

Seminar 4 - Lies in the Textbook

by Kent Hovind

Dr. Kent Hovind exposes lies in science textbooks and promotes the importance of accuracy in education, highlighting the differences between creation science and evolution.

Duration: 59:47

Scripture: Genesis 1:24

Topics: "Creation Science", "Evolution Debate"

Description

This sermon by Dr. Hovind addresses the fallacies in science textbooks, particularly focusing on the lies presented in textbooks regarding evolution, the age of the Earth, and the origin of species. He emphasizes that mutations do not create new information, natural selection does not lead to evolution, and the examples used to support evolution like the peppered moth have been proven wrong. Dr. Hovind challenges the idea that survival of the fittest explains the arrival of the fittest and uses humorous anecdotes to illustrate the flaws in evolutionary theory.

Transcript

Dr. Hovind taught science for 15 years, then he got his PhD in education. He's always had a love for teaching, but one thing that he's discovered is that in many of the science textbooks across America today, there are some fallacies, some false information being presented. Why is this information in the science textbooks? What are they trying to prove? Hi, my name is Eric, and in this seminar called Lies in the Textbooks, you're going to find out some of those lies that are being presented and what you can do about it.

Welcome to our seminar tape number four on lies in the textbooks. I taught high school science for 15 years, and now I travel and do seminars on creation, evolution, and dinosaurs. And I'm concerned that what kids are being taught in our classroom is simply not true.

There are some lies in our textbooks. In our first few seminar tapes, we talk about a variety of lies in the books. Now, I like science.

I'm not against science. I collect science textbooks. I have actually hundreds of them, and I really, really like science.

But I'm concerned there are some things in these books that just simply are not true. Somebody wants your kids to believe a particular theory, which is understandable. Everybody tries to convert others to their belief system.

I'm going to try to convert you to my belief system. That's perfectly fine for everybody to try to do that. However, you don't want to use lies to accomplish that.

So I'm going to tell you about some of the lies in the textbooks. In my first three videos, on number one, we talk about how students are being lied to about the Big Bang. It's a big dud.

It didn't happen. They're being lied to about the age of the Earth. The Earth is not billions of years old.

They're being lied to about the caveman. There's never been a caveman, unless you mean Osama bin Laden. They're being lied to about the dinosaurs.

Dinosaurs did not live millions of years ago. Both dinosaurs lived with Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. And on this tape, we're going to talk about at least 25 or 26, maybe even 30 if we get time, more lies that students have to face in their textbooks.

And then on tape number five, we're going to tell you what you can do about it, and some of the dangers of this philosophy. More lies in the textbooks. Let me set the record straight right up front.

I am not trying to get evolution out of the schools. I'm not trying to get creation into the schools. I just want the lies out of the textbooks.

I think we'll find if we take the lies out of the books, there's nothing left to support the evolution theory. Okay, well that's their problem. If all you have to support your theory are things that have been proven wrong years ago, I think it's about time you get into the theory.

Is there anybody here who thinks teachers or textbooks should be allowed to deliberately lie to students for any reason? Wisconsin has a law that requires textbooks to be accurate. So does Alabama. Textbooks shall be adequate and current.

Texas says instructional material shall be factual. Florida has a law that says instructional material shall be accurate. California says textbooks shall be factually accurate.

Minnesota says a teacher shall not deliberately suppress or distort subject matter. The problem is absolutely none of those states, including your state, enforce the law as it's written on the book. The books are simply not accurate.

Here's a publishable textbook from 1908. They told the kids in 1908, God created the heavens and the earth in six days. And all that was made was very good.

Prayer is a duty, but it's vain to pray without a sincere desire of heart. God governs the world in infinite wisdom. Publishable textbook.

Here's a publishable textbook from the year 2000. Evolution is a fact, not theory. Birds arose from non-birds and humans from non-humans.

No person who pretends to have any understanding of the natural world can deny these facts. I think things have changed a little bit, folks. By the way, when he says evolution is a fact, this is called a mantra.

They think if you say it long enough and loud enough, everybody will start believing it. It's not a fact. Evolution's a religion.

This textbook says, boys and girls, even though most scientists and religious leaders no longer see evolution and religion as in conflict, a minority of Christian fundamentalists remain opposed to evolutionary biology. This is called slanted journalism. A minority of fundamentalists, they're trying to marginalize those, even though it's the majority of the population of America that believes this, not the minority.

Look what it says over here. It says, creation science states that all species were created by God roughly 10,000 years ago, and that they have not evolved since. By the way, let me stop right there.

That is not what creation science teaches. Creation science teaches that all the kinds of animals were created roughly 10,000 years ago, and the only evolution has been variations within those kinds. So they're setting up a straw man here so they can knock it down and think they won the argument.

Keep reading here. As scientific issues, we know these assertions are false. Over here they tell the kids, if we prevent our secondary school students from learning what science has to offer, let me stop right there, I'm not trying to prevent students from learning what science has to offer.

I love science. I'm trying to prevent students from being lied to, but then show us what does science have to offer, things that we can observe and test and demonstrate. Evolution is not part of science.

That's the problem. Watch this now. If we prevent our students from learning what science has to offer, we run the risk that they will not be able to compete effectively in college classrooms or in today's global economy.

This is the evolutionist altar call right there. The world will be destroyed if we don't preach evolution. Oh, the sky is falling.

We've got to get more evolution or we're all going to die. They somehow think that their religion is important in our schools, and it's not. This textbook has over 100 pages where evolution theory is presented to the kids.

Not one mention of creation. If they do mention creation, it's always in ridicule like the one I showed you a minute ago. A minority of Christian fundamentalists.

Folks, things have changed in our textbooks. Now, this chart shows how the atheists rate the United States based on how well they teach evolution. If your state is red, they think you're doing a lousy job of teaching evolution.

Yay, go Wisconsin. All right. The green states are doing a very good or excellent job of teaching evolution.

They ought to be ashamed of themselves. Is there anybody here that thinks teachers or textbooks should be allowed to use outdated or false information just to get students to believe a particular theory? No? Okay. Anybody here that thinks teachers that lie, deliberately lie, should be fired? Okay, fair enough.

Anybody here that thinks textbooks with lies should be banned or the lies torn out? Sure. Okay, good. Just so we're all on the same page here.

Now, it's always amazed me how two people can look at the same thing and come to opposite conclusions of what they are seeing. Two people can look at Grand Canyon. One of them believes in evolution.

He looks at the canyon and says, Wow, look what the Colorado River did for millions and millions of years. The Bible-believing Christian stands there, looks at the same canyon, and says, Wow, look what the flood did in about 30 minutes. Now, how was that canyon formed anyway? This textbook says, Over millions of years, the Colorado River has carved the Grand Canyon from solid rock.

Now, just slow down a minute. Kids, it is a fact Grand Canyon exists. How many have been to Grand Canyon? I taught earth science, studied Grand Canyon avidly.

I like Grand Canyon. Beautiful place. Big hole in the ground.

Now, there are two interpretations of how it got there. The evolutionists have an interpretation, and so do the creationists. The evolutionist is going to tell you, That canyon formed slowly by a little bit of water and lots of time.

Millions of years. The creationist is going to tell you, Oh, the canyon formed quickly by lots of water and a little bit of time. The guys who believe in evolution are continually trying to erase the line between their interpretation and the fact column, and they want you to somehow think that what they interpret as evidence is now part of the fact.

You've got to really watch them on this. They're pretty slick. This textbook author does it just blatantly.

He says, The Colorado River has cut through layer upon layer of rock over millions of years. Now, just hold on a minute. I was in a debate one time, and this atheist said, Hovind, you're so dumb.

Don't you know it took millions of years to make Grand Canyon? I said, Well, sir, I taught earth science for years. I really enjoy studying Grand Canyon. I said, Did you know if you built a dam across Grand Canyon, that would take a lot of dirt, by the way, but if you did, a huge lake would fill in behind it.

Did you know some of the water from Montana drains through the Grand Canyon? It's a huge drainage area. I said, Sir, did you know in between these two red lines is what we call the snow line. There's a ridge right there.

The Grand Canyon enters at the far right over here. The elevation of the river at that point is 2,800 feet above sea level. The river flows downhill for 270 miles and comes out the other side.

And in between, while the river's flowing down, the ground is rising up and then slowly coming back down. It is so wide, 270 miles, that you don't notice it until you get way back and look at it from a satellite. But if you look at it in its cross section, this schematic shows the difference here.

The river enters right here and flows downhill and comes out the other side. It's actually going through a giant ridge, 270 miles long. At the highest point of the ridge, the river's at about 1,800 foot elevation, so it's nearly a one-mile drop down into the canyon.

Really big hole in the ground. I said, Sir, there are a couple things you ought to consider about Grand Canyon. I said, Did you know the top of Grand Canyon is higher than the bottom? He said, Yes.

I said, Sir, did you know the river runs through the bottom? He said, Yes. I said, Sir, did you know the top is higher than where the river enters the canyon, by over 4,000 feet? I said, Sir, did you know that rivers don't flow uphill? I said, Sir, did you know there is no delta? Nobody knows where the mud is that got washed out of there, but it's probably out in the Pacific Ocean. They can't find the delta for Grand Canyon.

There is no possible way that river made that canyon. Grand Canyon is quite obviously a washed out spillway. There used to be two big lakes, Grand Lake and Hopi Lake, and they got too full one day, who knows when.

I suspect shortly after the flood, maybe a few hundred years later, the ice caps melted or something, and the lakes got too full, and the water went over the top. While the ground was still relatively soft, within the first few hundred years, washed out that canyon in a hurry. There are still beaches where the lakes used to be.

They call them Grand Lake and Hopi Lake. The lake is long gone, but you can still see the beach line, where the lake used to be. Grand Canyon is a washed out spillway, folks.

The water got too deep, went over the top, and washed out that whole region in a real big hurry. So when they tell you it took millions of years, they're lying to you. It did not.

It's not geophysically possible. If you look at the way most rivers come together, almost all rivers join at what are called acute angles, less than 90 degrees. You can look at any map of the world, nearly all rivers come together and keep going the same general direction.

Well, if you look at Grand Canyon, the rivers on the lower left side join at acute angles, normal river pattern. If you look at the right side, the rivers go backwards and run into the channel and turn around and come back the other way. This is evidence of a big lake that is draining.

Any farmer that's ever built a dam to hold water to feed his cows or something, or water his cows, will tell you, once the water goes over the top of the dam, it can wash it out in a hurry. And it doesn't wash away the whole dam, it washes one slot, wherever the water finds the weakest point. So the water's running backwards off the dam to hit the lower channel, turn around and come back the other way.

Grand Canyon was not formed by the Colorado River, folks. Grand Canyon was formed by a flood. A lot of water with a little bit of time.

Are there any farmers or veterinarians in the crowd that might know what this machine is? Anybody know what that is? What is that, sir? That's a calf puller. That's a what? A calf puller. Once in a while, a cow has a hard time having that baby calf, and so to get the calf puller out, tie the cable around the calf's leg and jack the calf out of the cow.

You get a few tons of pressure on there, that calf comes right out, no problem. One day this farmer was out pulling a calf. It was a breech birth, the back feet are coming out first.

Not good, but hey, it happens once in a while. And so the farmer had the calf puller out there, he's pulling the calf out of the cow, and a city fellow stopped his car to see what on earth is going on. And the farmer

said, Hey, you ever seen anything like this before? The city fellow said, No, sir, I've never seen nothing like this.

The farmer said, You got any questions? The city fellow said, Yes, sir, I have one question. The farmer said, Let's hear it. The city fellow said, How fast do you figure that calf was going when it ran into that cow? No, no, no, no.

We're not separating the wreck here, fellas. You know, two people can look at the same thing, and one of them gets the wrong idea of what he's looking at. The Bible warned us that was going to happen.

2 Peter chapter 3, Knowing this first, there shall come in the last days scoffers. Did you know there are people that scoff at the Bible? I deal with them on a regular basis. I attract them like a lightning rod.

And the Bible says they're going to walk after their own lust. See, the reason some people don't like the Bible is because of their lust, not because of their science. They don't like that book because it chaps their hide.

I tell them, You better get some Vaseline, man. You're going to need it because you're going to be judged by that book whether you like it or not. Well, the scoffers in the last days, the Bible says they're going to say, Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were.

Boy, that's an important phrase. Peter told us in the last days the scoffers would say, The way things are happening now is the way they've always been happening. Long, slow, gradual processes.

Hmm. Uniformitarianism. The Bible says the scoffers will be willingly ignorant.

Willingly ignorant. In the Greek, that means dumb on purpose. They're willingly ignorant of how God made the heavens and the earth.

We cover that on video number two. That's why it's heavens, plural. And how the earth was overflowed with water and perished.

The scoffers are willingly ignorant of the flood. We'll cover lots more about the flood on videotape number six. What caused the flood anyway and what damage it did to this planet.

Well, one of the scoffers in the last days was a guy named James Hutton. James Hutton lived in the late 1700s and he wrote a book and said, The earth is much older than everybody thinks. Now, you need to understand, during James Hutton's lifetime, most people believed the Bible and most people thought the earth was about 6,000 years old.

But this was also a time of many revolutions. We had the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Spanish, the Polish, the German. Everybody's getting rid of the king and establishing democracies.

Well, whether that's good or bad is another subject, but the fact is the Bible says to honor the king. And some people thought the Bible was an obstacle to their political objectives. And so they wanted to discredit the Bible.

So back when everybody thought the earth was a few thousand years old, James Hutton came along and said it's millions of years old. He was one of the first guys in the Western world to come across this idea

and say, oh, wow, maybe the earth is real old. James Hutton developed an idea called uniformitarianism.

The present is the key to the past. In other words, the way things are happening now is the way they've always been happening, just like Peter prophesied these guys would come. Well, I think the Bible is the only perfect key to the past, but that's another story.

The fact is James Hutton's book that he wrote had a very strong influence on a young lawyer from Scotland. The lawyer's name was Charles Lyell. Charles Lyell, the lawyer, hated the Bible.

Somebody calculated one time that if all the lawyers in the world were laid end to end around the equator, we would all be better off. In 1830, Charles Lyell wrote this book right here, Principles of Geology. Here on this book, you can see his hatred for the Bible kind of ooze off every page.

This guy really did not like the Bible. He kept referring to it as ancient doctrines. You know, you're outdated if you believe the Bible.

He talked about those people who have religious prejudices because they believe the Bible. He said, the men of superior talent who thought for themselves and were not blinded by authority. I mean, you can just skim through it for yourself and you'll see he didn't like the Bible.

Charles Lyell said his goal was to free the science from Moses. What do you suppose he meant by that? You see, people who read what Moses wrote will feel that God made the world in six days and the flood formed most of the geology of the world. Noah's flood messed up the real estate big time.

And if people believe the book that Moses wrote, they're going to think that coal, oil, natural gas formed from the flood when things got buried. And they're going to think the canyons formed as the water ran off from the flood. Lyell didn't like that idea.

He wanted people to believe the earth is millions of years old. Charles Lyell, in this book, building on the work of a couple other guys, he developed the idea that each layer of the earth is a different age. And he invented what we call today the geologic column.

How many have ever heard of the geologic column before? He divided the earth up into layers and he gave each one a name, an age, and an index fossil. Maybe you saw the movie Jurassic Park named after the Jurassic layer. Each layer was given a name and they told everybody how old it was.

Now this was done in 1830, long before there ever was carbon dating, potassium-argon dating, rubidium-strontium dating, lead-208, lead-206, uranium-235, uranium-238. None of those existed. This was all done based on the assumption that each layer is a different age.

They made up the whole thing out of the clear blue sky. That's a fact. The earth has many layers of rock.

No question. That's a fact, folks. How'd they get there? Well, there are two interpretations.

The evolutionists will say the layers formed slowly over millions of years and each one is a different age. The Bible-believing Christian says, Oh, no, these layers are all from the flood in the days of Noah. You can get a jar of dirt and shake it up, set it down.

It'll settle into layers for you in a few minutes. But the guys, again, who believe in evolution are always trying to erase the line and make you think their interpretation is part of the fact column. The geologic

column is actually the Bible for the evolutionists.

It can only be found one place on planet Earth. The only place you will ever find the geologic column is in the textbooks. There is no geologic column.

This guy admits it. He said, If there were a column of sediments, unfortunately, no such column exists. I had one professor I debated one time said, Oh, you're wrong.

Now, there are 26 places on planet Earth where the geologic column exists. I said, No, I'm sorry, you're wrong. There are 26 places on planet Earth where the fossils are found in the order you would like them to be.

But that doesn't prove the geologic column exists in any of those places. There is no geologic column. If there was in one place, it'd be 100 miles thick.

And the obvious question would be, Where's all this dirt coming from? One of the biggest lies kids face in the textbooks is about the geologic column. It's a joke. It's a hoax.

It doesn't exist. But that really caused problems for the world in 1830 when it was taught. We'll get into that in a minute.

Look, there's no question the Earth has layers. But if those layers are different ages, why are there no erosion marks between the layers? They all just fit tight to each other like pancakes. I mean, don't you think if that one layer sat there waiting for the next one to come on top, it'd rain once in a while in 10 million years? Just go home and get a jar of dirt and put some water in it and shake it up, folks.

It'll settle out of the layers for you in a few seconds. It's called hydrologic sorting. Many years ago, I was speaking in Union Center, South Dakota.

Union Center is right there. It's not even on the map. And South Dakota puts everything they can find on the map just to fill in the white places.

There were 40 people in the whole town. 38 of them came to church. I don't know where the other two were.

Probably out pulling a calf, I reckon. We had a great time. It was a wonderful little church out there in the country.

The preacher said, hey, Brother Hofer, let's go down to Rapid City. They've got a museum with dinosaurs. I said, man, I like dinosaurs.

Let's go. So we all drove down to Rapid City. We walked in the door and this old fellow met us at the door and he said, folks, I'm a guide here.

Would you like me to give you a tour? We said, that would be great, sir. The first place we stopped on the tour was the geologic time scale. They've got it behind glass, all lit up.

It's holy. Don't touch it. We're standing there and the guide said, now folks, this layer of rock you're looking at right here is about 70 million years old.

And it's so cool because they always get that sanctimonious tone in their voice, you know. 70 million years old. Oh.

My daughter raised her hand. She said, sir, how do you know that layer is 70 million years old? He said, that's a good question, honey. He said, we tell how old these layers are by what kinds of fossils are found in them.

They're called index fossils. She said, okay. We walked around the other side.

We're standing over here and the guide said, now folks, these bones you're looking at are about 100 million years old. My daughter raised her hand again. She said, sir, how do you know the age of those fossils? He said, well, honey, we tell the age of the fossils by which layer they come from.

She said, sir, when we were standing over there, you told me you knew the age of the layers by the bones and now you're telling me you know the age of the bones by the layers. She said, isn't that circular reasoning? I thought, wow. A chip off the old block.

That guide had the strangest look on his face. It was almost as if he were thinking. He looked at my daughter.

He looked at me. I wasn't about to help him. I thought, man, this is going to be good.

I got to hear this. He looked back at my daughter. He said, man, you're right.

That is circular reasoning. He said, I never thought of that before. That poor fellow drove 50 miles one way that night to hear me speak in Union Center, South Dakota.

The crowd swelled to 39. We set up a chair in the aisle. Afterwards, he talked to me for almost an hour.

He said, Hovind, is everything I believe about geology wrong? I teach this stuff at the college. I said, oh, no, man, I like geology. Are you kidding? You've learned the names of all the minerals.

That's a good trick, folks. There are 1,200 minerals. Some have names about this big.

I said, you've learned the hardness test, the Rockwell test, the scratch test. I said, no, sir, I like geology. I like rocks and minerals.

I have a huge fossil collection, a big mineral collection. I like minerals. I said, but, the part about them being different ages is all baloney.

But he doesn't dare quit teaching it because he'll lose his job. See, people who don't support the evolution theory lose their job in public schools. That's the way it works.

We cover more on that on video number seven. It's a carefully protected state religion. It's all based on circular reasoning.

I'll show you. This textbook tells the kids on page 306 to date the fossils, I'm sorry, date the rocks by the fossils. On the next page, it says, date the fossils by the rocks.

Circular reasoning, this is silly. This guy says, the intelligent layman has long suspected circular reasoning in the use of rocks to date fossils and fossils to date rocks. The geologist has never bothered to think of a

good reply.

This guy says, I can think of no cases of radioactive decay being used to date fossils. If they tell you they date the fossils by carbon dating or potassium argon or one of those other ones, they're wrong. That's not how it's done.

Fossils are dated by which strata they come from. Strata are dated by which fossils they contain. Circular reasoning.

Radiometric dating would not even be feasible if the geologic column had not been erected first. This guy says, the rocks do date the fossils, but the fossils date the rocks more accurately. I think the cheese done fell out of his sandwich, folks.

If somebody charges you with circular reasoning, here's how they answer them. They say, the charge of circular reasoning in stratigraphy can be handled several ways. It can be ignored.

It's not the proper concern of the public. In other words, it's none of your business how we do it. Or it can be denied by calling down the law of evolution.

It can be admitted as a common practice or avoided by pragmatic reasoning. But the fact is, it's all based on circular reasoning. I like to ask the evolutionists, I'll say, fellas, your geologic column contains limestone in quite a few different places.

I mean, if I just handed you a piece of limestone and said, how old is it? How would you know if it's 100 million year old Jurassic limestone or 600 million year old Cambrian limestone? I mean, they're both limestone. How would you know the age of it? They'd say, oh, that's easy. We would tell by the index fossils.

Precisely my point. This textbook shows the kids a trilobite. And it says, a trilobite's a good index fossil.

If you find a trilobite, it probably lived 500 to 600 million years ago. I don't think so. Somebody found a human shoe print where the guy had stepped on and smashed a trilobite.

They asked geologists all over, how could a human step on a trilobite if trilobites lived 500 million years ago? One guy said, well, maybe aliens visited the planet 500 million years ago. Hey, those aliens will do it every time. Another guy said, maybe there was a large trilobite shaped like a shoe that fell on a small one.

Oh, hey, there are some big trilobites, okay, but they're not shaped like a shoe. 2 Peter's got the best story about that one. The scoffers are willingly ignorant.

You'd have to have help to be that dumb. You couldn't do it on your own. Trilobite had the most complicated eyeball ever.

That's supposed to be one of the first creatures to evolve in the Cambrian explosion. I mean, come on, it's got an eyeball incredibly complex. Trilobites did not live millions of years ago.

There could be some trilobites still alive. There certainly are isopods, which are very similar, except one piece shell instead of three lobes. Otherwise, it could be a descendant, a mutant, which is a loss of information, not a gain.

This textbook shows the kids a fossil graptolite. This is the New York State fossil. It says graptolites lived 410 million years ago.

Only problem is they found graptolites still alive. Now, if they're still alive, couldn't they be found in any rock layer? This one shows the kids the Devonian period. It says this is from 325 million years ago.

It has lobe-finned fish. They got a short leg and then the fin. Well, this is silly.

Lobe-finned fish are still very much alive today. It's called the coelacanth. And when they first found the coelacanth still alive in 1938, they said, wow, would you look at this? They survived for 325 million years.

It never dawned on them one time to question the geologic column. That thought never crossed their brain. This lady wrote a book about it, A Fish Caught in Time.

Yes, boys and girls, this is our own great uncle, 40 million times removed. I'm not sure I can help somebody like that. This textbook says the Cretaceous and Jurassic period are from dinosaurs that lived 70 million years ago.

Oh, come on. Dinosaurs have always lived with man. We cover that in video number three.

Dinosaur blood was found inside a T-Rex bone about ten years ago. They tried everything they could to disprove it and they couldn't. This is dinosaur blood cells.

It's not going to last 70 million years. Human hands were found fossilized in the same strata as dinosaurs were found fossilized. Textbooks say the layers are different ages.

I'm sorry, that's baloney. Now, Charlie Darwin didn't like round numbers. He said the Weldian deposits are 306,662,400 years old.

How he knows is anybody's guess. But here they are telling the kids the layers are different ages and yet all over the world, petrified trees are found, like this one, standing up, connecting different rock layers. Now, if you have a petrified tree standing up, running through multiple rock layers, I don't think it's common sense to say the layers are different ages.

Not by much, anyway. I mean, how long can a dead tree stand there before it falls down? Five years? Ten years? Twenty years? Five thousand years? I doubt that. And yet, petrified trees in the poly, they're called polystrata fossils, going through multiple layers.

They're very common. Hundreds and hundreds have been found. It would only take one to prove the point.

But hundreds have been found, petrified, standing up. In central Alabama, there's a large coal mine where they found all kinds of petrified trees standing up. Now, the kids have been taught for years that those two layers of coal, called the Mary Lee and the Blue Creek formation, are different ages, by millions of years.

And yet, when you get all the fossils together, they label them, sample A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, you can put it together and figure out and prove positively that Mary Lee and the Blue Creek had to form within a few weeks or months of each other. That's exactly what you get in a flood. We cover more on that on video number six about the flood, what caused the coal seams during the flood.

Here's some from Cookville, Tennessee. Petrified trees standing up, running through multiple layers. Joggins, Nova Scotia, is famous for its petrified trees in the vertical position.

Most of these pictures are on our website, drdino.com. We've got a piece of petrified wood in our museum running through 12 different layers of slate. And they're going to tell you in school, each layer of slate represents a different season. That's 12 years.

I'm sorry, that's not true. It represents movement of the water and separation of the particles by density or something like that. We get into that in video six.

So don't let them tell you the layers are different ages. Sometimes trees are found petrified upside down, running through multiple rock layers. Now we really have a problem.

I've thought about this one until my brain hurts. As far as I can figure this out, the evolutionist only has two ways to solve this. He can say the trees stood upright for millions of years, while the layers slowly formed around them.

I find that one hard to believe. Or he can say the trees grew through hundreds of feet of solid rock, looking for sunlight. So there's a third way to solve this.

Maybe those trees were buried in a big flood. How fast was that calf going? Might be two ways to look at this, you know. Well Mount St. Helens blew its top.

It blew thousands of trees down into Spirit Lake. Over 20,000 trees have already sunk to the bottom and are stuck in the mud. The mud at the bottom of Spirit Lake.

Many thousands of them are standing up in the vertical position. And those trees are going to petrify. They're already beginning to petrify.

It does not take long for things to petrify. Here's a piece of petrified firewood. I've got a piece of petrified pallet in our museum from a pallet shop that cut pieces of wood.

Some kid sent me a box of petrified acorns. He said, Brother Hovind, I tried an experiment. I put these acorns in a bucket of water and forgot about them.

A year later I went back and I said, they might sprout, but now they're all petrified. Would you like some for your museum? Solid rock. Here's a petrified dog inside a tree in Georgia.

They cut the tree down for firewood and said, Wait, wait, wait. Don't cut that one up. There's a dog inside.

Turned to stone. Here's a petrified cowboy boot with the cowboy's legs still in it. The boot was made in the 1950s.

Here's a petrified fish giving birth. A petrified hat from New Zealand. Here's a petrified pickle in our museum.

I'm not kidding. The guy sent it to me. He said, we found this old house in Montana.

The roof was gone. The house had been empty for at least 30 years. We went down to the basement.

Here's a bunch of jars of pickles. A pantry. But the lid of one of the jars rusted off and inside the pickle turned to stone.

Would you like it for your museum? I said, yeah. A petrified pickle. A jar was made between 1930 and 1960.

That's the year they made those jars. I don't know when the pickle got put in there, but sometime in there. Don't let them tell you it takes millions of years.

There's petrified sacks of flour found in Eureka Springs, Arkansas. From a flour mill that flooded in the 1910s, I believe. So kids, when they tell you the layers are different ages, you're being lied to.

That's not true. Don't believe that. 80 to 85% of Earth's surface does not even have three geologic periods appearing in correct consecutive order.

This guy says it becomes an overall exercise of gargantuan special pleading and imagination for the evolutionary uniformitarian paradigm to maintain there ever were geologic periods. The geologic column is a hoax. One of the biggest lies ever passed off on humanity, but the vast majority of the world believes it, even though it doesn't exist.

When they started teaching that in the 1830s, people began to change their world view away from what the Bible teaches to this new view from Charlie Lyell, the lawyer from Scotland, that each layer was a different age. This teaching really had a strong influence on a young preacher from England. There was a fellow that just graduated from Bible college to be a preacher.

His name was Charles Darwin. The only degree Darwin ever got was a theology degree, and today they call him a great scientist. All he ever got was a theology degree, which is not bad, but he's not a scientist.

Charles Darwin set sail on board the Beagle. He's going to sail around the world and collect bugs for somebody back in England, and he decided to bring some books with him to read. He's going to be gone for five years.

As he sailed around, he brought with his Bible, and he brought with that book by Charles Lyell, Principles of Geology. That book changed his life forever. Darwin later wrote to a friend and said, Disbelief crept over me slowly.

I felt no distress. He slowly lost his faith in the Bible. By the way, later when he died, his wife started the rumor that he repented on his deathbed.

That rumor still circulates today, but apparently his wife made up the whole thing. Nobody knows for sure, but that's what the best research says. Darwin sailed around the world.

He stopped off at these islands right there called the Galapagos Islands. There on those islands, Charlie noticed there were 14 different varieties of finches, a little bird about this big, but their beak shape was different. Now, Charlie didn't like birds too well.

I mean, he raised pigeons, but he also liked worms. He was a strange guy. So he shot all kinds of birds, thinking he would help the worms out, give them a better chance of survival.

His birds ate worms, and he thought that might be kind of hard on the worms, so he shot all the birds he could find. Well, he collected all these birds, and he noticed there were 14 varieties of finches. He studied them carefully and said, You know what, folks? I think all these birds have a common ancestor.

I bet you're right, Charlie. It was a bird. And then Charlie said, You know, maybe this proves that birds are related to bananas.

He said, Oh, he didn't say that. Oh, he sure did. I got his book right here.

Charlie Darwin said in his book on page 170, he said, It's a truly wonderful fact that all animals and all plants throughout all time and space should be related to each other. Isn't he saying the birds and the bananas are related? He sure is. That's a lie.

There's no proof any animals are related to a different kind of animal other than maybe a common designer. Charlie noticed what is sometimes called microevolution. I don't like that word.

I think it confuses kids. I'm going to use it, but you understand what I mean. Microevolution is actually just a variation.

Dogs produce a variety of dogs. Roses produce a variety of roses. Nobody argues about that.

It's a fact, folks. It happens. The question is, does it go any farther than that? Does it go into what we call macroevolution, where it changes to a different kind? Walt Brown in his book in the beginning, an excellent book by the way, he says microevolution is horizontal.

Macro would be vertical, changing to a different kind. Another way to illustrate it. Dogs probably had a common ancestor.

Even the Great Dane and the Chihuahua probably had a common ancestor. I wouldn't question the fact that the dog, the wolf, and the coyote had a common ancestor. But every five-year-old kid knows they're the same kind of animal.

We had one try it earlier in the seminar. We had a dog, a wolf, a coyote, and a banana. We asked the five-year-old, which one is not like the others? He got it right away.

The banana. See, the Bible says they bring forth after their kind. National Geographic here has an article from wolf to wolf, how the dog evolved from a wolf.

I don't argue with that. It probably did. But it's still the same kind of animal.

Here's Mickey Mouse evolving. The Bible says they bring forth after their kind, not after their species. But this guy says, the results of this and other similar surveys are startling because evolution has been a settled issue for science, in science, for nearly 150 years.

They found out that 46 percent of adults in the United States do not think humans had evolved. Well, you better define what you mean by evolved. Right.

The majority of folks do not think they came from a rock 4.6 billion years ago. If you want to believe that, that's fine. I don't care what you believe, but don't call it science.

Evolution has six different meanings. First, you'd have to have cosmic evolution, the origin of time-space matter. Secondly, you'd have to have chemical evolution.

The hydrogen from the Big Bang would have to evolve to all 92 elements plus the synthetic ones. Then you'd have to have what we call stellar evolution. The stars would have to evolve.

And nobody's ever seen a star form. We see them blow up all the time. And yet there's enough stars out there that everybody on planet Earth can own two trillion of them to yourself.

Those are the ones we know about. We don't know about the ones we don't know about. Then we'd have to have what we call organic evolution, the origin of life.

Nobody has a clue how life can get started from non-living material. We'll cover more on that in the next session, about the origin of life. Next, we have what's called macro evolution, changing from one kind of animal into another.

Nobody's ever seen a dog produce a non-dog. And lastly, we have variations within the kind that some people call micro evolution. Okay, this one happens, whatever you call it, it happens.

The first five are purely religious. But the definition of the word evolution is really confused for the students on purpose, I believe. I think it takes a giant leap of faith and logic just to go from micro to macro.

It sure takes a big leap to go to the other four stages. Macro evolution is a fantasy based on imagination. They believe it must have happened, but there is no evidence for it at all.

Teachers, though, will give the students one definition of the word to get them to believe the theory, and then they slowly weed in the rest of it when they're not looking. They're going to say evolution is descent with modification. That's deceitful.

That's not really what they mean by evolution. This textbook says evolution is change over time. First definition.

Watch how they change the definition now. In other words, living things have changed over time. Wait a minute.

What happened to the first four stages? You're going to skip all the way down to living things and just assume the first four happened? Then they say evolution is a change in species over time. Now they jumped right down to what I believe in. I believe species can change over time.

I think the changes are limited. It's still the same kind, but somebody might call it a different species. It's still the same kind of animal.

That's not really what they mean by evolution, folks. What they really mean is the whole theory comes as a package deal. Variations certainly happen, but they have limits.

Haven't the farmers been trying to get bigger pigs for a long time? Do you think they'll ever get a pig as big as Texas? No, I bet there's a limit in there someplace, isn't there? I'm not sure if they reached it or not, but they're probably getting close to the limit of pig size. Roaches eventually become resistant to pesticides. That's a fact.

Do you think they'll ever become resistant to a sledgehammer? No, I bet there's a limit. They always still produce the same kind of plant or animal, too. No new information is added.

See, real evolution would mean an increase in genetic complexity, not just shuffling genes that already exist. When you have varieties of dogs produced, the gene pool is more limited for the variety. The Chihuahua is swimming in the shallow end of the gene pool.

Somebody spent years crossbreeding dogs to develop a Chihuahua. All that time and money to make a dog that is 100 percent useless. Hey, how long would the Chihuahuas last in the real world? Turn them all loose back into the woods and watch what happens.

They'd run up to the wolf. End of gene pool, right? Genetic information is lost, not added, when you get your variety. Real evolution would be an increase in genetic complexity, not just shifting of gene frequency.

Now, I grew up in Illinois, corn country. Did you know there are so many kinds of corn down there, they have to number them? You're driving down the highway and you'll see a sign, you know, BX 65, don't mix it up with XL 29, something will explode. But I'll tell you what folks, you can crossbreed corn from now until the cows come home and you're always going to get corn.

You're never going to get a hamster or a tomato or a whale to grow on your corn stalk. That ain't going to happen. There's a variety of dogs in the world, a whole bunch of them.

And I bet they had a common ancestor, a dog. This Irish textbook calls it divergent evolution. Saying the terrier and the poodle had a common ancestor? Oh, come on, don't give it a fancy name, it's still a dog.

Don't call it divergent evolution, it's a variety of dog. This Mexican textbook says the horse and the zebra had a common ancestor. I agree.

Looked like a horse. Four wheel drive, genuine leather upholstery, all the standard equipment folks. I mean the horse, right? And every kid knows they're the same kind of animal.

They've got little bitty horses available today. We had the world's smallest horse come visit us in Dinosaur Adventure Land. Talk about useless.

Can't ride it, it won't bark. My granddaughter wrote it. She thought it was cool.

I don't know if she thought anything. You know, horses, zebras, and asses can all be crossbred. There's some folks in California that wrote me a letter and said, Brother Hogan, we crossbreed all sorts of these animals and get some really strange crossbreeds.

We get zorses, zonkeys, zionis, and zebongs, and shebras. There's a herd of zebroids running around. See, the Bible says if they can bring forth, they're the same kind.

A horse and a zebra can bring forth. A horse and a hamster cannot. They're a different kind, okay? In most cases, the kinds are real recognizable to anybody with average intelligence.

There might be a few questionable ones in there. Okay, I think that's worthy of research. But the fact that we don't have the answer to every single one doesn't prove that everything is related, like the evolutionist says.

You know, in the last 100 years, the Kentucky Derby has gone from an average winning speed of 127 down to 123. And even back in the early days, it had some low times turned in. Question.

How much money, would you guess, has been spent on the Kentucky Derby trying to get faster racehorses? Millions and millions and millions of dollars, right? I don't know if they reached the absolute limit of horse speed or not. I suspect they're getting pretty close. I mean, if you really want to win the Kentucky Derby, why don't you breed wings on your horse and fly around the track in 12 seconds? My whole point is, sure variations happen, but they're limited.

The evolutionist does not want to admit there are any limits, and that's where the problem comes in. There's a variety of cows in the world, and they might have had a common ancestor. A cow.

There's a book you can order chickens from. What kind of chickens do you want to get, kids? Do you want to get red rocks, cinnamon queens, white rocks, cherry acres, brown leg horns? There's a lot of different kinds of chickens you can get. But look at what the book says.

The jungle fowl are the original bird from which all varieties and strains of domesticated chickens are derived. Hey, did you know all the chickens had a common ancestor? Guess what it was. A chicken.

Exactly correct. There are eight varieties of bears in the world, and they might have had a common ancestor. I wouldn't argue with that.

But it was a bear. Did you know that broccoli, brussel sprouts, cauliflower, and cabbage all came from a common ancestor? It was a plant. The Bible says they bring forth after their kind.

Here's what happened though. James Hutton wrote a book, and people began to doubt the earth was 6,000 years old. Then along came Charlie Lyell, and he wrote a book, and people began to doubt the flood formed the layers.

Then along came Charlie Darwin, and people began to doubt the creator. And by the mid-1800s, the world was in kind of a problem because they didn't think God did it, but they didn't know how it got here. So they looked around and said, well, if God didn't make this place, who's in charge? It must be us.

That led to the rise of humanism, communism, Marxism, Nazism, socialism. It all ties together. We cover all that on Video 5. But those same three false teachings are still in your textbooks today.

The teaching kids the earth is millions of years old. We got here by uniformitarian processes, and Godless evolution is how it happened. Paul said, Timothy, you be careful about science that is falsely so-called.

Evolution is not science. Evolution's a religion. Hitler said, let me control the textbooks, and I'll control the state.

Professor Wilson from Harvard University said, as were many persons from Alabama, I was a born-again Christian. When I was 15, I entered the Southern Baptist Church with great fervor and interest in the fundamentalist religion. I left at 17 when I got to the University of Alabama and heard about evolution theory.

First year in college, destroyed his faith. I suspect that might be what happened to Tom Hanks. I read an article where he was 16 years old.

He wrote about how much he loved the Lord, wanted to serve him with his life. What happened, Tom? I've been praying for Tom a lot. I'm going to try to get him saved.

I'm sending him some of my videotapes here soon. I don't want to burden for him, but I just am. Many people go off to college and lose their faith.

Scott wrote me a letter from Iowa. He said, Brother Holman, until I went to college, my faith in God was sound. My college history class helped to destroy that faith.

I started to doubt the Bible and God's word. I even started to doubt that Jesus was truly God's son and that he died and rose from my sins. My best friend showed me your tapes and I was in awe of what I saw.

Everything I thought I knew about life was changed. Yay, rescued one. But there are millions more that need rescued.

There are kids doing homework right now tonight while we're sitting here and that homework is destroying their faith. Seventy-five percent of kids from Christian homes that go to public schools are going to lose their faith after one year of college. What's in these books anyway? What are they teaching our kids? They tell them they've got evidence for evolution.

Here's the evidence they give them. Evidence from fossils. Oh, come on.

Anybody with half a brain knows no fossil counts as evidence for evolution. None. You bring some bones into the courtroom.

Your Honor, see these bones right here? These are the ancestors of everybody today. Any freshman law student could say, Your Honor, he doesn't know those bones had any kids that lived. And why would you think a bone you found in the dirt can do something animals today cannot do? You know, produce something other than their kind? Fossils simply don't count, folks.

No fossils count as evidence for evolution. They say we've got evidence from structure, molecular biology, development. They say the process of evolution is by natural selection.

There's no scientific evidence to support evolution except things that have been proven wrong years ago, and we're going to cover some of those here tonight. Now, if real evidence exists for that theory, then please show me. I'm not against scientific evidence.

I am against lying to the kids. And everything they use to teach that theory to your kids has been proven to be a lie. Evolution is based on two faulty assumptions.

Number one, they say mutations make something new. That's never been observed. Number two, they say natural selection makes it survive and take over the population.

Now, think about this carefully. If an animal evolves a little better than the rest, what must happen to the rest of them in order for this process to work? They all have to die, or else the good genes get blended back into the population. Evolution is a religion of death, not life.

The question is very simple. Did man bring death into the world like the Bible says, or did death bring man into the world like evolution says? They are polar opposite and one of them is wrong. This textbook says mutations are the original source of variation in populations, shown by the many varieties of roses

available.

I agree. Probably all the roses are mutants from the original rose. I agree with that.

That's not evolution. That's a variety of rose. Mutations do not produce any kind of evolution.

Anybody that studies biology knows that. Pierre Grosse believes in evolution, but he says it doesn't work, folks. It doesn't happen.

Here's a five-legged bull that is a mutation. Notice he did not get any new information. Getting an extra leg is not new information.

It's a scrambling of existing information. Doesn't the bull already have legs? So it just made one in the wrong place. That's all.

Here's a short-legged sheep. That's a mutant. No new information is added, though.

That's a loss of information. And he's the first one the wolf is going to catch. Go, boys, go.

Here comes the wolf. Herman didn't make it. Here's a two-headed turtle.

That's a mutant. It's not a ninja, but he's a mutant. He's going to freeze.

First winner. Because nobody makes a double-necked, turtleneck sweater. I've never seen one.

See, a mutation is scrambling existing information. It's not new information. If you can scramble up the letters for the word Christmas, you can get all sorts of different words.

But you're never going to get Xerox, Zebra, or Queen out of Christmas. The letters aren't available. And scrambling existing gene code will not give you new information.

This textbook shows the kids a four-winged fly. Look what it says here now. Normal fruit flies have two wings.

This mutant has four. This rare mutation, like most mutations, is harmful. Watch this carefully.

It says beneficial mutations are the raw material for natural selection. Excuse me, teacher. Why don't they give an example of a beneficial mutation? Why do they show us a bad one, and tell us about the good ones? You see, beneficial mutations are pure imagination.

They don't exist in reality. You have to imagine that they happen. Oh wow, there must have been a bunch of them too.

Nobody ever shows one. One professor said, I know a beneficial mutation. I said, what is that, sir? He said, people in Africa that get sickle cell anemia are less likely to get malaria.

I said, sir, that is brilliant, you know. That's like saying, if you cut off your legs, you can't get athlete's foot. And by the way, that's the one they always bring out, because that's the only one they've got.

Guarantee, you get into a discussion on evolution, ask somebody for a beneficial mutation, I guarantee they'll bring that one up right there. That's all they've got. And that's not beneficial.

Neither sickle cell nor malaria is beneficial. They say, evolution and natural selection go together. Oh, yeah.

This one says, natural selection causes evolution. No, it does not. Natural selection selects.

If I said, I'm going to select everybody in the room over 12 feet tall to survive, everybody else dies. I don't have anybody to select from. Do I? No.

Natural selection doesn't create. If I wanted to create a race of people over 12 feet tall, so I kept killing everybody under 12 feet tall, how long would it take to get a race of people 12 feet tall? It's never going to do it. Now, the average population today probably ranges from say, 5 feet to 6 foot 6 or something.

I probably could create a population of people that are all 6 foot 6 or maybe even 7 foot. By continually killing everybody under a certain point, sure, you could do that. But you're selecting part of the gene code that already exists.

You're not creating anything new. Natural selection is a conservative process. The creation is thought of at first.

It selects. It doesn't create. This guy says, natural selection may have a stabilizing effect, but it does not promote speciation.

It is not a creative force. Don't let them tell you what it is. Natural selection is selection, not creation.

Why they don't see this, I don't know. This textbook says, finches with larger beaks, larger and stronger beaks, were better able to open the tough pods and so they survived. Evolution by natural selection had occurred in just one year.

That is pure propaganda. It still a bird and it reverted right back to the same national average after the famine or the dry spell went by. Part of the population already had the genes for tougher beaks.

Natural selection does not lead to evolution. This is a lie. Natural selection selects.

I'll show you. If you worked in a factory that made cars and your job was quality control, every car that goes by your job is to see if it runs, slam the door, kick the tires, whatever you do to check it, see if it works. If you caught every single mistake, they don't by the way, but if you did, how long would it take that process to change the car to an airplane? You say, Brother Holman, you don't understand.

Quality control doesn't change it. Oh, I do understand. Natural selection is like quality control.

It doesn't create a thing. It makes sure you have a good species, but it won't change it to something else. They tell the kids in school the peppered moth is evidence for evolution.

Yes, boys and girls, they counted the moths on the trees. Must have been a government project. Instead it was 95 percent light color and 5 percent black.

Then they tell the kids that the trees turned black from coal burning factories and it was only 5 percent light and 95 percent black around the factories. The problem is the whole story is a lie. It didn't happen.

After 40 years of watching, they found two moths on the trees. Two. In 40 years.

So they glued dead moths to the tree to take that picture for your kid's textbook. Those are dead moths glued on a tree trunk. It's a lie.

The story is a phony. They still teach it. That's all they've got.

I think that page ought to be torn out of the book. They tell the kids in the Tulsa Zoo, yes, this is proof for evolution right here. Proven wrong years ago.

There's a good website, Icons of Evolution, or the book, Icons of Evolution, has a whole lot on peppered moth. See, they talk about survival of the fittest. Well, survival of the fittest does not explain arrival of the fittest.

And survival of the fittest, I think, is what's called a tautology, a sentence that means nothing. If you say, Professor, why did it survive? Oh, because it's the fittest, you know, survival of the fittest. Because it survived, how else can you tell? Look, folks, if a whale goes through a school of fish and eats 80% of them, it's not survival of the fittest.

It's called survival of the luckiest. That's what really happens out there. But some of these people make these good observations and still come to the wrong conclusions.

I don't know if you heard the story, but there was a bunch of scientists one day that wanted to see how far a frog could jump. They put the big old frog down there and said, jump frog, jump. That frog, he jumped 80 inches.

Wow. They brought him back, cut off one leg. Said, jump frog, jump.

He only went 70. They brought him back, cut off another leg. Said, jump frog.

He went 60. They brought him back, cut off another leg. Said, jump frog.

He went 50. They brought the frog back, cut off his last leg. Said, jump frog.

You know, they expected he might go maybe 40 based on the data so far. Actual jump was zero. Frog didn't move.

They yelled louder, jump frog. Frog didn't move. They were baffled.

They tried the experiment again. New frog. Got the same results every time.

So the brilliant scientists got their data together and said, folks, you know what, we can jump frog. We can conclude that the frog jumped less as the legs were removed. Hey, you have to give them credit, folks.

That is a good observation. Then they said, but we must conclude that a frog with no legs goes deaf. You had a good observation there, fella, but you blew it with your conclusion.

That's what they did with the fruit flies, though. They put them flies in the laboratory and they nuked them and microwaved them and x-rayed them and did all sorts of mean things to those flies and they got all kinds of mutated flies. They got flies with curled wings.

They fly around and couldn't go anywhere. They got flies with no wings. What do you call that? Craw? Can't fly.

The reason all these mutated flies in the laboratory, they said, folks, you know what, all the mutations observed produced flies that were inferior to grandpa fly. Hey, that's a good observation. They said, so...

Video: <https://sermonindex2.b-cdn.net/GqLkTduzRPs.mp4>

Source: <https://sermonindex.net/speakers/kent-hovind/seminar-4-lies-in-the-textbook/>

Grow in Your Walk with Christ

Listen and read messages that will stir your heart for Christ and point you to deeper repentance and devotion.

- 50,000+ Sermons from speakers past and present
- 3,900+ Classic Christian Books freely readable online
- 1,200+ Bible Translations and Commentaries
- Over 450k forum posts — Join our vibrant online Christian forum

www.sermonindex.net