists and professors (just try to get a job teaching science at a university if you do not believe in the theory of evolution), and, even though you claimed *the validity is clear to anyone who examines the fossil record*, there are still thousands of men and women with Ph.D.'s in geology, biology, anthropology, physics, chemistry, astronomy, entomology, hydrology, mathematics, genetics, archaeology who do not believe in evolution. Now, if evolution is such a fact, allowing you to place it along side the theory of gravitation, the germ theory of disease, atomic theory, etc., then why doesn't every scientist and every holder of a PhD in a scientific field believe in it? We can certainly understand why the fundamentalist Christian does not believe in evolution; he just isn't evolved enough or smart enough to understand that the evidence for evolution is overwhelming (besides, fundamentalists, by definition, are going to be closed-minded, right?). But, what the heck happened with these others who have PhD's in related scientific fields yet don't believe in evolution? What is wrong with them? Did someone forget to mention to these scientists and PhD recipients that evolution is *the only scientific process that makes sense and that meets the requirements of a scientific explanation?* The plain fact of the matter is that most people simply believe in evolution because that is what they have been taught all of their lives. Evolutionists seem to have no problem misrepresenting to the public that their opposition is made up of religious types with hidden agendas who have not one whit of scientific evidence. However, point of fact: the average person, including the average science teacher, and most definitely the average high school student, does not even realize that is an abundance of scientific evidence which refutes evolution.

Science assumes that the universe is explainable without appeals to supernatural events; it depends on knowledge constructed by rational analysis and it is driven by data. There are few things more supernatural than non-life becoming life and simple molecules eventually organizing to becoming something as complex as a human being. You have heard of the Second **Law** of Thermodynamics, have you not? Evolution attributes to random events in nature a very carefully planned chain of events which could be easily classified as supernatural and incredibly miraculous when faced with the ramifications and implications of the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

You grouped evolution with the *great theories: gravitation, the germ theory of disease, atomic theory, plate tectonics, electromagnetism, the chromosome theory of inheritance, cell theory.* There are several differences: what these theories predict can be replicated in the lab; what evolution predicts cannot. There are no serious movements against the fact of the chromosome theory of inheritance; thousands of scientists do not dispute atomic theory; thousands of PhD's do not contravene gravitation theory; there are no scientific organizations which stand in opposition to the theories of electromagnetism; there are no organizations or publications spearheaded by scientists and/or PhD's which oppose these other theories. So if you want to call any of those other theories, for all intents and purposes, facts, that is fine with me. But as soon as you lump the theory of evolution with those others, you have improperly placed what is essentially a non-theocentric religion into the realm of scientific fact. It doesn't matter that the majority of scientists believe in it—in science, we don't decide

what is true and false by voting. In the progressive history of science, there are many present-day scientific facts were once hypotheses proposed by a few and opposed by many.

Science does not, indeed cannot, address issue related to religion. What is life springing from non-life? Just what exactly do you think the Big Bang Theory is? In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth. Isaiah, in 800 BC, mentions that the earth is a sphere. There are roughly a dozen other scientific statements made in the Bible which have since been shown to be facts. I would think that a science which refuses under any circumstances to consider divine revelation is bereft in that regard. Evolution is simply a nontheistic religion proselytizing our youth in government-supported schools..

Creation has absolutely no basis in science and we do not, therefore, treat it as a scientific explanation for the origin or diversity of life on earth. Like most of the people that I know who believe in creation, I began by believing in evolution. For twenty plus years I had assumed it was the only scientific explanation and I even subjugated my faith in Jesus Christ to evolution. Without giving the matter a great deal of thought, I reconciled my Christian faith with evolution. Theologically and intellectually, at that point in time, I had no problem with that stance; and, as you well know, there are many Christians, pastors and priests who believe in evolution and can reconcile that with their doctrine. So this is not simply a matter of the uncredentialed, unscientific Christian vs. the learned, objective scientist. For me, it was not until I began reading the side of the creationists that I realized that the scientific evidence does not favor evolution but creation. I did not change my mind about evolution because of my religion; I changed my mind about evolution because of the scientific evidence which I searched out and read and pondered. This is scientific evidence which is essentially banned from the classrooms of our schools and from the textbooks which you peddle because it contradicts the theory of evolution. Most of the creationists which I know or have read about have had the same experience. We originally believed in evolution; we were able to reconcile our faith and evolution; and we did not realize that there was a case for creationism until we searched out and studied the other side. Unfortunately, a person cannot just walk into his public library or into his college or high school library and find any information which controverts evolution. It is not that we lack books which critically examine evolution from a scientific point of view—it is just that we cannot find them where they should be—in our schools and libraries.

Let me deal with one final misconception, before I touch on evolution directly: I believe that Jesus Christ is God and I believe that as God, He created man directly and I believe that anyone who teaches differently is either intentionally lying or is misled (99% of the time, the latter is the case).¹ However, I personally do **not** want to see creation taught in the classroom because I know that it will be belittled and it will be presented as strictly supernatural, as if bereft of scientific merit. What I would like to see in the classroom is equal time given to the evidence which controverts evolution taught side-by-side with evolution. I don't give a flip if God's name is ever mentioned. And I would guarantee that hundreds of thousands of people who believe in direct creation of man by God would be thrilled to see both sides presented; i.e., the evidence for and the evidence against evolution. And I personally would have no problem whatsoever with allowing the kids to make up their own minds. And how could you lose? No one would be teaching religion; evolution would be examined with the critical eye it deserves, and perhaps, when all of the problems are placed before these young budding scientists, maybe they might come up with a better theory of evolution.²

It is my own personal belief that, *irrespective of his or her religion, a scientist must go where the data indicate, even if the destination calls into question long-standing, comfortable myths such as evolution; this is because it is our objective, indeed our obligation, [as educators] to present sound science.* So you see, we agree almost

¹ A personal note, Mr. McInerney—which are you? Did you knowingly misrepresent the fact that there are a significant number of scientists who do not believe in evolution or are you actually unaware that there are those in the scientific community who oppose evolution on scientific grounds? In either case, I don't know that I am comfortable with the fact that you have anything to do with providing textbooks for our children.

² Okay, I have been dishonest in this paragraph. I said, *what could you lose*, implying that you would not. Well, you would. If all of the evidence, pro and con, was presented in our schools to the young high school mind, then I can guarantee you that evolution would lose its foothold in our school system in one generation.

100% here. So are you afraid to subject your dogmatism to a critical scientific examination? That would make you appear to be just like the religious fanatic who is not wrong, no matter what.

Let's examine just a smattering of some serious critiques of the theory of evolution. I present these here for your own edification, assuming that you have never heard the other side (otherwise, you are morally bankrupt to lie to a young person and tell him that *evolution change [is]...an established fact...not in dispute among scientists*).

The time frame: Almost every Algebra II and Pre-Calculus teacher teaches logarithms and how to solve exponential equations using logarithms. We often teach the population growth equation, which is $A_t = A_0 e^{kt}$. As a hawk of high school text books, I am certain that you remember that from your high school and college days. Using that equation and any population figures that you want from any reputable source that you choose, you can project the population of man backward into time maybe 4,000-25,000 years (the latter figure was obtained by purposely using data on both sides of the Dark Ages, which will give us a smaller population constant). Now if man is 1,000,000 years old, then we have a long enough period of time to build up our population to today's levels forty times! Don't misunderstand what I just said. I am not saying our population should be forty times what it is; I am saying that, using observable evidence, that mankind could start at zero, build up to a population similar to today's world population; then be totally destroyed save two people, and build it up again to today's population, destroy everyone but two people, and build it up again—and we would have to do that 40 times if man is 1 million years old! And this is when we use the **most conservative** observable growth constant for man. Let's say that there was no world wide destruction (like a worldwide flood for instance), then, because my scientific calculator only goes up to 9.9999999×10^{99} , I am unable to give you what the world population would be today. However, assuming the lowest growth constant which we have observed for mankind and assuming that there were no worldwide disasters only for the past 100,000 years (this is one-tenth of what the evolutionists claim), then the world population today would be around 6×10^{38} . That is a 6 with thirty-eight zeroes behind it. What I am saying is that unless at least forty worldwide disasters wiped out the entire human population, man's age of one million years is mathematically untenable. Knowing that you should be able to do the mathematics of a high school Sophomore or Junior, I will leave the verification to you. I have never seen anyone come close to controverting this argument nor have I seen evolution offer a very large series of natural world wide disasters which has mediated our population growth.

The mechanism of evolution: The life of man and animals on this planet has to be an unthinkable long ago in order to make palatable the number of favorable, "hopeful monster" mutations which must have occurred in order to eventually turn inanimate, nonliving matter into living matter which eventually mutated into human beings. We are not talking ten thousand or even a hundred thousand favorable mutations that must have occurred, but millions upon millions of mutations which provided new limbs, organs, digestive systems, etc. To eventually build from nothing the great complexity of life that we have in this world is beyond human comprehension. It would be a miracle of nature such has never been seen before or since. Since such an occurrence is so unfathomable, it is easy for some to say, well, over millions of years it just gradually occurred. They can say that because the incredible complexity of life is beyond our grasp. The idea of it evolving from practically nothing falls into the realm of science fiction. Recall that these favorable changes or mutations occurred in thousands of different animals to bring them from non-living molecules to almost being perfectly designed for their habitat today.³ During **each and every single year** during those formative years of all living things, several significant mutations must have taken place, all moving in one direction. With thousands upon thousands of lab hours, we cannot produce a single new organ; 99.9% of the mutations we observe do not improve the organism, but inevitably result a greater disorganization of cells so that these observed mutations significantly limit or retard the organism in which they occur. Mutations do not improve that organism (recall again that Second Law of Thermodynamics?). In comic books, regular guys like you and me get exposed to radiation or some other factor which causes favorable mutations and they develop super powers. This happens

³ And we have seen how catastrophic minor changes in the environment can wipe out entire species in a blink of an eye, by the time frame of evolutionists. In our short time on this earth, we have observed huge numbers of animal types to become extinct; however, we haven't observed any new animals to take their place. Isn't that odd?

to hundreds of comic book characters. It does not happen in real life. Do you know that there are actually some contemporary evolutionists who believe a reptile laid an egg and out came a bird? I don't see that as scientific; I find that notion to be hilarious.

This disagreement between scientists over the mechanisms of evolution is always down played, but the fact is, scientists do not have any real answers in this area. They have a lot of theories, but they sharply disagree with one another here. One of the cornerstones of evolution are mutations. Let's look at the facts: (1) Mutations are rare, occurring perhaps 1 out of a 100,000 times (actually, my sources claim more like one in a million). (2) Not only are mutations rare, but they tend to be harmful. It is like tossing a grenade into a library. Do you really think that you could pick up four hundred random pages of a pile and they will now be a greater novel than all of the previous novels housed in that library? I think not. Not even if you threw the grenade in a million times. Mutations disturb normal function, they don't improve it.⁴ (3) Finally, **mutations do not create structures which were not there**. Mutations affect what is already in the organism. **They act as a randomizing factor for pre-existing material**. You do not *mutate* into existence eyes, hair, blood, bones, nervous systems if they weren't there in the first place.

So you want me to place my faith in what you call science, that man is a million years old, even though mathematically, that would be an impossibility; and that man came into being from nonliving matter using a method which is rare, destructive and has never been shown in the lab to create a new thing but rather randomizes what is already there? Furthermore, you imply that I am a religious fanatic because I question these things and I think that young people should be allowed to question these things as well? Sir, you have a much greater religious faith than I do, yet you con yourself into thinking that what you believe in is tried-and-true science and I believe in comfortable myths and fables. You are intellectually dishonest, Mr. McInerney. Therefore, the crap that you peddle under the so-called blessing of first amendment freedom *from* religion is merely a subterfuge which allows you to peddle your own philosophical system which cannot withstand the careful scrutiny of science. Again, why not allow your readers, including the science teachers, to read some of the scientific objections to evolution? You don't have to mention God. Instead of brainwashing your reading public, why not just give your readers a shot at discovering truth for themselves?

Natural selection is also touted as a mechanism of evolution. The often-cited case of the giraffe is, unfortunately for the evolutionist, a very poor example. Because of many severe, recurring droughts, giraffes, we are told, grew necks of increasing length in order to reach the high leaves of the trees, the lower leaves dropping off due to the droughts. Those giraffes with longer necks survived and passed their genes on. So, why didn't the giraffes migrate? Why didn't they eat something else and have their digestive systems adapt to that? Why did the other, similarly feeding animals from their area not develop longer necks? Finally, why is the neck of the female giraffe a full two feet shorter than that of the male's? The so-called natural selection which *must have occurred* causes one to have more questions than are actually solved by this theory. Another serious problem with natural selection is that it does not create new mechanisms, it, at best, re-enforces what is already there. Therefore, natural selection could in theory, eliminate, but not create.

The stratification of the earth's crust: "Okay," you may be thinking, "Many of us are already aware of the differences that evolutionists when it comes to the method of evolution, but certainly you cannot argue with the order of the fossil evidence found in our soil." This is because you think that rigorous, scientific tests are performed to determine the ages of the various strata. Wrong. "The rocks of each geologic age bear distinctive types of fossils unlike those of any other age. Conversely, each kind of fossil is an index or guide fossil to some definite geological time...fossils thus make it possible to recognize rocks of the same age in different parts of the Earth."⁵ Let me explain what Mr. Dunbar just said. We know what strata of rock we are dealing with because of the fossils found in it and we know the age of the fossils by the strata in which it is found.

⁴ The example of the naval orange is moot, as that did not necessarily improve the orange itself. It cannot reproduce itself and, without careful agricultural control, it would become extinct.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 47-48.

Evolutionist R.H. Rastall of Cambridge University: "It cannot be denied that from a strictly philosophical standpoint geologists are here arguing in a circle. The succession of organisms has been determined by a study of their remains buried in the rocks and the relative ages of the rocks are determined by the remains of organisms that they contain."⁶

Well, that is the only problem with stratification, then, correct? No. The stratification of the earth's crust was done in the 19th century, long before radioactive dating was developed. In fact, we still use the same geographical model from the 19th century today. Okay, then, you're thinking, the ordering of the fossils from simple to complex, the simple found in the lowest strata and the complex found in the higher strata, verifies the dating methods. Not exactly. Whereas there is a great deal of consistency of the geological column found from text book to text book and in the minds of most geologists, this same geological column does not occur consistently in nature. *Literally any rock system in the entire geologic column may be found lying directly on the basement complex and that any combination of rock systems may be found above it, at any given location.*⁷ Creationist Walter E. Lammerts writes: "The actual percentage of areas showing this progressive order from the simple to the complex is surprisingly small. Indeed formations with very complex forms of life are often found resting directly on the basic granites. Furthermore, I have...a list of over 500 cases that attest to a reverse order, that is, simple forms of life resting on top of more advanced types."⁸ What's more, don't think that certain fossils are exclusive to one layer and not to another, because they're not. But don't worry, evolutionists have a whole other host of theories (read, facts) which explain why the layers aren't layered like they're supposed to be and why we find fossils in the *wrong* places. Obviously, there must be some explanation, because evolution is certainly a fact, right?

Genetic similarities: You stated that the genetic similarities between man and ape are 99%. To this I must exclaim *vive la différence*. You may not realize this, but similarities in design do not mean that two things have a common ancestor. If you examined any two Chevrolet cars, you would notice that they have an awful lot of similar features. This indicates, at best, that they had a similar creator, or they were created from similar parts—they did not evolve from one another.⁹ The similarities of DNA between man and animal could just as easily testify to both having the same Creator (my apologies; I did not mean to mention God—how could I be so unyielding, dogmatic and superstitious?).

Implied and actual distortions of evolution: The average young person is led to believe that the change of brain size and the Neanderthal man are all proofs of evolution. No evolutionist believes that Neanderthal man, who has been historically presented as being a very apish-looking man, is our ancestor in the evolutionary chain. However, if the school-aged kid happens to believe this, no harm done, right? No evolutionary scientist believes that an increase in brain size indicates an increase of intelligence nor does it indicate evolution. The cranial capacity of modern man ranges from 700 cc to 2200 cc;¹⁰ homo erectus from 700 cc (Java Modjokerto infant) to 1200 cc (the largest Peking Man skull); Neanderthal from 1250 cc (Saccopastore I, Italy) to 1740 cc (Amud I, Israel—some Neanderthals are a little higher); archaic homo sapiens from 1100 cc to 1300 cc. Note that all of our *ancestors* fall within the range of modern man's cranial capacity. Nevertheless, in the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, there is this display titled "Increasing Brain Size." The text reads as follows:

Increasing Brain Size	
<i>Homo sapiens</i>	1450 cc
Neanderthal	1625 cc
Pithecanthropus	914 cc

⁶ Encyclopedia Britannica, *Geology*, 1956, Vol. 10, p. 168.

⁷ *The Twilight of Evolution*, Dr. Henry M. Morris, printed 1995, Baker Book House.

⁸ "Growing Doubts: Is Evolutionary Theory Valid?", p. 4.

⁹ I am indebted to one of the science teachers at my school for this analogy.

¹⁰ Stephen Molnar, *Races, Types, and Ethnic Groups* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.; Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 57.

Australopithecinae	650 cc
Gorilla	543 cc
Chimpanzee	400 cc
Gibbon	97 cc

As has been discussed, the nonscientific public has been led to believe that the soil stratification is an evidence of evolution. The explanation for the certain types of animal life and plant life occurring in certain strata, on the face of it, is simple. As a human being, I tend to spend more of my time hanging with human beings, and not with, for instance, trilobites.¹¹ Therefore, in an incredible natural disaster, such as one (or the ones) responsible for our fossils, would tend to have strata of people and their possessions in one place and strata of mollusks in another. Sociologically speaking, man tends to group with men who are physically similar, so it would seem reasonable to find bones of Neanderthals with other Neanderthal men bones. Under that interpretation, I don't have to be seriously concerned which strata is on top of which strata, because a natural disaster which caused such a thing will tend to group certain things together, but not necessarily one particular group of flora or fauna on top of another. Present the evolutionists view of stratification along side with the creationists view, and present with it the fact that the strata is never uniformly stacked as we see in a geology book and allow the kids to make up their minds. No evolutionist would allow for that because he is right and that is all there is to it. Presenting evidence to the contrary would only be teaching religion in the classroom and violating the first amendment.

As my understanding of evolutionary thought, *Homo habilis* preceded and evolved into *Homo erectus*, which preceded and evolved into *Homo sapiens* (modern man). However, there is some discussion among evolutionists as to whether *Homo erectus* is actually a separate species of man. Gabriel Ward Lasker, of Wayne State University, wrote: "*Homo erectus* is distinct from modern man (*Homo sapiens*), but there is a tendency to exaggerate the differences. Even if one ignores transitional or otherwise hard to classify specimens and limits consideration to the Java and Peking populations, the range of variation of many features of *Homo erectus* fall within that of modern man."¹² Michal Day wrote, "Of the three stages we know of the evolution of man (the australopithecine ape-men, *Homo erectus* the first true men, and early *Homo sapiens* our own species) *Homo erectus* of the Middle Pleistocene would have seemed the most clearly understood and the most taxonomically stable of them all a relatively few years ago—not any more. Important new finds as well as new ways of think about hominid taxonomy have thrown this 'species' into the same turmoil as all of the others."¹³

In Kenya, we have the 1984 discovery of a *Homo erectus* skeleton, which was associated (without any disagreement) with a *Homo erectus* cranium, the sum of which is designated as KNM-WT 15000. This skeleton is dated 1.6 Mya (by evolutionists), stands between 5'4" and 5'6" tall and belongs to a 12-13 year old boy. At maturity, it was estimated that he would have been about 6' tall. This is a problem for *Homo erectus*, who has always been thought to be significantly smaller than modern man. In fact, evolution has a serious problem if over the period of 1 million years there was no significant change in man. *Homo sapiens* and *Homo erectus* differences are, in truth, a genetic variations within the same species. Furthermore, the Neanderthal is much more similar in all respects to *Homo erectus*, but is presented as an ancestor, or offshoot, of *Homo sapiens*. This is because of the time period ascribed to these men.

Speaking of time periods, modern *Homo sapiens* fossils are dated back as far as between 2 and 3 mya (KNM-ER 1472, KNM-ER 1590 and KNM-ER 1470 and 1481). Archaic *Homo sapiens* (the *older* ones) are not found prior to 1 mya (Vértesszöllös skull fragment and teeth dated 500,000 ya; Ndutu skull, dated 500,000 ya; Petralona skull 650,000 ya; and Mauer mandible, almost 700,000 ya). *Homo erectus* and *Homo habilis* are almost completely contemporary (their fossils are dated between 0.5 and 2 mya and 1.5 and 2 mya,

¹¹ Yes, I know—I'm being facetious.

¹² Gabriel Ward Lasker, *Physical Anthropology* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973), p. 284.

¹³ Michael Day, "Homo turmoil," *Nature* 348 (20/27) December 1990; p. 688.

respectively, with some *Homo erectus* fossils being possibly as recent as 10,000 BC¹⁴). What I am saying could be better illustrated by a chart:

The generally accepted view of evolutionists:

australopithecine ape-men ➡ ***Homo habilis***¹⁵ ➡ ***Homo erectus*** ➡ ***Homo sapiens***.

Now, let's examine a chart, using the dates given by evolutionists, of the earliest and latest of each species with a few representative samples from in between.:

Time Period	australopithecine ape-men	<i>Homo habilis</i>	<i>Homo erectus</i>	<i>Homo sapiens</i> .
4–5 mya	<i>A. Afarensis</i>			Kanapol (KP 271) arm fragment ¹⁶
3–4 mya	<i>A. Afarensis</i> <i>A. Africanus</i>			Laetoli footprint trails, Tanzania
2-3 mya	Lucy (circa 3 mya) <i>A. Africanus</i> <i>A. Robustus</i>	KNM-WT 15001 cranium fragment (circa 2 mya)	Java (Djetis)/Damiao (circa 2 mya)	KNM-ER 1472, 1590, 1470, 1481 ¹⁷
1-2 mya	<i>A. Africanus</i> <i>A. Robustus</i>	KNM-ER 1470 KNM-ER 1590 KNM-ER 1802 Olduvai Hominid 52 cranium fragment Olduvai Hominid 24 cranium Olduvai Hominid 6 (circa 1.75 mya) Olduvai Hominid 13 cranial fragments (Circa 1.5 mya)	KNM-ER 3228 (circa 1.95 mya) Olduvai Hominid 29 Olduvai Hominid 51 Gomboré II SKX-5020 (circa 1.8 mya) Olduvai Hominid 9 Olduvai Hominid 36 KNM-ER 992, 803 KNM-ER 3883, 737 (circa 1.6 mya)	Koobi Fora footprints, Kenya Gomboré IB-7594 arm bone Olduvai Hominid 48 clavicle KNM-ER leg and ankle bones ¹⁸
0.5-1 mya	<i>A. Africanus</i> <i>A. Robustus</i>		Java Man skullcap (Luc Yen and Lang Trang) Olduvai Hominid 12 Olduvai Hominid 28 Olduvai Hominid 22	Mauer mandible, almost 700,000 ya; Petralona skull 650,000 ya; Vértesszöllös skull fragment and teeth dated 500,000 ya; Ndotu skull, dated 500,000 ya (These are the archaic <i>Homo Sapiens</i>)

¹⁴ In fact, the Cossack skull, which is only a few hundred years old, is very *Homo erectus* in its morphology.

¹⁵ Many leave out *Homo habilis* as a flawed taxon.

¹⁶ This is the one which is indistinguishable by computer from modern man.

¹⁷ Indistinguishable from modern *Homo sapiens*.

¹⁸ Every listing in this group is anatomically indistinguishable from modern *Homo Sapiens* although they are not so classified.

Time Period	australopithecine ape-men	<i>Homo habilis</i>	<i>Homo erectus</i>	<i>Homo sapiens.</i>
0-0.5 mya			A number of erectus-like fossils found in Coobool Crossing, Australia. Momo 2, Arago 21 Rhodesian Man skull	Hundreds from this era including the archaic <i>Homo sapiens</i> found in the Klasies River Mouth Caves, South Africa.

You can see by this chart that the fossil evidence does **not** support *Homo habilis* predating *Homo erectus* predating *Homo sapiens*. Is there some problem with the first amendment which would preclude science students from knowing this fact? Does hiding this sort of evidence against evolution fall into your commitment to the textual presentation of *sound science*? This chart is based up discoveries made by evolutionists using their numbers and using their data. Despite having over possibly as many as 6000 hominid (human) fossils or portions of human fossils, the evolutionist contends that this is a minuscule amount upon which to base any evidence. This is because every new discovery seems to cause more problems for the evolutionist than it solves.

The evolutionist has no problems with taking the available evidence and distorting it to fit his own theories. In 1965, in northern Kenya, Bryan Patterson, of Harvard University, discovered KP 271, a fossil of the lower end of a left upper arm bone. It is in excellent condition and this fossil has been dated at 4.5 mya. This is, as far as I know, the oldest hominid fossil in existence, predating Lucy and her australopithecine brothers and sisters (allegedly our apish ancestors). The bone was compared by computer in seven measured areas with three other bones (that of a chimpanzee, a modern human and an *Australopithecus robustus*, from Kromdraai, South Africa). Patterson, along with a man named W.W. Howells, published their results in *Science*, 7 April 1967: In these diagnostic measurements, Kanapoi Hominoid I [the original name given to the fossil] is strikingly close to the means of the human sample." Further computer analysis has been done on this bone, causing one Henry M. McHenry (University of California, at Davis) to comment:"The results show that the Kanapoi specimen, which is 4 to 4.5 million years old, is indistinguishable from modern *Homo sapiens*." However, despite the observable evidence, despite the fact that it is easy to distinguish between humans and other primates with regards to this piece of anatomy, despite the fact that all of the appropriate diagnostic tools were employed, KP 271 is suggested by Patterson and Howells to be *Australopithecus africanus*. Howells, fourteen years later, explains, "The humeral fragment from Kanapoi, with a date of about 4.4 million, could not be distinguished from *Homo sapiens* morphologically or by multivariate analysis by Patterson and myself in 1967 [or by much more searching analysis by others since then]. We suggested that it might represent *Australopithecus* because at that time allocation to *Homo* seemed preposterous, although it would be the correct one without the time element."¹⁹

Let me try to explain what is going on here. We have a fully modern human bone pre-dating our primate ancestors; however, because it predates our primate ancestors, we are allowed to toss that bone into whatever bone pile classification that fits our theories. Now that tells me that there is either less difference between ourselves and our alleged hominid ancestors than we are led to believe, or that evolutionists don't have to play by the rules if the observable evidence disagrees with their pet theories.

We have the incident of the dating of the East African KBS Tuff strata, wherein was found the very modern skull, designated KNM-ER 1470. The first date given to this skull was 2.9 million years. However, a modern skull can't be that old. Dating this strata became quite an important issue, as fossils cannot be dated directly. Since this strata was associated with hundreds of Hominid and australopithecine fossils, and since it contains radioactive potassium⁴⁰ which decays to argon⁴⁰, it can be dated directly. Because of the way that this three-foot

¹⁹ William W. Howells, "*Homo erectus* in human descent: ideas and problems," *Homo erectus: Papers in Honor of Davidson Black*, Becky A. Sigmon and Jerome S. Cybulski, eds. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), pp. 79–80.

layer, volcanic in origin, was laid, there was a mixture of foreign material with it, making dating difficult. Prior to the discovery of KNM-ER 1470, its date fell right in line with the other fossils found in association with it. What is found above it was considered to be more recent, and what was found below was assumed to be older than this layer. The fossils indicated the layer should be between 2 and 5 million years old, and therefore the first measurement was accepted as correct. However, the first dates given to this layer were 212 and 230 mya using potassium-argon dating. Obviously those dates were wrong, as that placed this back to dinosaur times and this did not square with the fossil evidence. You see, the evolutionist just knows when his fossils are supposed to have been alive, so whatever does not square with his theory must be tossed out. So, using new rock samples, the strata was given to this strata: 2.61 mya. A third study was done, which confirmed that the second study was accurate. A fourth independent testing was done and that strata below the KBS Tuff was determined to be approximately 1.8 mya. But now we have this modern skull, found below a 2.6 million year old strata and above another strata dated at 3.18 mya. So, the date of this skull was changed, and it was then classified as *Homo habilis* and Alan Walker, an associate of Richard Leakey, who headed the team which discovered KNM-ER 1470, and identified it as australopithecine. Does this mean that we can't just look at the skull and tell the difference? The area was dated once again, and one portion was determined to be 1.6 mya and another 1.82 mya and these became the accepted dates. Now, how do we know these are the correct dates and all the other dating was incorrect? We know the newest dates are correct because it jives with our presupposed theories of evolution as we believe in it this week. The other dates used to be good and firm until the discovery of that skull, and now the new dates are good, even though all previous teams of researchers were sincere scientists, who used *accurate* dating methods. And the dating of this area for years later still continued to be dated and re-dated.²⁰

I could go on, but doesn't it strike you as odd that three different evolutionists take the same skull and identify it as modern man, as *Homo habilis* and as australopithecine? This is science? We have dates which disagree hundreds of millions of years. But this is merely the tip of the iceberg. Should our students not be made aware of these things? Or do we have some moral obligation to keep the truth from them when it comes to evolution?

Addendum: The first amendment: There is a portion of this amendment at its inception meant that the state was not allowed in sponsor or to formally adopt a religion. They still prayed in the White house and in the schools and, for centuries, this did not contradict the First Amendment, either in the minds of the framers of the constitution nor in the minds of their antecedents for many generations thereafter. The courts have often been known to make law in their interpretation of the law, and that is what has happened historically with the first amendment in several areas of interpretation. So presently, the current *interpretation* of the first amendment is on your side. This does not make legislative attempts *to weaken the treatment of evolution and to promote religious perspectives about life on earth* either *foolish...generally erroneous* or *unconstitutional*.

Let's look at this from the standpoint of moral and intellectual integrity for just a moment. I am going to make an argument which you may or may not fully comprehend, so give this a careful read. Just because evolutionists have chosen to unequivocally rule out God as the immediate and recent creator of mankind, does not make evolution a science and creationism a religion. In fact, when some discoveries are covered up, when some facts are distorted, when evidence is reinterpreted several times in order to jive with the most current evolutionary beliefs, when the most complete display of evidence (such as the listing of human fossils) is found in the books of those who oppose evolution and not in the books of evolutionists, when the methodology and process of this *science* cannot be replicated in the lab; when all criticism of this *science* is completely excluded from textbooks adopted by our schools, when this theory is repeatedly presented as though it is an indisputable fact (although there is not one single facet of evolution which is an incontrovertible fact) and when all those who oppose this dogma are brandished as fanatics, unscientific, unenlightened, and/or the unfortunate products of their backward upbringing, then we have entered into the realm of religious teaching, and, worse yet, evolution has herein become a dangerously restrictive, state-sponsored religion which preaches if there is a God, then He did not under any circumstances create us directly. Mr. McInerney, your state-sponsored religion offends

²⁰ Much of the information found in this letter came from Marvin L. Lubenow's book *Bones of Contention*, Baker Books, ©1992.

me because it teaches me and my children that if I believe that God created mankind immediately, then I am unscientific and wrong; that evolution is the only scientific explanation; and therefore you will not present the evidence any against evolution in any of your textbooks because that would be, by definition, unscientific. Mr. McInerney, if that is not religious dogma, then I don't know what is. I would think that the principles of science would be better served if all evidence and interpretation of same was presented and let the chips fall where they may. If I, as a closed-minded, fundamentalist Christian, can live with that—why can't you?

Sincerely,

Gary Kukis

I never received a response to this, either from the textbook company or from any of the science teachers, other than one who, in the hallway, said, with a smile, "Way to go" or words to that effect.

Gary Kukis
Math Instructor, Humble High School
20507 Spoonwood
Humble, TX 77346 (home)
1700 Wilson Road
Humble, TX 77338 (school)