TRAITS  by Bob Zuvich

1. What Is A Trait?
A trait is a characteristic of a particular organism.

2. How Can So Many Come All At Once?
- Any organism possesses many different traits needed to perform its living functions. They all have to be in place and act together at the same time in order for the animal to live in the world.
- For instance, the leopard possesses stealth to stalk its prey, strength (which, pound for pound, makes it the strongest cat) for the capture, claws to bring the prey down, spots for camouflage, short distance speed for the pounce.
- If any one of these traits is not present or lacking in performance, the leopard will not live long at all. There is not much future in a dead leopard!
- You yourself have many needed traits, which make you unique. For instance, the acid in your stomach is strong enough to burn a hole in the carpet, yet it does not burn a hole in your stomach, because of the makeup of the stomach lining. These traits both have to be there at the same time. Without the acid, you could not digest your food. Without the protection of the cells of the stomach, you would die instantly.
- Suppose your body had no immune system, as in A.I.D.S.? Where would you be then? Could the body evolve first without the immune system? Could the immune

(Continued on page 3)

DEVOTIONAL – GOD IN THE GARDEN

“And the LORD God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there He put the man whom He had formed” (Genesis 2:8). This was the world’s first garden, and it must have been a beautiful garden, for God had planted it Himself. Every tree was “pleasant to the sight”; there was a lovely river “to water the garden” (Genesis 2:9, 10), and God was there. Then one day God was “walking in the garden” only to find that “Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden” (Genesis 3:8). Sin had entered, and Adam and Eve had to be cast out, leaving God alone in the garden (Genesis 3:23). Many years later, God entered another garden with his loved ones. “He went forth with His disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a gar-

(Continued on page 4)
Darwin's downfall: Show me a walking fish and we'll talk by Preston R. Simpson


Christians and other creationists can take heart from a new phenomenon that has appeared on bumper stickers in the Fresno area.

I am referring to the "Darwin fish" icon whose history was entertainingly summarized in a recent Associated Press article, which appeared in The Bee's Religion section Oct. 19. The bumper sticker, which shows a fish with legs and the name "Darwin" along its body, unwittingly makes two statements, which support the creationist view of origins.

Sounds fishy

Every time I see the symbol I am reminded that one of the biggest weaknesses in the evolutionist's scientific arsenal is precisely the absence of any creature, living or fossil, that shows evidence of transition from one major group to another. In short, the fish with legs is exactly the kind of creature the Darwinist must produce to validate his theory, and one of the biggest embarrassments to evolutionists is the absence of any such organisms.

Wouldn't it make more sense for the bumper-flaunting evolutionists to display a genuine transitional form that supports their case instead of pointing out to everyone driving by that the only rebuttal they can offer to creationists is an imaginary creature?

The co-opting of a religious symbol by the Darwinists also helps emphasize the point that every discerning student of the issue already knows, namely that the evolutionist mind-set is essentially a metaphysical or religious one.

The evidence for this is the fanatical zeal with which evolutionists attempt to prevent creationists from even stating their case. This point has been well addressed by Berkeley law professor Phillip Johnson in his two books, "Darwin on Trial" and "Reason in the Balance." In short, the evolutionist puts his faith in imaginary fish with legs because he is philosophically unable to cope with the alternative.

Accidentally on purpose

In contemplating the origin of the world around us, there are only two possibilities. Either everything we see came about by purely naturalistic means with no directing force, that is to say by accident; or it was created by an intelligence far beyond our understanding.

There is no other alternative. In deciding which view to take, a reasonable person can only study the data and decide for himself which model best fits his observations. Certainly the absence of any convincing transitional forms, i.e., of any fish with legs, is strong evidence for the creationist model. Indeed when any major anatomic structure or any type of organism appears in the fossil record, they appear fully formed. More recently proposed mechanisms of evolution such as punctuated equilibrium are based not on any evidence for their occurrence but solely out of a need to explain away the absence of transitions in the fossils.

In fact, the more evolutionists try to state their case, the more they reinforce my creationist interpretation of the data. Several months ago there was a symposium at Fresno City College in which Professor Arthur Shapiro, an evolutionary biologist from the University of California at Davis, interacted with Phillip Johnson. Someone in the audience asked Professor Shapiro what he thought was the best evidence for evolution. His reply was what he referred to as the "nesting phenomenon" in nature. By this, he explained, he meant that humans have certain characteristics that make them unique, such as the ability to carry on discussion of this nature. We share with the great apes many but not all characteristics. In turn, humans and great apes share a lesser number of characteristics with other mammals, and so on. That, said the evolutionary biologist, is the best evidence for evolution.

The Chevy theory

As I drove away from the meeting, I pondered the fact that my Chevrolet Lumina has certain unique features that make it recognizable as a particular make and model. It shares with the Ford Taurus in the next lane a number of characteristics including but not limited to four wheels, a piston-driven engine, and a steering mechanism.

The Chevrolet and the Ford share with a motorcycle, wheels, a piston-driven engine and a steering mechanism. The automobiles and the motorcycle share with my child's wagon a steering mechanism and wheels. Yet not even a child would claim that a wagon transformed by a series of accidental changes into a Chevrolet. Clearly both were the separate products of intelligent design.

If the nesting phenomenon and imaginary walking fish are the best evidence the evolutionists can produce for their case, creationism is on sound intellectual footing indeed.

GRAPHIC: Preston R. Simpson, 43, is a pathologist who lives in Fresno.
system evolve without a body to dwell in?

- What about the clotting of the blood? Blood without the clotting factor is useful only up to the point of the first (and last) injury- an inevitability in nature.
- How about life as a person before developing hemoglobin to carry oxygen to the cells?
- Every organism has many traits, all working together to make up the package. Each package is and has to be complete, fully formed, fully functional, always.

3. AaBb? Say What?
The genetic code is programmed precisely enough that you can be assured of traits when breeding. The process is not nearly random enough to get whatever you want. By this I mean that you will always get the same organism, albeit a variety.

- When you breed two dogs, no matter what varieties, you will always get another type of dog, or a mix of the two types, plus any mixture from generations past. You will not get an elephant, a rodent, a cat or anything other than a canine.
- If you could get anything else, no woman would ever want to get pregnant, for fear of some strange creature being born! Genetics is a very precise technology.

- The "father" of genetics is considered to be Gregor Mendel. He first experimented with pea plants. He wrote the two Mendelian Laws, which the Evolutionists have consistently tried to fit into their theory, but to no avail.
- He proved the stability of the basic "kinds", this fact seemingly overlooked by the Evolutionist.

He found when crossing tall and dwarf plants over several generations, that the split with the offspring was not even, and there were what he called DOMINANT and RECESSIVE genes. The dominant (tall) outnumbered the recessive (dwarf) three to one. No matter what he did, this was the result. The first time he cross-pollinated them, he got all tall. He tried crossing the other way and got the same result. He got no plants of intermediate size. The second generation of the tall plants was self-pollinated, with both tall and short progeny being the result. This was where his 3:1 ratio came in. 3 tall: 1 short.

Darwin Day
Monday, April 10
2:00 PM Technical Lecture:
“Evolutionary ethics: a phoenix arisen?”
Dr. Michael Ruse, Ph.D.
University of Guelph
Auditorium, Science and Engineering Bldg., UT

7:00 PM
Public Lecture:
“Darwinism and atheism: a marriage made in heaven?”
Dr. Michael Ruse
Shiloh Room, UT University Center
This is the last Darwin Day event of this semester.

The Revolution Against Evolution

We are going to be taking a tour to the Smoky Mountains this summer to investigate the out-of-order strata there and videotape it for our TV show. We will combine this with a tour of Answers in Genesis and a planning session for the museum they are going to build next year. Tentatively this tour will be the third week of July. If any of you would like to participate, be interviewed on TV, or just hang out with us for fellowship, we would welcome your company. The Smoky Mountains trip will be from July 15 to 19, and the 20th and 21st will be spent at AiG. Let me know if any of you would like to join us.

Doug Sharp
The Revolution Against Evolution
<http://www.rae.org>
<revev@voyager.net>
Answers in Genesis seminar

Coming in May: Answers in Genesis seminar at Grace Baptist Church, Oak Ridge Hwy. May 22-24. The speakers will be Ken Ham, Buddy Davis and David Menton. Their will be a free breakfast, Christian Leaders Meeting for all Pastors, April 12th, to inform them of the need for this seminar. For more information, please call (865) 692-3865 or Kent (865) 376-5186.
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den, into the which He entered, and His disciples” (John 18:1). There in the garden of Gethsemane, the disciples soon fell asleep, once again leaving Him alone in the garden, “withdrawn from them about a stone’s cast” (Luke 22:41). There He “offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears” (Hebrews 5:7) as He faced the death that He had pronounced on His very first loved ones long before in that first garden. There was yet another garden where He must be alone. “In the place where He was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus . . .” (John 19:41,42). God had walked alone in the first garden, seeking His own. He knelt alone in the second garden, praying for His own. He was buried alone in the third garden, dying for His own. Therefore, in the new “paradise of God” where the pure river flows and the tree of life grows eternally, “His servants shall serve Him” and reign with Him “for ever and ever” (Revelation 2:7; 22:1,2,3,5). Henry M Morris