

SCIENCE FALSELY SO CALLED

Evolution

***1 Timothy 6:20 "...keep that which is committed to thy trust,
avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science
falsely so called"***

Matthew John
mattyjohn14.6@mail.com

Contents

Prologue + A Brief History of Evolution Theory	Page 2
The Hoaxes	Page 3 - 8
The Scientific Method + Definitions	Page 9
Micro Evolution – Is it Science?	Page 9 - 10
Macro Evolution – Is it Science?	Page 11
Macro Evolution (i) Mechanisms	Page 11 - 12
Macro Evolution (ii) Proofs	Page 13 - 15
Evidence Against the Theory of Macro Evolution	Page 16 - 20
Abiogenesis (the spontaneous origin of life)	Page 21
Other Theories for the Origin of Life(i) Panspermia	Page 22
Other Theories for the Origin of Life(ii) Special Creation	Page 22 - 23
The Fruits of Evolutionism	Page 23 - 24
Why Don't We Hear Objections to Evolution Theory?	Page 25 - 27
Epilogue	Page 27

Prologue

| Before we begin I kindly ask you consider these scenarios; you discover a painting, do you conclude that there is a painter or that the painting randomly formed over vast spans of time from the materials around it? You see a bridge, do you conclude there must be an engineer or that it assembled itself over millions of years? You pick up your favorite book, could that appear by a natural process that lacks intelligence? When you see yourself in the mirror...

Colin Wilson, Researcher and author – “How unbiased is science itself. Does it really do what it claims to do? Take the facts and start from there. Throughout history science has tended to concentrate more on its own theories than on the facts.”



A Brief History of Evolution Theory

James Hutton in his book *Theory of the Earth* 1795, postulated the possibility that the Earth was much older than people thought. This book influenced Charles Lyell to write his book *Principles of Geology* in 1830 in which he invented the idea of the geologic column. Charles Darwin was heavily influenced by both of these authors, amongst others, and wrote his book on the *Origin of Species* in 1859. At this time there was no evidence for an old Earth, the geologic column or evolution. The theory however had useful political purposes as well as being grasped at by naturalists who did not believe in special creation but had not formerly had an alternative theory they could really promote. As a result a wide spread group across Europe began looking for evidence to support the theory of evolution.

These people took with them a bias which prevented an objective, scientific method being employed and as a result a long list of errors, frauds and hoaxes ensued in the pursuit of evidence for evolution & some examples are listed in the next few pages.

So why was this theory accepted and eventually taught in spite of a lack of evidence? Europe and the west at this time were transitioning through a period of history known as the age of revolutions & anti-monarchy & any teaching which contradicted the Bible was readily promoted in order to undermine the authority of monarchs who claimed a divine right to rule. Evolution was a political tool & still is today.

Charles Lyell, June 14th 1830 letter to G P Scrope – “... what will *free the science from Moses*, for if treated seriously, the party are quite prepared for it.”


The Hoaxes

1. In text books and history museums the world over a picture of the **geologic column** can be found. This comes straight from Charles Lyell and the dates were assigned ad hoc before any dating techniques existed. This 'column' is the bible for the evolutionist and is the most fundamental lie underlying the theory.

John Woodmorrape – The geologic column, does it exist? Technical Journal 1999 - “If there were a deposit of sediments deposited continuously since the formation of the Earth, the entire history of the planet could be reconstructed. Unfortunately no such column exists.”

A Beka Books Biology p.385 - “if the geologic column existed it would be 100 miles thick.” [The earth crust is predicted to be 21 miles thick, the deepest drilling/digging by man extends 7.5 miles deep.]

Carl Dunbar, Author of Historical Geology Textbook 2nd edition - “No single area contains a record of all geological time... A third of the Earth’s land surface does not even have even three of the geologic periods in consecutive order”



The geologic column exists nowhere except the imagination & textbooks and circular reasoning is used in the dating of both layers and fossils.


“The intelligent layman has long suspected circular reasoning in the use of rocks to date fossils and fossils to date rocks.” – **J.E. O'Rourke, American journal of science 1979 pg.276**

“Geologists are arguing in a circle. The succession of organisms has been determined by a study of the remains embedded in the rocks and the relative ages of the rocks are determined by the remains of organisms that they contain.” – **R.H. Rastall, Geology Encyclopedia Britannica Vol.10 pg.168**

“There is no way to simply look at a fossil and tell how old it is. And this poses something of a problem: if we date the fossils by the rocks, how can we then talk about patterns of evolutionary change through time in the fossil record?” – **Niles Eldredge, Biologist and Paleontologist in Time Frames 1985 pg52**

2. Ernst Haeckel faked drawings of **embryonic development** to support evolution. He was convicted of fraud in 1875. His drawings are still used in text books all over the world as evidence for evolution almost a century and a half later.

“Although Haeckel confessed... and was convicted of fraud at the University of Jena, the drawings persist. That’s the real mystery” - **Dr Richardson of St George hospital medical school in London, New Scientist Sep 6th 1997 p.23**



Darwin himself considered this to be the single best proof for his theory. Surely a century & a half is long enough to remove this lie from school text books so why does it remain?

“If the lies about evolution were removed from the text books there would be nothing left to teach about the theory.” – **High school teacher Dr Kent Hovind**

3. The largest body of frauds exists surrounding the **ape to man missing links** and these are the most famous that have occurred over the last century and a half.

Pitldown man is one of the most famous ape-men & was a complete hoax.

www.dailymail.co.uk/.../Pitldown-Man-The-truth-fraud-revealed-100-years-fooled-world... 16 Dec 2012 - **Unmasked: The truth behind Pitldown man fraud to be revealed 100 years after it fooled the world.**



Nebraska Man was purported to be a missing link, but five years later was confirmed to be just a pig's tooth. Yes, evolutionists concluded a pig tooth was the remains of an ape-man.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nebraska_Man ... "possible human ancestor that turned out to be a hoax."



Horse man, another imagined ape-man was a sophisticated artist rendition based on the skull cap of a donkey.

<https://evolutionistscience.wordpress.com/evolution-frauds>




Australopithecus aka 'Lucy' was discovered by **Richard Leaky** and he says - "this discovery is so incomplete that it is mostly imagination and plaster of Paris."



Ramapithecus man was a sophisticated artist rendition based on a baboon skull.

<https://sapientiaexanimo.wordpress.com/.../the-missing-links-of-human-evolution> "We're all familiar with the alleged "ape-to-man" evolutionary sequence. All we have is just a handful of bones and a history of mistakes and hoaxes. Ramapithecus, like Lucy, was promoted as the most primitive hominid ancestor."



Neanderthal man was a more elaborate hoax, involving falsified dates and using deformed bones from specimens exhibiting rickets disease.

http://hoaxes.org/weblog/comments/neanderthal_hoax_exposed - "Anthropology is going to have to completely revise its picture of modern man between 40,000 and 10,000 years ago," said **Thomas Terberger, archaeologist** who discovered the hoax. "Prof Protsch's work appeared to prove that anatomically modern humans and Neanderthals had co-existed, and perhaps even had children together. This now appears to be rubbish."

Georg H V Meyer, Anatomist 1860 – "Neanderthal is not ancient... a human that suffered from rickets."



In summary there is not a single ape to man evolutionary link in existence that has not been proven fraudulent and yet they are still taught in schools and in our media.


Researcher and author Lloyd Pye - “The problem is when you pay people for ‘pre-human’ fossils, that is exactly what they will bring you, even if there aren’t any.”

L. S. B. Leakey, paleoanthropologist - “To this day there is not one single human bone in the ‘pre - human’ fossil record.”

Ian Anderson, New Scientist Publication – “The problem with anthropologists is that they want so much to find a hominid (human) that any scrap of bone becomes a hominid bone”

4. Evolutionary trees also exist nowhere except the imagination and school text books.

“All those trees of life with their branches of our ancestors, that’s a lot of nonsense” - **Mary Leaky Paleanthropologist 1996 December 10th Associated press.**




“Other examples including the much-repeated ‘gradual’ evolution of the modern horse, have not held up under close examination.” - **Biology the Unity and Diversity of Life, Wadsworth 1992, p. 304**

“Many examples usually cited [for evolution], such as the evolution of the horse family or sabretooth tigers can be readily shown to have been falsified” - **George Simpson, Scientific Monthly Vol. 71 p.264**

A Whale Fantasy from National Geographic https://www.trueorigin.org/ng_whales01.php - “One instance of National Geographic's 'sensational, unsubstantiated and tabloid' evolutionist propaganda was its 'Evolution of Whales' article.”

“The evolutionary trees that adorn our text books have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils” - **Dr Stephen Jay Gould Harvard University 5th May 1977**



5. The famed **Peppered Moth**, a British ecologist, H. Kettlewell glued dead moths to trees and photographed them to tell a story of how they had evolved darker colours to adapt to local pollution. His fraud has since been exposed and yet this example of evolution is still taught in school classrooms world over!

www.hoaxes.org/photo_database/image/the_peppered_moth




6. The **dinosaur to bird** story is fast becoming a popular evolutionary myth.

The 5 Greatest Paleontology Hoaxes Of All Time #3. Archaeoraptor, by Oliver Kneivitt | June 7th 2011
science 2.0 the fake dino to bird missing link. - "Though I do not want to believe it, Archaeoraptor appears to be a composite." - **Xu Xing, vertebrate paleontologist**



Another "Dinosaur to bird" evolutionary nonsense –. "Paleontologists have tried to turn Archaeopteryx into an earth bound feathered dinosaur. But it's not. It's a bird. A perching bird and no amount of 'paleobabble' is going to change that." – **Alan Feduccia, Science Magazine Feb 5th 1994 pg. 764**



The Scientific Method

The famed 'scientific method' is a body of techniques for investigating phenomena, acquiring new knowledge, or correcting and integrating previous knowledge. To be termed scientific, a method of inquiry is commonly based on empirical or measurable evidence, observation and experiment.

Definitions

- 1. Micro evolution** - small adaptation/s in a creature/plant (remaining homogeneous).
- 2. Macro evolution** - the change over time of one creature/plant into a new creature/plant (no longer homogeneous).
- 3. Abiogenesis** - the spontaneous origin of life by animation of non-living matter into living matter.
- 4. Science** – A branch of knowledge or study dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged & showing the operation of general laws.
- 5. Religion** – A set of beliefs concerning the cause, nature and purpose of the universe; a set of fundamental beliefs generally agreed upon by a number of persons or sects.

For my purposes herein I will be exploring whether micro evolution can be explained outside of the overall Darwinian paradigm (Darwinian evolution by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life).

I will proceed to clearly demonstrate that macro evolution did not begin as, become, nor is to this day a science. It is a religion which has been adopted by nation states and carefully protected.

Finally I will examine three theories on the origin of life.

“Evolution is a religion. This is true of evolution in the beginning and it is true of evolution still today.” -
Dr Michael Ruse Professor of zoology at the University of Guelph

Micro Evolution – Is it Science?

Firstly, can we establish that micro evolution can be called science? Yes. We can measure, observe and test this phenomenon.


In the neo-Darwinian paradigm the mechanism for small adaptation is random mutation over time which eventually, accidentally results in a beneficial change in the genome which manifests a physical attribute. This physical attribute must be present in dominant alleles and be passed on through procreation into a new generation and later become prevalent in the gene pool.

Random mutation will produce harmful changes in the genes of an organism 99.9% of the time it has been observed (conservatively). A mutation will occur in a dominant allele 25% of the time when observed. A dominant allele will be passed to offspring 75% of the time when observed & there are many other factors to consider, so the time it would take according to mathematical probability for a random mutation to be beneficial for even a simple celled organism and for the mutation to become dominant in even a small population has been calculated to be in excess of 10, 10³³ years. That is 21

Quintillion years, older than the universe in the most stretched age of present cosmology. It is statistically impossible that this process explains every biological adaptation we observe in nature. Can there be another mechanism for micro-evolution?

There is a scientific field of study called Epigenetics. This study began (1940s, Dr. Waddington) when experiments were being conducted on embryonic stem cells to understand how a zygote takes up the form of the organism through its development. An observation was made during a simple experiment.

There were placed genetically identical stem cells into different environments and some were observed to become muscle cells, some bone cells and some neurons. This field of study has since confirmed that environment causes a response in organisms as they develop which determines their form. Furthermore it has been established that in an animal/plant group which experiences drastic environmental changes, adaptations can manifest in as little as two generations. These adaptations occur through the environmental stimulation of recessive alleles to switch to dominant, thus providing the necessary variations best for survival in the new conditions. This mechanism does not require vast spans of time, is not random and utilizes existing genetic information in the organism.



Finch beaks, which Darwin saw in the Galapagos Islands and thought were evidence for his theory, are actually an example of genetic variation, and not evidence for macroevolution.

In summary the present neo Darwinist approach to observable micro evolution does not adequately explain this phenomenon and micro evolution should not be seen as an evidence of macro evolution. Epigenetics demonstrates no changes are required in an organism's genetic make-up to account for the adaptations and variations we observe.

Also consider that if the information required to adapt to a change in the environment already exists within an organism, this points to both design and prescience.

Biochemist James Shapiro, Evolution; A view from the 21st century, pg.82 – “It is difficult (if not impossible) to find a genome change operator that is truly random in its action within the DNA...”

“The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying micro evolution can be extrapolated to explain macro-evolution... The answer can be given as a clear, no!” -

Roger Lewin – Evolution theory under fire, Science vol.12

Macro Evolution – Is it Science?

Firstly can we establish that macro evolution can be called science? No.

Macro evolution has never been observed, nor has it been demonstrated in a test/experiment. Of course the claim is that this cannot be observed or tested because the process is so slow. So all that is left then is to present evidence that shows this process exists and a hypothesis that offers a mechanism of how this process works. Let's first explore the proposed mechanisms that drive the change of simple organisms into all the extravagant and abundant varieties of life in our world today and then we will examine the proposed evidence.

Macro Evolution (i) Mechanisms

1. Natural selection is a part of the mechanism for evolutionary change in the theory. Natural selection does not create. Nature can select from what is available to select *from* but this will not *add* anything new.

“Natural selection is a conservative process that removes defective organisms and keeps the species strong” – **Edward Blyth, Zoologist**

Dr Marciej Giertych, population geneticist for the European Union – “Darwin assumed that the increase in information comes from natural selection. But, natural selection reduces genetic information and we know this from all the genetic studies that we have.”



2. Survival of the fittest is a part of the mechanism for evolutionary change in the theory. Survival of the fittest is a tautology.


Q. Why did it survive?

A. Because it is the fittest.

Q. How do you know it is the fittest?

A. Because it survived.

Circular reasoning! If a whale swims through a school of fish and eats 80% of them it is not survival of the fittest it is survival of the luckiest.



3. Genetic mutation is claimed to be the driver of evolution. Genetic mutation is almost always fatal. In the very rare examples it does not kill the organism it is never beneficial. Mutation only distorts what was already there, it does not create or add anything new.

Sometimes the example of sickle cell anemia is given as an example of a beneficial mutation because the sufferers of this disease cannot contract malaria. This is like saying being born with no feet is beneficial because you cannot contract athlete's foot!

“No matter how numerous they may be, mutations do not produce any kind of evolution” - **Pierre Paul Grasse, Evolution of living organism's 1977 p.88**

“Experiment; mutate fruit flies with radiation. Conclusions from fruit fly experiment 1. All mutations produced flies that were inferior to the original fruit fly.” – **In the beginning Walt Brown p.34**



In summary every suggested mechanism to drive the hypothesized macro evolutionary changes in the theory are logically fallacious and provably false.

Macro Evolution (ii) Proofs

1. Similarity in form and genetics across the spectrum of life is easily observed. An evolutionist will argue that this is evidence for a common ancestor. A creationist will state this is evidence for a common designer. These are interpretations and it is not evidence either way. It is simply a fact that living things share features.


None the less many claims of genetic similarity are in fact deceptions. An example is the claim that Chimpanzees are 98% similar to Human beings. This is untrue as the entire human genome is yet to be mapped and the same applies for chimps. What really happened was a small amount of DNA from blood was compared and found to be 98% similar. Human genome mapping 20%, Chimp genome mapping 6% source - <https://www.genome.gov> - Two previously completed mapping attempts were limited by technology. "...within the limits of today's technology, the human genome is as complete as it can be. Small gaps that are unrecoverable in any current sequencing method remain..."

"...Sizable portions of none similar sequences are typically omitted, markedly enhancing reported similarity data. As a result, estimates of similarity are inflated because of this 'cherry-picking' of the data" - **Jeffrey Tomkins, Ape-Man or Image of God**

More than this, anybody with a calculator can see that the claim chimps and humans are 98% similar is a lie. Humans have 46 chromosomes and chimps have 48. Even if chimps and humans shared identical DNA in all 46 chromosomes they share except the extra 2 the chimp has, this would still only equal 95.9%! But that doesn't stop or even slow the evolutionist's propaganda:

<http://www.amnh.org/exhibitions/permanent-exhibitions/human-origins-and-cultural-halls> -

"Humans and chimps share a surprising 98.8 percent of their DNA. How can we be so similar--and yet so different?" *Impossible - a provable lie!*



"Yes we share 98% of our genome with chimpanzees if we ignore 18% of their genome and 25% of ours." - <https://www.quora.com/Are-humans-really-98-similar-to-chimpanzees>

2. Vestigial structures (structures that are no longer used by an organism) are argued by an evolutionist as evidence for their theory. Firstly, not one supposed vestigial structure has ever been proven to be such. For example the human appendix was supposed to be vestigial, it has however been identified as a key part of the immune system (killer B cells). The coccyx has also been claimed to be a vestigial tail. This is also false, the coccyx plays a vital role in the function of the bowls and posture while sitting. Whale hips are presented as vestigial legs, another fallacy as it has been well established that these bones are used in mating and reproduction.

This list goes on and on and all of these ‘examples’ are still found in textbooks in schools to support evolution the world over despite being disproven long ago.

However, even if a vestigial structure could be found this is not and cannot be evidence for evolution. Losing a feature is evidence for devolution!

“Vestigial organs are fully functional” – **Jerry Bergman Ph.D. & George Howe Ph.D.**



3. Fossils. Now this is perhaps the most clear and obvious falsehood an evolutionist can tell. To state that fossils are evidence for evolution is so obviously false that they must be aware they are being deceitful or they are not qualified to speak on this topic. Not one single transitional fossil has ever been discovered. There should of course be countless.


"The number of intermediate varieties which have formerly existed on earth must be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory." - **Darwin, Origin of Species p.413**

“It is simply a fact that Darwin’s theory and the fossil record are in conflict.” – **Dr David Berlinski**



“...on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them.” - **Dr Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the prestigious British Museum of Natural History.**

“The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages has been a persistent and nagging problem for evolution” - Dr Stephen J Gould – Evolution now p.140

“In the years after Darwin his advocates hoped to find predictable progressions. In general these have not been found – yet the optimism has died hard, and some pure fantasy has crept into textbooks” - Raup, David M. Science Vol.213 1981



4. Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny (Embryonic development undergoes all the changes of the evolution of the species). This was first presented by Ernst Haeckel, covered in our earlier list of frauds. Despite this being proven to be a lie this is still taught as a fact in our school text books.



Merrill Earth Science 1993 p.451 - “The folds of skin in a human embryo neck have nothing at all to do with breathing. The folds grow into bones in the ear and glands in the throat. They are not gills.”

So to summarize, all the evidence presented for the theory of macro evolution can & has been thoroughly refuted, however it all remains taught worldwide in schools as facts of life not to be challenged.

Evidences Against the Theory of Macro Evolution

1. Irreducible complexity is when you find an organelle, organ or mechanism in a living thing which must arise with all its parts at once. This cannot occur through the process of gradual evolution. We find examples in every single cell & organism on Earth of irreducible complexity. Examples on the cellular level are flagellum, 26s proteasome, F1 ATPase enzyme, cilium and so on...


On a larger scale there are also many examples of irreducible complexity. The eye is a spectacular example.

Darwin himself had this to say about the eye – “To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree.”

Dr Ernst Mayer, Systematics and the origin of species – “it is a considerable strain on one’s credulity to assume that finely balanced systems such as certain sense organs (the eye of vertebrates or the birds feather could be improved by random mutations.”

“If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.” –

Darwin, Origin of Species p.154



“Everyone concludes naturally and comfortably that highly ordered and designed items (machines, houses etc.) owe existence to a designer. It is unnatural to conclude otherwise. But evolution asks us to break stride with that which is natural to believe and then believe in that which is unnatural, unreasonable and unbelievable.” – **R.L. Wysong, biologist**

“It is important to realize that we are not inferring design from what we do not know but from what we do know... biochemistry has opened the cell and we see that it, too, was designed.” – **Michael J Behe, molecular machines** - “The conclusion of intelligent design flows naturally from the data itself.”

2. Symbiosis in organisms and throughout nature is a real headache for an evolutionist. There are countless symbiotic relationships in nature and most, like irreducible complexity, cannot come about by a gradual process. For example oak trees have a fungus that lives only on their roots and they cannot live without each other, which came first? The oak tree has no residual trace of function to absorb the nutrients it requires from the soil through its roots without this fungus, and this fungus cannot live anywhere except upon the oak tree roots. The Australian termites have a codependent symbiotic relationship with three other organisms, all of which require all of the others to live, which came first? Even we are symbiotic with many forms of bacteria in our bodies and they actually make up 90% of our cells. The list goes on and on and on and on... This is the old chicken and the egg scenario. Some things *must* come into existence all at once and together.




“If it could be proved that any part of the structure of any one species had been formed for the exclusive good of another species it would annihilate my theory.” – **Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species pg.164**

3. Entropy. No proposed mechanism to drive any added changes to an organism exists in the theory of macro evolution. For macro evolution to happen there would have to be a natural force that creates and builds. Rather than this we have entropy - lack of order or predictability; gradual decline into disorder. This is the second law of thermodynamics.

Henry Morris, The Twilight of Evolution – “Regarding the second law of thermodynamics, it would hardly be possible to conceive of two more opposite principles than this principle of entropy increase and this principle of evolution. Each is precisely the converse of the other. As Aldus Huxley defined it, evolution involves a continual increase of order, organization, complexity and size. It seems axiomatic that both cannot possibly be true. But there is no question whatsoever that the second law of thermodynamics *IS* true.”


Sir Arthur Eddington, Astronomer, Physicist & Mathematician - “The law that entropy always increases holds, I think, the supreme position among the laws of Nature. If someone points out to you that your pet theory of the universe is in disagreement with Maxwell's equations — then so much the worse for Maxwell's equations. If it is found to be contradicted by observation — well, these experimentalists do bungle things sometimes. But if your theory is found to be against the second law of thermodynamics I can give you no hope; there is nothing for it but to collapse in deepest humiliation.”



4. Human 'evolution' - *Y chromosome* studies have presented compelling evidence for a single male Ancestor 'bottle necking' around 6000 – 10000 years ago - **DNA Mysteries, The Search for Adam || National Geographic BBC**

Mitochondrial studies have presented compelling evidence for a single female ancestor 'bottle necking' around 6000 – 10000 years ago - www.mhrc.net/mitochondrialEve.htm

Evolution tells us that man evolved over millions of years and didn't become modern man until 200,000 years ago, but genetic studies utterly debunk this. Additionally human population growth does not support this ancient, gradual evolutionary model either.




5. No Tree of life actually exists outside of the imagination and text books. If we look at some living things in the order of how much genetic data they are made of we see that it is in direct contradiction to the evolutionary 'tree of life'.

Organism	Chromosomes
Penicillin	2
Fruit fly	8
House fly	12
Pees	14
Honey Bee	16
Lettuce	18
Carrot	20
Kidney bean	22
Frog	26

Onion	32
Cat	38
Soybean	40
Wheat	42
Bat	44
Human	46
Chimp	48
Amoeba	50
Dog	78
Turkey	80
Sweet potato	90
Goldfish	94
Carp	100
White ash	138
Fern	480


“The really significant finding that comes to light from comparing the proteins’ amino acid sequence is that it is impossible to arrange them in any sort of evolutionary series... There is little doubt that if this molecular information was available a century ago the idea of organic evolution might never have been accepted.” – **Michael Denton, Evolution in Crisis pg.289 1985**

6. Mortality - All organisms have the ability to repair and regenerate their genome. The simple life forms, which evolution tells us the higher life forms evolved from, do not have “the end replication problems” aka aging. If evolution were true then other than fatal trauma or disease all organisms should be immortal. Telomeres are caps at the ends of chromosomes which snip parts off during replication, limiting the life span of an organism. This is a built in expiration date that has no business existing in the evolutionary world. There are, fascinatingly, some rare organisms which do not have this built in death clock, See *Turritopsis dohrnii* aka the immortal jellyfish.



7. DNA (Deoxyribonucleic Acid) has done nothing since its discovery by James Watson and Francis Crick in the early 1950's to help the evolution theory. On the contrary, the more we learn about the code of life, the more absurd the macro evolution theory appears. Nobody of sound mind would recon a book could ever write itself by an unintelligent, unguided process. DNA is a code, a language of unparalleled complexity. Codes do not write themselves.

Furthermore, proteins are essential to every cells existence. Proteins require DNA to be formed. Proteins are chains of specifically sequenced amino acids. Amino acids must combine in a precise sequence to form a protein. This sequence is dependent upon the bases in the DNA molecule. Proteins cannot form in any other way without DNA. Simply put, life requires proteins and proteins require DNA. The problem for evolutionists is that DNA alone is useless, it cannot do anything. DNA doesn't go anywhere or build anything without already existing proteins. This is because in order that DNA is transcribed and utilized in a cell, DNA requires already existing proteins to perform these functions. Think about this carefully. If life began with DNA, then you could never have life because DNA makes proteins, but needs existing proteins to make proteins. There must have been both DNA and proteins existing together to start life. Once again we have an irreducibly (& most incredibly) complex system that must come into existence all at once and together.



“DNA is like a software program, but it is more complex than anything we have ever been able to design.” – **Chuck Missler, engineer & author**

“The quantity of information is so vast we have to invent new numbers to measure it: not just terabytes (a trillion bits of genetic data) but petabytes (equivalent to half the contents of all the academic libraries in America), exabytes, yottabytes and zetabytes. All the words ever uttered by everyone who ever lived would amount to about 5 exabytes.” – **Time magazine, Feb 2003**

“The information contained in all the chromosomes of one human being, if typed out, would fill enough books to fill the Grand Canyon 78 times.” – **Dr. Walt Brown, In the Beginning pg.62**

“And now the announcement of Watson and Crick about DNA. This is for me the real proof of the existence of God.” - **Alan Lindsay Mackay, Crystallographer**

In summary I could continue to produce an almost in-exhaustive list of evidences against the macro evolution theory but I will just leave you with these few more considerations; *origin of meiosis* (sexual reproduction), *sleep* (the lack of requirement for such an unusual behavior, even in regards to conservation) and *orphan genes* (genes unique to certain organisms). Finally *transitional forms*; it is simply a clear and observable fact that there is no partially evolved anything anywhere!

Dr David Berlinski - “There is an incredible body of literature criticizing the theory of Darwinism.”

Abiogenesis (the spontaneous origin of life)

This is a supposed event when a rock came to life, or a soup depending on which evolutionist you talk to. This was a one-time deal of course because it doesn't happen anymore. Even though we live in a perfectly conducive environment for life and more biological matter exists now, it was still just a one-time hocus pocus magic lottery winning deal. An evolutionist claims that during the Archean era (a made up fairy tale time period) *"The first living cells emerged between 4 billion and 3.8 billion years ago. There is no record of the event"* - **Biology the unity and diversity of life Wadsworth 1992 p.300**

"It's almost as if science said, "Give me one free miracle, and from there the entire thing will proceed with a seamless, causal explanation."" - **Dr Rupert Sheldrake**

"The probability of just one deoxyribonucleic acid arranging itself by chance has been calculated to be just 1 in 10^{119,000}" – **Walt Brown, In the Beginning pg.12**

"It is extremely unlikely that a random search through all the possible amino acid sequences could generate even a single relatively short functional protein in the time available since the beginning of the universe" – **Steven C Meyer, Evidence for design in physics and biology**

"Nobody knows how a mixture of lifeless chemicals spontaneously organized themselves into the first living cell" - **Paul Davies, Australian Centre for Astrobiology, New Scientist 179**

Prokaryotic cells are the simplest organisms known. Prokaryotes are unicellular organisms that lack organelles or other internal membrane-bound structures. Therefore, they do not have a nucleus, but, instead, generally have a single chromosome: a piece of circular, double-stranded DNA located in an area of the cell called the nucleoid. These cells are immensely complicated and the single chromosome found in these cells contains a strand of DNA 6000 million miles long. - **University of Leicester, UK**

"The cell needs all its basic parts with their various functions for survival; therefore, if the cell had evolved it would mean that billions of parts would have had to come into existence at the same time, in the same place, and then simultaneously come together in a precise order." – **B.G Ranganatham, Origins**

Urey-Miller experiment 1952 was an attempt to simulate conditions on early earth and produce living compounds (amino acids). This experiment is shown in text books as a success but in reality was a failure. Only 6/20 amino acids were produced, half of which were left handed (all amino acids in life are right handed), tar made up 85%, carboxylic acid 13% and amino acids only 2% of the mixture (that's 98% toxic to life) and he did not include oxygen in the experiment - **Origins of life volume 12 1982**

"Problem 1. Ozone and UV light... Stanley Miller's experiment creates a conflict as life must and yet cannot evolve without oxygen".

"Spontaneous generation must be true, not because it has been proven in the laboratory, but because otherwise it would be necessary to believe in a creator" - **Records from the university of Jena trial in 1875**

To summarize, no scientific theory exists which adequately explains how life began and nobody can artificially create life. Only existing life begets life.

Other Theories for the Origin of Life

(i) Panspermia is a theory other than abiogenesis for the origin of life on Earth. Panspermia is also often known as ‘ancient aliens’. This notion is best summed up by **Richard Dawkins, Evolutionary Biologist**, when asked in an interview with **Ben Stein regarding the evidence for intelligent design in organisms and the origin of life** – “Well it could come about in the following way. In some earlier time somewhere in the universe, a civilization e-evolved, probably by some kind of ‘Darwinian means’ to a very high level of technology and designed a form of life which they seeded onto perhaps this planet.”

This ‘theory’ cannot of course be tested, observed and certainly has no evidence for it & is therefore not scientific.



Theoretical physicist Michio Kaku on *Big Think* TV show – “When we physicists look for aliens we don’t look for little green men. We look for type 1, type 2 and type 3 civilizations. Type 1 is planetary and is kind of like Buck Rogers. Type 2 is stellar and is similar to the federation of Star Trek. Type 3 is galactic and the empire of Star Wars would correspond to a type 3 civilization... we should see civilizations all over our galaxy. We see no evidence whatsoever.”

So in summary panspermia has no evidence, observation or test to confirm or support it. Furthermore we are simply seeing the problem of the origin of life transplanted to some ‘other world’ and we still must beg the questions, *when, where* and most importantly *how?*

(ii) Special Creation offers the hypothesis that life was created, this is also known as intelligent design. This hypothesis also incorporates the creation of not just life, but reality, including time. This addresses cause and effect or “who made them?” This idea is the oldest and most universal explanation of all origination. This is theism, and we call this creator *God*.

This is supported by the incredibly fine-tuned physics of our reality which must be just right for life to exist. Cosmologists have calculated the odds of a life-friendly universe appearing by chance are less than one part in $10^{10^{123}}$. That’s ten raised to a power of 10 with 123 zeros after it!

“There is now broad agreement amongst physicists and cosmologists that the universe is ‘fine-tuned’ for life.” – **P. C. W. Davies, *Int. Journal of Astrobiology* 2003**

Sir Fred Hoyle, *Engineering and Science*, pg.8 – “A common sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super intellect has monkeyed with the physics, as well as with chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature.”

An argument against special creation to explain the perfect conditions for a life friendly universe is the multi-verse theory. This is the idea that there are infinite universes and that we are just in the one which is so finely tuned. This 'theory' cannot be observed or tested and has no evidence for it.

Leonard Susskind, physicist – “If it’s not the multi-verse it’s intelligent design and we simply cannot have that.”

“Stephen Hawking himself admits that the theory that there are multiple universes is still just a theory. It is yet to be confirmed by any evidence.” - **BBC news report on Hawking’s new book ‘The Grand Design’**

John Hogan, Scientific American – “These multiverse theories all share the same fundamental defect: They can be neither confirmed nor falsified. Hence, they don’t deserve to be called scientific.”

To summarize, the evidence presented to us by science and other disciplines is that life did not accidentally happen and we did not get here by a slow process of change from simpler life forms. Rather the evidence paints a picture of design and creation.

Dr Berlinski – “Suppose we find, simply as a matter of fact that all our scientific inquiries point in one direction, which is that there is an intelligent creator. Why should we eliminate that from the discussion?”

Dr Antony Flew, atheistic rationalist philosopher who wrote 14 books on atheism – “It was the integrated complexity of the biological world... I now believe that the universe was brought into existence by an infinite intelligence. I believe that this universe’s intricate laws manifest what scientists call the mind of God. I believe that life and *re-production* of life originate in a divine source. Why do I now believe this given that I expounded and defended atheism for more than half a century? Because this is the world picture that has emerged from modern science.”

The Fruits of Evolutionism

The full title of Darwin's work "On the origin of species" is: "On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of **Favoured Races** in the Struggle for Life"

The philosophies that were born directly out of evolution theory have caused some of the most awful human tragedies of all time, and these philosophies and their tragic consequences are still proliferating to this day!

“With savages the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated. We ‘civilized’ men on the other hand do our best to check the process of elimination. We build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed and the sick. Thus the weak members of societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals would doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. Hardly anyone is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed. – **Charles Darwin, the decent of man.**

Dr Berlinski – “Darwinism is not a sufficient condition for a phenomenon like Nazism but it is certainly a necessary one.”

Dr Michael Egnor “Anybody who is aware of the true history of America, harbor some harsh feelings towards Darwinists because of the creation of eugenics. The attempt to ‘breed’ human beings was the darkest chapter of American history.”

Ben Stein, Documentary movie Expelled – No Intelligence Allowed – “Evil can sometimes be rationalized as science.”



In summary, evolution teaches us that we are mere animals and the result of pure chance. As a result entire generations have grown up with this worldview which often leads to nihilism, hedonism or worse...

William Provine, Historian of science – “Let me summarize my views on what modern evolutionary biology tells us loud and clear, and I must say that these are basically Darwin’s views. There are no gods, no purposeful forces of any kind and no life after death. When I die, I am absolutely certain that I am going to be completely dead. That’s just all—that’s going to be the end of me. There is no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning in life, and no free will for humans, either.”

Or another way to put it is “If God does not exist, everything is permissible.” - **Dostoyevsky**

Why Don't We Hear the Objections to Evolution Theory?

Dr Richard Thompson, Science philosopher – “Basically what you find is something we call a knowledge filter. This is a fundamental feature of science and human nature. People tend to filter out things that don't fit. In science you tend to find that evidence that doesn't fit the accepted paradigm will be eliminated. It's not taught, it is not discussed and people who are educated in scientific teachings generally don't even learn about it.”

In addition to this 'knowledge filter' there is also a strong prejudice and even persecution against anybody who criticizes evolution theory in the scientific community.

This quote from one of the world's most famous evangelical atheists and **evolutionary biologists Richard Dawkins** illustrates this kind of mind set perfectly - “It is absolutely safe to say that if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that).”

God Made Me



But I have to keep it a secret...

Ben Stein – “I love freedom... what would we lose if we start to lose our freedom, well I no longer need to imagine. It is happening. We are losing our freedom in one of the most important sectors of society - Science. I had always assumed that scientists were free to ask any question, to pursue any line of inquiry, without fear of reprisal. But recently I have been alarmed to discover that this is not the case.

So what happens to scientists and other professionals if they do criticize or offer alternatives to evolution theory? Some examples listed below...

Dr Richard Sternberg, evolutionary biologist, Smithsonian museum of natural history USA. Fired for publishing an article on intelligent design on 4 August 2004. - ***“These people were so upset about it that you could see they had a physical emotional reaction... I was viewed as an intellection terrorist!”***

Dr Caroline Crocker, Immunopharmacology University of Southampton UK. Fired for mentioning intelligent design in her class and has been blacklisted and unable to work in her field. - *“Since my name can be googled, when I get interviews and I get many interviews, I never get offered a job. I don’t have to tell them about my “science sin””.*

Dr Michael Egnor, neurosurgeon State University of New York USA. He stated publically that - “doctors do not need to study evolution to practice medicine.” Evolutionists have called for him to retire, to be fired and he has received innumerable slanders and abuses. He says - *“I knew when I publically questioned the adequacy of Darwin’s theory that I would encounter some criticism. What I didn’t expect was the viciousness or the baseness of it.”*

Dr Robert Marks, engineer Baylor University USA. Had his research website shut down and was forced to return grant money because he was presenting evidence for intelligent design. He says - *“I feel for the young people in this country right now because of this scientism gulag, it is really terrible.”*
Robert V. Gentry had a similar experience because of his work on polonium halos.

Dr Guillermo Gonzalez, Astronomer Iowa State University USA. Because he stated a case for intelligent design in his book, he has come under incredible fire by colleagues who have petitioned to have him removed from his position. He says - *“I have little doubt I would have tenure now if I had not done any work on intelligent design. I doubt I will ever get tenure now.”*

Pamela Winnick, journalist, refused to take sides in an article focusing on the debate between atheism and creationism, she too had her career ended. She said - *“I am not religious, not Jewish or Christian. I was not taking a position in favour of either side. That didn’t matter... There were hate letters... If you write anything about intelligent design you are just finished as a journalist.”*

.....

This is a sad fact that is not obvious to the public who holds our scientific establishment up on such a high pedestal. The thought that false religions could be being taught in our school classrooms as science is almost unthinkable, and yet that is exactly what is happening today in much of the world.

Fortunately there are many within the scientific community that are fighting to have their voices heard and some of these are listed for you below:

.....

“Evolution became in a sense a scientific religion... many are prepared to bend their observation to fit in with it.” – **H.S Lipson, Physics Bulletin**

“Evolution is a kind of dogma which its own priests no longer believe, but which they uphold for the people” - **Paul Lemione, Director of the national museum of natural history of France**

“Evolution is a fairy tale for grownups. The theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless.” - **Professor Louis Bounoure, Director of the Strasbourg zoological museum**

Dr Jonathon Wells, molecular biologist – “I love science. The way Darwinism corrupts the evidence and distorts the evidence is bad for science.”

"I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it has been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so flimsy and dubious a hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has." - **Malcolm Muggeridge Philosopher - University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada**

"Scientists that go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great conmen, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever. In explaining evolution we do not have one iota of fact." - **Dr T.N Tahmisian, Atomic energy commission USA**

"Evolution is not a fact. Evolution does not even qualify as a theory or hypothesis." - **Dr Karl Popper**

"There are presently no detailed Darwinian accounts of any biological or cellular system, only a variety of wishful speculations." - **Franklin M Harold 2001 – Oxford University Press**

Dr. Richard Lumsden - professor of parasitology and cell biology at Tulane University in Louisiana –
"Evolution is bankrupt as a scientific theory."

"The theory of undirected evolution is already dead" – **Michael J Behe, Biologist**

Epilogue

Is it right because you believe it or do you believe it because it is right? Evolution is the choice religion for those who do not want to believe in God.

"I suppose the reason why we leapt at the origin of species was that the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores." – **Julian Huxley, evolutionary biologist**

Geneticist Richard Lewontin – "We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs. In spite of its failure to fulfil many of its extravagant promises... In spite of the tolerance of the scientific community of unsubstantiated 'just so' stories. Why? Because we cannot allow a divine foot in the door!"

"Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, and that is unthinkable." - **Sir Arthur Keith**

"I do not want to believe in God. Therefore I chose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible: spontaneous generation arising to evolution." – **George Wald, Harvard University nobel laureate**

"Often a cold shudder has run through me, & I have asked myself whether I have devoted myself to a fantasy." - Charles Darwin, **letter to C. Lyell 23.11.1887**

Genesis 1:24

And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so.