

What Scientists Say About Evolution

The modern theory of evolution is largely attributed to Charles Darwin who published his book, On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection in 1859. From 1922 through 1953, Alexander Oparin, a Russian biochemist, and J.B.S. Holdane, an English biologist added what has been called the Oparin-Holdane hypothesis. This theory deals with the origin of life by chemical evolution in a "prebiotic soup" composed of methane, ammonia, hydrogen and water vapor in a reducing (little or no free oxygen) atmosphere. Although several slight changes in the "prebiotic" or "primordial soup" have been suggested, we could summarize the idea of evolution as generally taught in biology texts today, as follows:

prebiotic soup >> "Simple" >> "Complex"
Chemicals >> amino acids >> polymers/RNA/DNA >> single cell >> plants and animals >> plants and animals >> ape >> man

Three major ideas are always present:

1. simple >> complex (i.e., non-living >> living)
2. a very long period of time
3. no design (i.e., random, chance, or "natural processes")

As a recent college biology text has observed...

*"Proof of evolutionary theory, in the rigorous sense of an experimental verification or demonstration is impossible for several reasons. The most important reason is that evolution is a historical phenomenon."*¹

Also, evolutionist and scientist, Colin Patterson, Ph.D., has stated:

*"We must ask whether the theory of evolution by natural selection is scientific or pseudoscientific (metaphysical)...taking the first part of the theory, that evolution has occurred, it says that the history of life is a single process of species-splitting and progression. This process must be unique and unrepeatable, like the history of England. This part of the theory is therefore a historical theory about unique events; and unique events are, by definition, not part of science, for they are unrepeatable and so not subject to test."*²

This means that evolution is not a fact but a hypothesis not proven by science. However, we can look at the evidence and see if the facts seem to support the idea of evolution or not. This is the purpose of this booklet-to compare the evidence with the hypothesis. When one does this, one finds several discrepancies between the facts of science and the hypothesis of evolution. Five major problems are listed below.

1. **Lack of Evidence for Prebiotic Soup** There is a growing body of evidence that the early earth's atmosphere was not reducing and not composed of the materials proposed by Oparin, Holdane, etc. Dr. Robert Shapiro, an evolutionist and biochemist, has a whole chapter titled "The Spark and the Soup" in which he discusses "the myth of the prebiotic soup"³. Drs. Thaxton, Bradley and Olsen have summarized the problem as follows:

"...in the atmosphere and in the various water basins of the primitive earth, many destructive interactions would have so vastly diminished, if not altogether consumed, essential precursor chemicals, that chemical evolution rates would have been negligible. The soup would have been too dilute for direct polymerization to occur. Even local ponds for concentrating soup ingredients would have met with the same problem. Furthermore, no geological evidence indicates that an organic soup, even a small organic pond, ever existed on this planet. It is becoming clear that however life began on earth, the usually conceived notion that life emerged from an oceanic soup of organic chemicals is a most implausible hypothesis. We may therefore with fairness call this scenario 'the myth of the prebiotic soup.'"⁴

It should be noted that the reason the reducing prebiotic mixture was selected in the first place was that only it could have possibly produced the organic material needed for the chemical evolution of life. Geologists in the 1920's did not produce fossils showing such a prebiotic soup which then led to the Oparin-Holdane hypothesis.

2. **Lack of Transitional Fossils** Scientists agree that we have fossils of the major types of plants/animals. However, since evolution states that change from one type of plant/animal to another type occurred very slowly, we should find many fossils of transitional or intermediate life forms. For example, according to the theory of evolution, reptiles became birds over a long period of time. We should, therefore, find fossils of several animals between reptiles and birds. What do we really find? None! Actually, Darwin knew this problem and said so: "*Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this,*

perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory."⁵ However, he thought that as we found more fossils we would find these transitional forms. What have we found so many years later? Let the scientists speak. Evolutionist and paleontologist David Raup, Ph.D.:

"Darwin...was embarrassed by the fossil record, ...we are now about 120 years after Darwin and the knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded. We now have a quarter of a million fossil species, but the situation hasn't changed much...We have even fewer examples of Evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin's time."⁶

Evolutionist geologist and paleontologist Stephen Gould, Ph.D.:

"The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution."⁷

In fact, Dr. Gould calls this lack of evidence of transitional forms a secret well-kept from those in the general public (apart from those in paleontology): *"The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of paleontology."⁸ Dr. Michael Denton, (also an evolutionist) has said, *"Without intermediates or transitional forms to bridge the enormous gaps which separate existing species and groups of organisms, the concept of evolution could never be taken seriously as a scientific hypothesis."⁹**

3. **Sudden Appearance of Complex Life Forms** (esp. in the lowest geological layers). We could summarize the evolutionary position on geology and life forms as follows:

- 1) The earth's surface is composed of several layers, with the oldest at the bottom moving up to the youngest layer on top.
- 2) Since the simplest life forms are the oldest they appear in the lowest layer and gradually change through the layers to the complex life forms in the top level(s).

This means that the ancestral form of each life form should be in the layer below it and the lowest layers should have the 'simpler' life forms. However, what do the rocks tell us? Let the scientists speak.

Fred Hoyle, Ph.D. and Chandra Wickramasinghe, Ph.D.:

*"The problem for biology is to reach a simple beginning...the tendency is to imagine that there must have been a time when simple cells existed but when complex cells did not. ...this belief has turned out to be wrong. ...Going back in time to the age of the oldest rocks... fossil residues of ancient life-forms in the rocks do not reveal a simple beginning. Although we may care to think of fossil bacteria and fossil algae and microfungi as being simple compared to a dog or horse, the information standard remains enormously high. Most of the biochemical complexity of life was present already at the time the oldest surface rocks of the Earth were formed."*¹⁰

Take the trilobite for example. *"These animals first appeared at the beginning of the Cambrian period approximately 570 million years ago."*¹¹ The Cambrian layer is characterized by a tremendous variety of fossilized life forms. However, the layer below it, the Precambrian, contains almost no fossils (bacteria, algae, etc.) and certainly nothing that could have remotely given way to a trilobite because the trilobite is a very complex little animal with organs, exoskeleton, etc. Consider the trilobite eye...

*"At least two types of eyes are distinguishable in the trilobites...The holochroal or compound eye consists of touching hexagonal calcite lenses which may number from 100 to more than 15,000."*¹²

Anyone who has ever seen or held a trilobite realizes that they are very complex creatures. Could they have come directly from a spore, a bacterium or algae? What is such a complex animal doing in the very bottom of the fossil record? We observe again and again this fact that the plants/animals appear in the fossil record abruptly, with no ancestors and fully formed, just as in the Cambrian record (where we also find jellyfish, starfish, mollusks, etc.). To summarize I would like to quote evolutionist Michael Denton (Ph.D. in molecular Biology and M.D.):

"It is still, as it was in Darwin's day, overwhelmingly true that the first representatives of all the major classes of organisms known to biology are already highly characteristic of their class when they make their initial appearance in the fossil record ...The mollusks for example,...are all highly differentiated when they burst into the fossil record...the strata lain down over the hundreds of millions of years before the Cambrian era, which might have contained the connecting links between the major phyla, are almost completely empty of animal fossils...The story is the same for plants. Again, the first representatives of each major group appear in the fossil record

already highly specialized and highly characteristic of the group to which they belong...Like the sudden appearance of the first animal groups in the Cambrian rocks, the sudden appearance of the angiosperms is a persistent anomaly which has resisted all attempts at explanation since Darwin`s time. The sudden origin of the angiosperms puzzled him...Again, just as in the case of the absence of pre-Cambrian fossils, no forms have ever been found in pre-Cretaceous rocks linking the angiosperms with any other group of plants... The same pattern is true of the vertebrate fossil record. The first members of each major group appear abruptly, unlinked to other groups by transitional or intermediate forms. ...The virtual complete absence of intermediate and ancestral forms from the fossil record is today recognized widely by many leading paleontologists as one of its most striking characteristics..."¹³

4. **Non-Living Cannot Become Living By Natural Processes** Evolution says that simple things became complex, that non-living chemicals (macromolecules) became living cells with DNA by chance. Is that even possible? Do scientists observe anything like that today? Can we even synthesize living matter in a laboratory using high-tech lab equipment, computers, etc., and lots of design? The answer is no, no, and no. Fred Hoyle, Ph.D. and Chandra Wickramasinghe, Ph.D., both evolutionists, explain why this is not possible.

"...Life cannot have had a random beginning... the trouble is that there are about two thousand enzymes, and the chance of obtaining them all in a random trial is only one part in $(10^{20})^{2,000} = 10^{40,000}$, an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup. If one is not prejudiced either by social beliefs or by a scientific training into the conviction that life originated on the Earth, this simple calculation wipes the idea entirely out of court,...the enormous information content of even the simplest living systems...cannot in our view be generated by what are often called "natural" processes...For life to have originated on the Earth it would be necessary that quite explicit instruction should have been provided for its assembly. There is no way in which we can expect to avoid the need for information, no way in which we can simply get by with a bigger and better organic soup, as we ourselves hoped might be possible a year or two ago."¹⁴

Hubert Yockey, Ph.D, an expert in molecular biology, information science and mathematical probability (and an evolutionist), stated: *"the building blocks...do not*

spontaneously make proteins, at least not by chance. The origin of life by chance in a primeval soup is impossible in probability...A practical person must conclude that life didn't happen by chance."¹⁵

Nobel Prize winner, strong evolutionist and biochemist, Francis Crick, Ph.D, recently concluded:

*"An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going."*¹⁶

To summarize this point, I would like to quote Dr. Michael Denton again from a chapter he titled The Puzzle of Perfection:

*"The intuitive feeling that pure chance could never have achieved the degree of complexity and ingenuity so ubiquitous in nature has been a continuing source of skepticism ever since the publication of the Origin of the Species; and throughout the past century there has always existed a significant minority of first-rate biologists who have never been able to bring themselves to accept the validity of Darwinian claims...perhaps in no other area of modern biology is the challenge posed by the extreme complexity and ingenuity of biological adaptations more apparent than in the fascinating new molecular world of the cell,...To grasp the reality of life as it has been revealed by molecular biology, we must magnify a cell a thousand million times until it is twenty kilometers in diameter and resembles a giant airship large enough to cover a great city like London or New York. What we would then see would be an object of unparalleled complexity and adaptive design. On the surface of the cell we would see millions of openings like the port holes of a vast space ship, opening and closing to allow a continual stream of materials to flow in and out. If we were to enter one of these openings we would find ourselves in a world of supreme technology and bewildering complexity...Is it really credible that random processes could have constructed a reality the smallest element of which-a functional protein or gene-is complex beyond our own creative capacities, a reality, which is the very antithesis of chance, which excels in every sense anything produced by the intelligence of man?"*¹⁷

5. **No Valid Mechanism** Science is about process and explaining how things happen. For evolution to be credible it must explain how one plant/animal changes into another plant/animal. As most of us know, Charles Darwin proposed natural selection (sometimes called 'survival of the fittest') as the mechanism of change. However he later became uncertain about natural selection as the mechanism of evolution, gave in to the weight of scientific evidence and abandoned it in the 6th edition of his book, The Origin of Species (see Randall Hedtke, The Secret of the Sixth Edition, Vantage Press, 1983). We now know natural selection moves in the direction of preserving the species, not changing it to another. As evolutionist Dr. Colin Patterson said, "*No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has ever gotten near it...*"¹⁸ Well-known evolutionist Niles Eldridge, Ph.D., a curator of the American Museum of Natural History in New York City has also stated, "*natural selection...does not work to create new species.*"¹⁹ Another proposed mechanism for evolution has been mutations, which are actually genetic accidents. ("*All mutations seem to be in the nature of injuries...*")²⁰ .

Radiation and mutation expert Dr. H.J. Muller had said:

*"There is no single instance where it can be maintained that any of the mutants studied has a higher viability than the mother species...A review of known facts about their ability to survive has led to no other conclusion than that they are always constitutionally weaker than their parent form or species, and in a population with free competition they are eliminated... Therefore they are never found in nature (e.g., not a single one of the several hundreds of Drosophila mutations), and therefore, they are able to appear only in the favorable environment of the experimental field or laboratory..."*²²

Let's go back to the evolutionist scenario of reptiles (which are vertebrates) becoming birds, and consider the change which would have had to occur in their lungs. Here is Dr. Denton's discussion of this:

"The evolution of birds is far more complex than the above discussion implies. In addition to the problem of the origin of the feather and flight, birds possess other unique adaptations which also seem to defy plausible evolutionary explanations. One such adaptation is the avian lung and respiratory system."

In all other vertebrates the air is drawn into the lungs through a system of branching tubes which finally terminate in tiny air sacs, or alveoli, so that during respiration the air is moved in and out through the same passage.

In the case of birds, however the major bronchi break down into tiny tubes which permeate the lung tissue. These so-called parabronchi eventually join up together again, forming a true circulatory system so that air flows in one direction through the lungs. ...Just how such an utterly different respiratory system could have evolved gradually from the standard vertebrate design is fantastically difficult to envisage, especially bearing in mind that the maintenance of respiratory function is absolutely vital to the life of an organism to the extent that the slightest malfunction leads to death within minutes. Just as the feather cannot function as an organ of flight until the hooks and barbules are coadapted to fit together perfectly, so the avian lung cannot function as an organ of respiration until the parabronchi system which permeates it and the air sac system which guarantees the parabronchi their air supply are both highly developed and able to function together in a perfectly integrated manner."²³

Can natural selection or mutations explain the thousands (millions) of genetic changes that would have to take place exactly at the same time for a reptile to become a bird? Does this hypothesized change in lungs (and feathers, etc.) even agree with what we know is true about the nature of mutations? Evolutionist Dr. Pierre-Paul Grasse', former president of the French Academie des Sciences and the scientist who held the Chair of Evolution at the Sorbonne in Paris for twenty years has clearly stated the problem:

"The opportune appearance of mutation permitting animals and plants to meet their needs seems hard to believe. Yet the Darwinian theory is even more demanding: a single plant, a single animal would require thousands and thousands of lucky, appropriate events. Thus, miracles would become the rule: events with a infinitesimal probability could not fail to occur. ...There is no law against day dreaming, but science must not indulge in it."²⁴

This lack of a credible explanation for how evolution could happen has been highlighted by Dr. Michael Behe in his recent book, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: Free Press, 1996).

Charles Darwin himself stated in *The Origin of Species*, a type of test that could be applied to his idea of evolution:

If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.

Considering this idea, Behe said he asked himself, "What type of biological system could not be formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications? Well, for starters, a system that has a quality that I call irreducible complexity." (From a talk to biologists at the University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida). He means that these systems are made up of many parts that interact in complex ways, and all the parts need to work together. Unless all the other parts are also present, a single part has no useful function. Behe shows that such irreducibly complex systems are too inter-related to have been built up slowly step-by-step and, therefore, point to design not gradualism. As a practical example of this (that everyone knows), he uses the mousetrap which must have all parts fully-formed and in place to work. Then in his field of biochemistry he gives examples such as the chemical chain reaction that makes vision possible, the mechanism for blood clotting, tiny electric "motors" of cilium, etc. All of these are irreducibly complex.

In the above-mentioned lecture Behe summarized the problem:

As you search the professional literature of the last several decades, looking for articles that have been published even attempting to explain the possible Darwinian step-by-step origin of any of these systems, you will encounter a thundering silence. Absolutely no one-not one scientist-has published any detailed proposal or explanation of the possible evolution of any such complex biochemical system.

Thus, Behe shows that at the molecular level the modern evolutionary theory fails Darwin's own test; he summarizes:

To Darwin, the cell was a "Black box"-its inner workings were utterly mysterious to him. Now, the black box has been opened up and we know how it works. Applying Darwin's test to the ultra-complex world of molecular machinery and cellular systems that have been discovered over the past 40 years, we can say that Darwin's theory has "absolutely broken down.

So, in summary, here again are five major problems with the theory of evolution.

1. **Lack of Evidence for Prebiotic Soup**
2. **Lack of Transitional Fossils**
3. **Sudden Appearance of Complex Life Forms (esp. in the lowest layers)**
4. **Non-living Cannot Become Living by Natural Processes**
5. **No Valid Mechanism**

CONCLUDING REMARKS

1. Much has been written and spoken by evolutionists to the effect that evolution is happening today but so slowly that we cannot observe it. What is the difference between that idea and this: the reason we cannot observe evolution happening today is that it's not taking place. Is one conclusion more valid than the other? The second idea is the simplest solution that fits the data. The only reason a person would choose the first idea is that he already has a belief (faith) that evolution is happening. Is this scientific?

2. Evolutionist writers and speakers have also used the small variations within types of plants/animals (sometimes called "microevolution") as proof of evolution. However, *"Microevolution (small changes or variations) involves small-scale biological changes only (e.g., color, size). Microevolution does not produce new genetic information; it only reshuffles existing genes. The gene pool remains constant."*²⁵ Evolution (or "macroevolution") is about one plant/animal changing into another plant/animal and microevolution simply cannot be used in any way to explain or prove it, as Darrel Kautz has clearly stated:

"People are misled into believing that since microevolution is a reality, that therefore macroevolution is such a reality also. Evolutionists maintain that over long periods of time small scale changes accumulate in such a way as to generate new and more complex organisms... This is sheer illusion, for there is no scientific evidence whatever to support the occurrence of biological change on such a grand scale. In spite of all the artificial breeding which has been done, and all the controlled efforts to modify fruit flies, the bacillus escherichia (e-coli), and other organisms, fruit flies remain

fruit flies, E-coli bacteria remain E-coli bacteria, roses remain roses, corn remains corn, and human beings remain human beings.¹²⁶

3. When one reads the writings of evolutionist writers as well as high school and college biology texts, etc., you continuously read words (describing the process of evolution) like "we think that", "scientists believe", "may be", "could be", "might be", etc. Although the language of science (at the hypothesis level) should certainly contain words like these, they seem strangely out of place in a discussion coming from the point of view that evolution is a proven fact accepted by all knowledgeable scientists. (Please see quote below in comment #6)

4. Imagine that you are in Stockholm, Sweden and a member of the Nobel Prize committee for science. Scientist Mr. A applies for the Nobel Prize with evolution as his topic and the following conversation occurs:

You: Do you have any evidence that this has happened in the past?

Mr. A: No, I'm sorry I don't have.

You: Well then, do you have any evidence it's happening now, in the present?

Mr. A: Actually, I don't. The answer is no.

You: Mr. A, science is about giving explanations for phenomenon. Could you please tell us how evolution takes place, that is, how one plant/animal changes into another plant/animal?

Mr. A: Well you see, we used to think natural selection, then mutation, and, well, now...I just don't know...

Would you vote to give Mr. A the Nobel Prize?

5. It should be noted that the whole process of evolution has a problem from the statistical point of view. Carl Sagan (an evolutionist) and other prominent scientists have estimated the probability of man evolving to be 1 chance in 10 followed by two billion zeroes.²⁷ However, according to Borel's law, anything beyond 1 chance in 10 followed by 50 zeroes is impossible.²⁸ Therefore, the incredibly small probability of evolution means it is, in reality, impossible.

Although Christian scientists with Ph.D.'s in related fields have long pointed out the scientific problems with evolution, I have tried to quote almost entirely from non-christian evolutionists who have noted the same errors (though they may not have abandoned the idea altogether). It is not hard to find such material written by evolutionists exposing the theory of evolution (actually, the real problem is condensing it because there is so much). More and more world-class scientists, once

very strong evolutionists, are abandoning or criticizing it as the data becomes more and more overwhelming and clear in pointing away from evolution. I would like to close with a quote from Colin Patterson, Ph.D., Senior Paleontologist, British Museum of Natural History, London:

"Last year I had a sudden realization--- for over 20 years I had thought I was working on Evolution in some way. One morning I woke up and something had happened in the night, and it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for 20 years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be so misled so long. Either there was something wrong with me or there was something wrong with the Evolutionary theory. Naturally, I know there is nothing wrong with me, so the last few weeks I've been putting a simple question to various people and groups of people. Question is: Can you tell me anything you KNOW about Evolution? Any one thing? Any one thing that is true?

*I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of Evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time, and eventually one person said, "I do know one thing-it ought not to be taught in high school."*²⁹

Bibliography

1. Barret, Abramoff, Kumaran, Millington, Biology, (Prentice-Hall,1985) p.750.
2. Colin Patterson (Ph.D.), Evolution (London: British Museum of Natural History, 1978) pp. 145-146.
3. Robert Shapiro, (Ph.D.), Origins: A Skeptic's Guide to Creation of Life on Earth (Simon & Schuster, 1986), pp.98-117.
4. Charles Thaxton (Ph.D.-Chemistry), Walter Bradley (Ph.D.-Material Science), Roger Olsen (Ph.D. Geochemistry), The Mystery of Life's Origins.. Reassessing Current Theories (New York: philosophical Library, 1984) p.66 (emphasis added)
5. p. 292, first paragraph of Chapter 9, "On the Imperfection of the Geologic record", of The Origin of Species (emphasis added).

- 6.** David Raup (Ph.D.-Harvard University), "Conflicts Between Darwin and paleontology", Field Museum of Natural History, Vol. 50, No. 1 (January 1979) p.22 (emphasis added).
- 7.** Stephen Gould (Ph.D.-Ardent Evolutionist and professor of Geology and paleontology, Harvard University), "Is a New and General Theory of Evolution Emerging?", Paleobiology, Vol. 6, No. 1 (January 1980), p. 127 (emphasis added).
- 8.** Stephen Gould "Evolution's Erratic pace", Natural History, Vol.86, No.5 (May 1977), pp. 13-14 (emphasis added).
- 9.** Michael Denton (Evolutionist, Ph.D.-Molecular Biology, and M.D.), Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (Adler & Adler, 1986) p. 158.
- 10.** Fred Hoyle and C. Wickramasinghe, Evolution From Space (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1981), p. 8,70 (emphasis added).
- 11, 12** Geologic Chart "What is a Trilobite?", Black Hills Institute of Geologic Research, 1989.
- 13.** Michael Denton, Evolution pp.162-165
- 14.** Fred Hoyle and C. Wickramasingh, Evolution From Space, pp. 148,24,150,30,31 (emphasis added).
- 15.** Hubert Yockey, Ph.D., Information Theory and Molecular Biology, (Cambridge University Press 1992), p.257.
- 16.** Francis Crick and L.B. Orgel (1973), "Directed panspermia", Icarus, 19: 341-46.
- 17.** Michael Denton, Evolution, pp.326-328.
- 18.** Colin Patterson, interview on the subject of Cladistics, British Broadcasting Corporation Television (March 4, 1982).
- 19.** Niles Eldridge, Ph.D, "An Extravagance of Species (The Diversity of Fossil Trilobites poses a Challenge to Traditional Evolutionary Theory)", Natural History, Vol.89, No.7 (July 1980) p.46 (emphasis added).
- 20.** C.P. Martin, "A Non-Geneticist Looks at Evolution", American Scientist, Vol.41, No. 1 (January 1953), pp. 100,103 (emphasis added).

- 21.** H.J. Muller, "How Radiation Changes the Genetic Constitution", Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Vol. 11, No. 9 (November 1955), p.331 (emphasis added),
- 22.** Heribert Nilsson, Synthetische Artbildung (Lund, Sweden: Verlag CWK Gleerup, 1953), p.1212,1186.
- 23.** Michael Denton, Evolution, pp. 210-212, (drawings also from this book).
- 24.** Pierre-Paul Grasse', Ph.D., Evolution of Living Organisms (New York: Academic press, 1977) pp.88,103, (emphasis added).
- 25.** Paul Taylor, The Illustrated Origins Answer Book (Eden Communications, 1995, p.84).
- 26.** Darrel Kautz, The Origin of Living Things (10025 W. Nash St, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53222, 1988), p.6 (emphasis added).
- 27.** Carl Sagan, et.al., Communication with Extraterrestrial Intelligence (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press) pp. 45-46.
- 28.** Emile Borel, Probabilities and Life (New York: Dover, 1962) Chapters 1 and 3.
- 29.** Colin Patterson, Ph.D., Unpublished transcript of keynote speech at the American Museum of Natural History, (New York City: November 1981), (emphasis added).