compiled by Bill Crews

The kind you never hear -- educators and the media don't want you to!

Professor Theodosius Dobzhansky, a leading spokesman for evolution, has said that "it would be wrong to say that the biological theory of evolution has gained universal acceptance among biologists or even among geneticists." Dobzhansky, Theodosius, *Science*, Nov. 29, 1963, page 366.

Dr. Austin Clark, noted biologist of the Smithsonian Institute, stated: "There is no evidence which would show man developing step by step from lower forms of life. There is nothing to show that man was in any way connected with monkeys ... He appeared suddenly and in substantially the same form as he is today ... There are no such things as missing links." "So far as concerns the major groups of animals, the creationists appear to have the best argument. There is not the slightest evidence that anyone of the major groups arose from any other. Each is a special animal complex, related more or less closely to all the rest, and appearing therefore as a special and distinct creation." Meldau, Fred John, Witness Against Evolution, Christian Victory Publishing Co., Denver, Colo., 1953, pages 39, 40, 73.

Professor G.A. Kerkut, an evolutionist, states, "There is the theory that all living forms in the world have arisen from a single source which itself came from an inorganic form. This theory can be called the 'GENERAL THEORY OF EVOLUTION,' and the evidence that supports it is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it as anything more than a working hypothesis." Kerkut, G. A., Implications of Evolution, Pergamon Press, Elmsford, N. Y., 1961 (In this volume an evolutionist candidly examined the so-called evidences for "general evolution" and quite honestly presented the problems that confront it. Now, fifty years later, they still confront it. -- **BC**)

John T. Bonner, who reviewed Kerkut's book for *Science*, Vol. 133, March 17, 1961, page 753, wrote: "This is a book with a disturbing message; it points to some unseemly cracks in the foundation. One is disturbed because what is said gives us the uneasy feeling that we knew it for a long time deep down but were never willing to admit this even to ourselves. It is another one of those cold and uncompromising situations where the naked truth is simply that we have no reliable evidence as to the evolutionary sequence of invertebrate phyla. We do not know what group arose from what other group or whether, for instance, the transition from Protozoa occurred once, or twice, or many times ...

"We have been telling our students for years not to accept any statement on its face value but to examine the evidence, and, therefore, it is rather a shock to discover that we have failed to follow our own sound advice."

Professor Albert Fleishman, professor of Comparative Anatomy at Erlangen University, said, "The theory of evolution suffers from grave defects, which are becoming more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge, nor does it suffice for our theoretical grasp of the facts. The Darwinian theory of descent has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of nature. It is not the result of scientific research, but purely the product of imagination." Fleishman, Albert, Victoria Institute, Vol. 65, pages 184, 195.

Sir William Dawson, Canada's great geologist, said of evolution: "It is one of the strangest phenomena of humanity; it is utterly destitute of proof." Dawson, Sir William, Story of Earth and Man, page 317.

(ALL QUOTATIONS TAKEN FROM SCOPES II, THE GREAT DEBATE BY LA. STATE SENATOR BILL KEITH)