The Giant Panda

The Giant Panda was unknown in the western world before 1969, when a French missionary working in China saw a Panda's skin, and realised it was from an unknown animal.

These attractive black-and-white mammals live only in eastern Tibet and southwest China. There have been concerns that they may become extinct because many of the bamboo forests they depend on for food have been cut down. There has been some success with breeding pandas in captivity, but they are still an endangered species.

Pandas eat an enormous amount of bamboo shoots, often spending 16 hours a day eating. Bamboo is tough and difficult to digest, but pandas have extra strong cheek muscles and specially flattened teeth to chew it, and an extra tough stomach lining to protect it from splinters. They also have unique front paws, with one of the wrist bones elongated into an extra “thumb” which is used to strip the bark from the bamboo shoots. This digit also has special muscles to move it.

Some evolutionists have rather arrogantly claimed that this special thumb is a poor design and that a Creator would never have made it that way. However, they can’t explain how it could have evolved (the fossils show that although pandas were smaller in the past, there has been no evolution). The panda’s extra thumb does an excellent job, and is a tool that bears all the marks of design by an intelligent Creator.

THINK FOR YOURSELF

When trying to solve a crime, good detectives carefully assemble evidence before presenting it to a court of law to obtain a verdict. Many people think that scientists work like that, too, but sadly this is often far from the case, especially when evolution is concerned. Most secular scientists have already decided to rule out anything supernatural when investigating the origin of life, and their research often reflects this.

It is easy for young people, in particular, to feel intimidated, and discouraged when trying to solve a crime, good detectives carefully assemble evidence before presenting it to a court of law to obtain a verdict. Many people think that scientists work like that, too, but sadly this is often far from the case, especially when evolution is concerned. Most secular scientists have already decided to rule out anything supernatural when investigating the origin of life, and their research often reflects this.

When trying to solve a crime, good detectives carefully assemble evidence before presenting it to a court of law to obtain a verdict. Many people think that scientists work like that, too, but sadly this is often far from the case, especially when evolution is concerned. Most secular scientists have already decided to rule out anything supernatural when investigating the origin of life, and their research often reflects this.

THINK FOR YOURSELF

When trying to solve a crime, good detectives carefully assemble evidence before presenting it to a court of law to obtain a verdict. Many people think that scientists work like that, too, but sadly this is often far from the case, especially when evolution is concerned. Most secular scientists have already decided to rule out anything supernatural when investigating the origin of life, and their research often reflects this.

THINK FOR YOURSELF

When trying to solve a crime, good detectives carefully assemble evidence before presenting it to a court of law to obtain a verdict. Many people think that scientists work like that, too, but sadly this is often far from the case, especially when evolution is concerned. Most secular scientists have already decided to rule out anything supernatural when investigating the origin of life, and their research often reflects this.
Charles Darwin visited the Galapagos Islands off South America, where he took careful notes about the Islands’ wildlife. He noticed that there were clear differences between the tortoises (left) on different islands, and suggested they had all descended from the same common ancestor. He also thought the different varieties of finches on the islands were related in the same way. He was probably right, but what he observed was natural selection at work, not evolution. The tortoises are still tortoises and the finches still finches, so Darwin was mistaken to suggest that this limited variation meant that all living organisms had evolved from a common ancestor over millions of years. Natural selection is a fact, but neither Darwin nor anyone else has ever observed one kind of animal changing into another, which is what evolution really means.

**Darwin didn’t see evolution in the Galapagos**

Some facts that evolutionists would rather you didn’t know about

Many people have been led to believe that the fossil record supports evolution. Yet ever since Darwin’s day, evolutionists have known that so-called “missing links” in the record provided evidence that plants and animals appeared abruptly. “Why… do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms?” asked Darwin, who hoped those “missing links” would eventually turn up. In his 1991 book, Beyond Natural Selection, evolutionist Robert Wesson admitted, “The gaps in the record are real, however. The absence of any record of any important branching is quite phenomenal.” Sometimes there are claims that a missing link has been found, but further research shows the claims are false, as was the case with archaeopteryx (below). Initially claimed to be a link between reptiles and birds, it is now regarded as 100% bird. The fossils suggest the creation of separate “kinds” with limited variation (see Genesis chapter one), not Darwinian evolution.

**The fossil record doesn’t support evolution**

**“Living fossils” show evolution doesn’t happen**

Evolution is supposed to be a process of ongoing change. Darwin wrote, “We may safely infer that not one living species will transmit its unaltered likeness to a distant futurity.” So it may come as a surprise to most people that thousands of living organisms have not changed at all, and are just like fossils which evolutionists claim are many millions of years old. These “living fossils” include trees, fish, reptiles, mammals, insects, birds, and so on. They have the same structure and date of origin as the fossils found in the Earth, yet have remained unchanged. Many people have been led to believe that these “living fossils” are evidence for gradual change, but these organisms are exceptions to the rule. In 1995 the Times Higher Education Supplement commissioned him to write an article critical of Darwinism, and promised readers: “Next Week: Darwinism – Richard Milton goes on the attack”. The article never appeared, because prominent evolutionists put pressure on the editor not to publish it. In 1991, science journalist Forrest Mims was asked by Scientific American to take over its most popular column, “The Amateur Scientist.” Not long afterwards, Mims met the editor, and happened to mention that he wrote articles for a number of magazines, including Christian ones. The editor then asked him: “Do you believe in Darwinism?” and Mims said he did not. Not long afterwards he was dismissed, even though he had never included any criticism of evolution in his column.

**There is no mechanism for evolution**

If all living things really evolved from a single-celled organism that lived millions of years ago, there has to be some mechanism to allow this to happen. Charles Darwin believed it was natural selection — small changes which make a plant or animal more likely to survive and have offspring. But natural selection can’t create anything new — only variations of what already exists. So evolutionists have proposed that mutations (genetic mistakes) are the mechanism. Experiments were carried out with fast-breeding fruit flies (left), by bombarding them with radiation. Although this did cause some minor changes, the offspring remained fruit flies. Mutations are usually harmful, but even though they sometimes benefit an organism, mutations that add new genetic information have never been observed, and without this evolution simply can’t happen.

**“Living fossils” show evolution doesn’t happen**

More than 700 scientists have signed the following statement: “We are sceptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life. Careful examination of the evidence for Darwinian theory should be encouraged.” The list of signatories includes member scientists from National Academies of Science in Russia, Czech Republic, Hungary, India (Hindustan), Nigeria, Poland, and the United States. Many are professors or researchers at major universities and international research institutions.

See www.dissentfromdarwin.org

People who dare to doubt Darwin in public face strong opposition, and can even lose their jobs. Richard Milton, a British science journalist, is neither a Christian nor a creationist, but after a 20-year study, he came to the conclusion that the so-called “evidences” for evolution were totally unconvincing. “One after another they crumbled as I subjected them to even routine journalistic scrutiny,” Milton (right) wrote a book, “Shattering the Myths of Darwinism”, which met with a hostile reception from evolutionists. In 1995 the Times Higher Education Supplement commissioned him to write an article critical of Darwinism, and promised readers: “Next Week: Darwinism – Richard Milton goes on the attack”. The article never appeared, because prominent evolutionists put pressure on the editor not to publish it. In 1991, science journalist Forrest Mims was asked by Scientific American to take over its most popular column, “The Amateur Scientist.” Not long afterwards, Mims met the editor, and happened to mention that he wrote articles for a number of magazines, including Christian ones. The editor then asked him: “Do you believe in Darwinian evolution?” and Mims said he did not. Not long afterwards he was dismissed, even though he had never included any criticism of evolution in his column.

In 2003 a book by former Grand Canyon guide Tom Vail went on sale at the Canyon’s Visitor Centre. “Grand Canyon: Different View” presents evidence that the Grand Canyon was formed rapidly by a catastrophic flood, rather than slowly over millions of years. Evolutionists were outraged, and a number of top scientists demanded that the book be removed. The centre subsequently removed copies of the book from the science section and placed them on a separate stand. This made the book, which is full of beautiful colour photographs, more prominent, and it became a best-seller!

There are many other examples of intolerance towards critics of evolution. Are these evolutionists so unsure of their theory that they are scared about what may happen if people learn about its many flaws? They must be challenged!

**Daring to Doubt Darwin!**