

Outline

- Darwinists claim that evolution is *observable*
- Classic example: Change in the size of the finch beaks (“Darwin’s finches”) on the Galapagos Islands
- The origin of the 13 species of these finches on the Galapagos Islands:
 - Darwin’s answer: Descent with modification and preservation by means of natural selection created the 13 species from a common ancestor
 - Creation answer: Based on breeding studies, these 13 species likely derive from a common “kind”
 - Creation and evolution explain the data the same way!
 - This is true of every example of “observable” evolution—the examples do not distinguish between the creation and evolution models
- Every example of “evolution in action” is “microevolution” (small changes), not macroevolution (large changes)
- Evidence for microevolution not equal to evidence for macroevolution
- Abundant evidence for microevolution exists—but all of it depicts change *within* a created “kind”
- Change from one created “kind” of creature into another created “kind” of creature has not been observed
- Macroevolution has never been observed—evolutionists admit that it is too slow to be observed
 - Hence, since macroevolution is not *observable*, it is not in the domain of science
- Macroevolution is theorized to occur by the slow and gradual accumulation of small changes (microevolution)
 - Hence, macroevolution *requires* deep geologic time
- Evidence for deep geologic time is missing:
 - Geologic layers can form quickly (over the last 30 years, the eruptions of Mt. St. Helens have laid down sediment and carved a canyon that is a 1/40th scale model of the Grand Canyon) (see *Footprints in the Ash* by Morris and Austin)
 - Radiometric dating fails to date rocks of known age correctly; therefore, it is not trustworthy on rocks of unknown age (see *The Young Earth* by Morris)
 - The fossil record looks like it is the result of a large watery catastrophe (see *The Fossil Record* by Morris and Sherwin)