What You Can Never Know Based on a Fossil

Don’t “Throw the Baby Out With the Bathwater”: Not All Theories Are Bad!

America’s Real Problem

Did the Bible Writers Borrow Mythology?

California Bans Counseling Homosexuals
JERRY Coyne’s book, Why Evolution Is True, purports to be a compendium of a vast amount of evidence that proves evolution to be a “fact.” The book does not accomplish its purpose, but it does offer some clear insight into the flaws that riddle the theory of Darwinian evolution and the thinking of those who support it. One of the easiest errors to spot is the way that evolutionists “date” animals in the fossil record.

Although the millions-of-years time frame is inherently flawed (see DeYoung, 2005), I will use it in this article just as the evolutionists use it. I will do so to show that, even using their own thinking, their conclusions are illogical. First, evolutionists remind us of the fact that the record of the rocks and the fossils it contains are a mere scintilla of the animals that actually lived on the planet. Since the chances of a particular organism actually fossilizing are so low, Coyne concluded: “[W]e can estimate that we have fossil evidence of only 0.1 percent to 1 percent of all species—hardly a good sample of the history of life!” (2009, p. 22). Evolutionists often insert this kind of statement into their writings to explain away the billions of “transitional” fossils that should fill the record if Darwinian evolution were true. Yet, in spite of this admission, evolutionists such as Coyne treat the fossil record as a perfect representation of life when it is in their “best interests.” Then they proceed to use it to tell us when certain organisms arose or disappeared from our planet.

For instance, Coyne stated: “Until about 390 million years ago, the only vertebrates were fish. But, 30 million years later, we find creatures that are clearly tetrapods: four-footed vertebrates that walked on land” (p. 36). Coyne is arguing, based on when certain fossils “appear” in the record, that no tetrapods existed “390 million years ago.” The fossil record, however, could only be used to date the “appearance” of an organism if it were perfectly complete. Could it be that tetrapods walked much earlier but did not fossilize? Certainly. In fact, we discover on a regular basis that when a fossil “appears” or “disappears” in the fossil record tells us absolutely nothing about when it actually lived.

“Take the coelacanth fish as an example. Supposedly, this lobe-finned fish “disappeared” from the Earth about 70 million years ago. This thinking was based on the idea that the fish did not appear in the fossil record that “dated” from 70 million years ago to the present. In 1938, however, fisherman found a living coelacanth (Lyons, 2007). Coyne stated: ‘Groups like whales and humans have evolved rapidly, while others, like the coelacanth ‘living fossils,’ look almost identical to ancestors that lived hundreds of millions of years ago’” (2009, p. 4, emp. added). So, we have a fish that lived “70 million” years ago, is still alive today, and left no trace in the fossil record for “70 million” years. Thinking critically about this, could it also be that these fish lived “70 million” years before they appear in the fossil record? Absolutely.

In his discussion of lobe-finned fish and land living vertebrates, Coyne wrote: “If there were lobe-finned fishes but no terrestrial vertebrates 390 million years ago, and clearly terrestrial vertebrates 360 million years ago, where would you expect to find transitional forms? Somewhere in between” (p. 37). But wait, why does Coyne suppose that no terrestrial vertebrates 390 million years ago? Because we have not found any in the fossil record. But that means nothing due to the limitations of the fossil record, which Coyne and host are quick to point out. This leads to the lack of transitional fossils. Could it be that terrestrial vertebrates “70 million” years before we find them in the fossil record? Definitely. “When” we see an organism in the fossil records gives us zero understanding of when it actually appeared or disappeared from the Earth.

Again, Coyne suggests: “Humans are newcomers to the scene—our lineage branches off from that of other primates only about 7 million years ago, the merest sliver of evolutionary time” (p. 28). Yet in order to remain consistent, Coyne and others can tell us nothing about our lineage “branching off” based on the lack of human fossils in certain layers. In fact, from their admission about the incomplete fossil record, could we surmise that humans might have lived “millions of years” before we find them preserved in the record?

This flaw in evolutionary thinking manifests itself remarkably well in Coyne’s assessment of the Laotoli footprints. In 1976, Andrew Hill found an 80-foot trail of footprints that were “virtually identical to those made by modern humans walking on soft ground” (Coyne, 2009, p. 202). Even though these footprints matched those of modern humans, they were attributed to Australopithecus afarensis. Coyne explained: “the trail dates from around 3.6 million years ago, a time when A. afarensis was the only hominin on record” (p. 202, emp. added). If the fossil record is so sketchy that lobe-finned fish can squeak by unnoticed for 70 million years, could it be that “modern humans” were around three or four “million years” earlier than their initial appearance in the fossil record?

Yes, when we look at the fossil record, it makes sense: (1) that modern humans lived “before” their first appearance in the fossil record, or (2) that a chimp-like creature such as A. afarensis made an 80-foot trail of footprints that is virtually identical to those made by modern humans walking on soft ground? Since we know that a creature’s appearance in the fossil record can tell us nothing about the time a creature appeared on Earth, the reasonable conclusion is that “modern” humans were around before evolutionists assert: they were—and therefore are not relatives of the Australopithecines. In February 2006, the media was awash with news about Castorocauda lutrasimilis, a beaver-like animal that supposedly lived 164 million years ago. They could have been on the Earth “70 million” years ago, is still alive today, and left no trace in the fossil record. Five-foot-long footprints of these animals were found in the United States (Coyne, 2009, p. 206). The fossil record “appears” to tell us that whales don’t “show up” in the fossil record until 30 million years later. But that means absolutely nothing about when they lived. They could have been on the Earth “70 million years” before they show up in the fossil record (using their flawed millions-of-years scheme). For Coyne to state that he knows when they arose on Earth based on when they are found in the fossil record is nothing short of deception, based on his own acknowledgement that the fossil record is incomplete.

We see, then, that evolutionists cannot tell us one thing about when a creature arose on Earth—based on its fossils. Neither can evolutionists tell us one thing about when a creature went extinct—based on fossils. A fossil can never tell you a beginning “date” or extinction “date.” And yet the most educated and applauded evolutionists in the world, such as Jerry Coyne, persist in falsifying their information by stating that they know when certain creature arose or disappeared—based on the fossil record. For Coyne to assert: “all the evidence—both old and new—leads ineluctably to the conclusion that evolution is a fact,” but then use such irrational “evidence” as proof of evolution, shows a glaring misconception in his idea of what a “fact” is.
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Indeed, myth was once seen as pure fiction with other literature and claimed it to be real. We realize that this may not necessarily be the case. The Bible and ancient myth are so different from one another that any allegations of wholesale borrowing on the part of the biblical authors must be rejected by those who have the ancient evidence with care.
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CONCLUSION
M ythology is much more than exciting stories filled with fantastic monsters, magic, and imaginative details. It is a way of thinking—a world view. Carolyne Larrington suggests that the Bible and myth in this context with myths it make clear that the Bible and ancient Near Eastern mythology are not merely different from one another—they are radically so. Even a cursory reading is enough to give most people a feeling that the Bible and myth are not quite different, even if they immediately may not be able to put their finger on why. Thanks to the discovery and study of ancient texts, the differences are easy to detect. The Bible, unlike Near East- ern mythology, has an air of dispensation- ary objectivity that puts it in a category by itself. The Bible and ancient mythology are so different from one another that any allegations of wholesale borrowing on the part of the biblical authors must be rejected by those who have the ancient evidence with care.
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Did the Founders of America believe that the survival of the Republic depends on America’s acknowledgement of Jesus Christ? Most educators and political theorists of our day answer with a resounding “no!” Nevertheless, the evidence is decisive. In their official pronouncements, the Continental Congress—quintessential Founders—forthrightly requested that God establish American independence on Christianity and Christian morality. They affirmed that Christianity is the foundation of national happiness as well as national prosperity. You must see the evidence with your own eyes.

For more information, please call (800) 234-8558.
America’s REAL Problem

Dave Miller, Ph.D.

V. Unprecedented Crime Rates

The average citizen of today, unlike the average citizen 60 years ago, lives daily with necessary security measures—from locking doors to setting alarms. Drive by shootings, burglaries, shoplifting, muggings, rape, and a host of other criminal infringements on peaceful existence are rampant and seemingly uncontrollable. Police departments are full to overflowing with continual efforts to provide more prisons and more law enforcement personnel.

Yes, all these issues are critically serious. But according to the Founders of the American Republic, they are only symptoms. And they are fully to be expected when a sizable percentage of the nation’s population has lost sight of the single, quintessential, most pressing concern. This concern was stated emphatically over and over again by the Founders at the very beginning of the nation throughout the tumultuous years of the Revolutionary War. Issuing 15 supplication proclamations to the nation, the Founders reiterated their belief that their hope of survival and establishing the Republic depended on citizen attention to the God of the Bible, the Christ of the New Testament, and the Christian principles taught in the Scriptures. This is one example of this forthright affirmation, issued by the Continental Congress in November of 1777:

FORASMUCH as it is the indispensable Duty of all Men to adore the superintending Providence of Almighty God... It is therefore recommended to the Legislative or executive Powers of these United States to set apart Thursday, the eighteenth Day of December next, for SOLEMN THANKSGIVING and PRAISE... That at one Time and with one Voice, the good People may express the grateful Feelings of their hearts, and communicate them in the Service of their Divine Benefactor, and that, together with their sincere Acknowledgments and Offerings, they may join the penitent Confession of their manifold Sins, whereby they have forsaken every good... and their humble and earnest Supplication that it may please GOD through the Merits of JESUS CHRIST, mercifully to forgive and blot out all Remembrance; To take Schools and Seminaries of Education, so necessary for cultivating the Principles of true Liberty, Virtue and Piety, under his nurturing Hand... and to promote the enlargement of that Kingdom, which consisteth in Righteousness, Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost [Romans 14:17—16:27]... God save the United-States. For more information, see America remains unbelievably energy dependent on foreign nations and hot oil sources.

Jeff Miller, Ph.D.

P ERhaps you have fallen victim to the fallacy alluded to by the title of this article. Creationists spend quite a bit of time countering the claims being made by those who believe in the Theory of Evolution and the Big Bang Theory—and rightly so. However, in our haste to show the flaws in evolutionary theories that contradict the laws of science, the impression might be left that we believe scientific theories are somehow unimportant, or are to be rejected and even scoffed at simply because they are theories. Let’s set the record straight. According to the McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms, scientific theory is an “attempt to explain a certain class of phenomena by deducing from other known principles (p. 2129).” Scientific theories are crucial and very beneficial to the work of a scientist. They are a starting point to try and explain and make sense of scientific evidence that has been gathered. Much of what we know to be true in science started out as theory that was later verified or proved and re-categorized. As a child, I often lay out “theories” as to what message might be conveyed in a certain difficult text. For example, in Matthew 20:39-44 and Mark 10:46-52, the Bible records an incident where Jesus is said to have been leaving Jericho, and seemingly the same incident is recorded in Luke—by deleting from other known principles. This concern was stated emphatically over and over again by the Founders at the very beginning of the nation throughout the tumultuous years of the Revolutionary War. Issuing 15 supplication proclamations to the nation, the Founders reiterated their belief that their hope of survival and establishing the Republic depended on citizen attention to the God of the Bible, the Christ of the New Testament, and the Christian principles taught in the Scriptures. This is one example of this forthright affirmation, issued by the Continental Congress in November of 1777:

FORASMUCH as it is the indispensable Duty of all Men to adore the superintending Providence of Almighty God... It is therefore recommended to the Legislative or executive Powers of these United States to set apart Thursday, the eighteenth Day of December next, for SOLEMN THANKSGIVING and PRAISE... That at one Time and with one Voice, the good People may express the grateful Feelings of their hearts, and communicate them in the Service of their Divine Benefactor, and that, together with their sincere Acknowledgments and Offerings, they may join the penitent Confession of their manifold Sins, whereby they have forsaken every good... and their humble and earnest Supplication that it may please GOD through the Merits of JESUS CHRIST, mercifully to forgive and blot out all Remembrance; To take Schools and Seminaries of Education, so necessary for cultivating the Principles of true Liberty, Virtue and Piety, under his nurturing Hand... and to promote the enlargement of that Kingdom, which consisteth in Righteousness, Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost [Romans 14:17—16:27]... God save the United-States.
The following article was written by A.P. staff writer Matt Vega, who received his doctorate from Yale University Law School.

A new California law bars licensed counselors and therapists from helping anyone under 18 to change their sexual orientation. The law states: “Under no circumstances should a child under 18 be pressured or coerced into undergoing sex-change therapy.”

Vega, who received his doctorate from Helping Attraction Issues Young Patients, targets so-called “reparative,” “conversion therapy” techniques that might harm the mental health of the child, the Supreme Court in a similar case involving the power of a parent to institutionalize a child, Parham v. J.R. Parham, rejected the “notion that government may not intrude itself upon the family orbit of a child’s body under control (1 Thessalonians 4:4; 1 Corinthians 10:27).”

In such cases, the California law would intrude on the freedom of religion of both the counselor and the child, according to the Supreme Court. In this case, the California law would encroach upon both the free exercise of religion and the free speech of the child, a court could feasibly uphold the statute under a “least restrictive means” test.

Californians have rejected similar proposals in the past. In 2012, the Michigan House passed H.R. 5040, the “Julea Ward Freedom of Conscience Act,” which would allow a religious counselor to refuse to provide counseling or therapy or to challenge the intent and training of a Christian counselor. The bill would go a long way towards creating a safe harbor in higher education for future Christian counselors. While the bill faces a great deal of political opposition and may never be signed into law, it does illustrate how the law can be used to advance rather than attack religious freedom in this country.

Regardless of the outcome of either S.B. 1172 or H.R. 5040, Christian counselors and parents must continue to try to find ways to help young people struggling with same sex attraction issues. All of us have a moral and civic obligation to support every possibility of helping the young who struggle with sexual confusion and the problem of sexual orientation change. The current law likely violates the First Amendment and may never be signed into law, it does not target a religious entity.
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The cultural conditions of our country are such that people are hungering to return to our roots—those values that have made America the envy of the world. Apologetics Press has been responding to this widespread interest with a variety of resources, including the production of *The Silencing of God: The Dismantling of America’s Christian Heritage* book and DVD. These items have been well received across the nation.

Three years ago, we released a sequel book—*Christ & the Continental Congress*—which answers the question: Did the Founders believe that the survival of the Republic depends on America’s acknowledgement of Jesus Christ? Revisionist historians, who now firmly dominate academia, answer that question with a resounding—“absolutely not”! But the truth is that the Founders stated over and over their deep conviction that, indeed, acknowledgement of God and the Christian religion are integral to the survival of the nation. This volume, like its predecessor, is a coffee table-style volume filled with stunning pictures and a wealth of information documenting America’s close connections to Christianity from the very beginning of the Republic.

We also published a Proclamation Packet that contains the valuable documents described in the book.

Now we are pleased to announce the completion of a DVD that is based on *Christ and the Continental Congress*. This seminar treats the audience to the fascinating, spiritually enriching, actual historical proclamations issued to the entire nation during the tumultuous years of the Revolutionary War. The documents prove conclusively that the Continental Congress openly acknowledged Jesus Christ as “our gracious Redeemer,” and advocated the exclusivity and priority of Christianity; they affirmed the critical importance of the Bible to the people, and beseeched God to spread Christianity throughout the Earth; they even requested that God establish American Independence on Christianity and Christian morality, while urging Americans to keep all of God’s laws. They enjoined on Americans the practice of Christianity as the foundation of national happiness, and credited God with America’s military success and national prosperity. You must see for yourself the evidence that establishes these facts. Also included in this live presentation are sessions on whether the Founders were deists and slave owners.

The DVD contains eight 30 minute sessions that are suitable for church and school classrooms, civic and school board meetings, and other venues. Special prices are available when purchased in quantities of 20 or more, and a discount applies when coupled with the book and Proclamation Packet.

Dave Miller