

# Questions for evolutionists

## Introduction

This paper is intended to be as simple as possible, without extended argumentation, to highlight flaws in evolutionary theory. To do this it will take the form of a number of questions posed to convinced evolutionists, which demonstrate some severe scientific problems in supporting evolutionary theory.

Not all these questions are claimed to be especially original; many such questions are either found in Creationist apologetics or are inspired by them by inference. However, the majority of these questions were first written without reference to other works, then some further excellent questions were adapted from a large number of books, magazines, talks and videos where the same questions appear repeatedly or where the information suggested a question to me.<sup>1</sup> I believe that a few of my questions are unique.

In this paper, evolutionary theory is considered to be the basis of modern cosmology including the origin of the earth and its features (geology), as well as the origin of life on earth and the consequent development of animals and plants on earth (biology, palaeontology, botany). In popular usage, the evolution of: the cosmos, of the earth, of the earth's features, of chemistry, of plant life and of animal life are encapsulated under the same evolutionary umbrella.

## General principles

### Evolutionary position in simple terms

Life and the universe evolved from simple structures to more complex ones over a period of billions of years. Life and the universe evolved, on its own, from nothing.

### Questions

Q. Where did the laws come from that govern the universe?

Q. The laws of thermodynamics teach that the nature is running down, that entropy prevails and that everything is degenerating. The latest genetic discoveries demonstrate that the genome of all creatures is also running down and sophisticated computer programmes can actually tell us at what generation the genome will be destroyed. The fossil record also shows us that the same animals we now see once had ancestors that were very much larger. Great White sharks, for example, which grow to about 20 feet or so, had ancestors that were in excess of 20 metres.

The question is, in the face of evidence everywhere that the natural processes are running down and decaying, how can evolutionary theory stand up, which is based upon the principle that everything in nature is developing upwards; that simple life forms are gradually becoming more complex and that the universe gradually developed into increasing order from a chaotic explosion?

---

<sup>1</sup> Of particular use was Walter T Brown; *'In the Beginning: Compelling Evidence for Creation and the Flood'*; available in print and searchable on the Internet as well as the *Creation Science Movement* newsletters.

Q, Why are carbon 14 and similar dating processes used to prove an old earth when they are unreliable? Repeatedly, living objects have been claimed to be thousands of years old.<sup>2</sup> Different parts of the same animal have been dated differently. Animals have been dated differently from trees next to them in a rock.

Q. If evolutionary theories are true, why does evolution hinder real science? ‘*Over the last 100 years, almost all of biology has proceeded independent of evolution, except evolutionary biology itself. Molecular biology, biochemistry, physiology, have not taken evolution into account at all.*’<sup>3</sup>

Q. Why is evolution taught as if it were a science subject and not a theory of history? Since it does not depend upon observation and repeatable experiments, it is not science. There is no empirical proof for it.<sup>4</sup>

Q. Why do most evolutionists deny that their theory is a religion or philosophy based upon faith and not scientific observation? If Creationism is denied in schools, why is evolution taught instead? Note: Karl Popper, ‘*Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory, but a metaphysical [religious] research programme.*’<sup>5</sup> Michael Ruse, ‘*Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.*’<sup>6</sup>

Q. Why did evolutionists support (and in many cases still teach) so many fraudulent artefacts and theories, such as Piltdown Man, Lucy, Java Man, archaeopteryx, vestigial organs, recapitulation theory, peppered moth evolution, horse evolution etc?

Q. Why is it more absurd to believe in a creator than to believe that life arose accidentally from rock, rain or hydrogen, or a combination of all three, by a process that no one understands or has witnessed?

## Cosmology

### Evolutionary position in simple terms

The universe began in an event known as the ‘Big Bang’. This was an explosion occurring 13.75 billion years ago, which spewed out the whole universe so that it is still expanding outwards. The Earth was formed about 4.4 billion years ago from a molten mass which gradually cooled down. [This is the most popular explanation, the one that appears in school text-books and the one constantly broadcast by BBC documentaries.]

### Questions

Q. What exploded in the big bang? Where did the matter come from?

Q. Where did the space come from that the singularity exploded into?

---

<sup>2</sup> Living mollusc shells were tested as 2,300 years old. *Science*, Vol 141 (1963), p634-637. There are many other similar examples.

<sup>3</sup> Dr Marc Kirschner, chair of the Department of Systems Biology, Harvard Medical School, *Boston Globe*, 23 October 2005.

<sup>4</sup> If you want a laugh note Richard Dawkins who said, ‘*Evolution has been observed. It’s just that it hasn’t been observed while it’s happening.*’ [pbs.org/now/printable/transcript349\\_full\\_print.html](http://pbs.org/now/printable/transcript349_full_print.html), 3 December, 2004.

<sup>5</sup> Popper, K.; [philosopher of science] *Unended Quest*, Fontana, Collins, Glasgow, p. 151, 1976.

<sup>6</sup> Ruse is an evolutionist science philosopher; ‘How evolution became a religion: creationists correct?’ *National Post*, pp. B1,B3,B7 May 13, 2000.

Q. Where did the energy come from to make the big bang?

Q. In the last hundred years it has been postulated by evolutionists that the big bang event began with the explosion of something that was originally estimated as trillions of miles across and then gradually whittled down to something that was the size of a full stop in a sentence and now is said to be nothing.<sup>7</sup> Which is correct?

Q. On what ground can evolutionists say that a Big Bang occurs every 80-100 billion years?

Q. The law of conservation of angular momentum means that all the objects in the universe should continue spinning in the same direction as the original object that was spinning in the Big Bang. However, two planets [Venus and Uranus] are spinning in the reverse direction to everything else, so are six moons (some say as many as 30). How is this possible?

Q. Explosions cause chaos and random activity; how did the universe organise itself into perfect structures and order?

Q. Why did the Big Bang create matter to be distributed in clusters in the cosmos (galaxies) with large spaces between them? An explosion should have distributed matter evenly.

Q. Since the gravity of a black hole is strong enough to even stop light escaping, how did all matter in the universe escape the singularity of the Big Bang [where all matter was squashed into the size of a full-stop on a sentence or less]?

Q. Where did the heavy elements come from? Fusion in stars cannot produce them. In fact, where did all the elements come from?

Q. Evolutionists claim that it is irrational for Creationists to believe in a God who can be in more than one place at a time and cannot be seen. So why is it not irrational for evolutionists to posit that a particle can be seen in two places at once, or not in either, and to base a branch of science on the existence of a particle which cannot be seen?<sup>8</sup>

Q. Why is the Big Bang theory published as fact in school textbooks, and widely popularised, when many modern scientists no longer believe in it? For example, Sir Fred Hoyle, the scientist who coined the term in 1950, later strongly rejected the theory: '*The Big Bang* is an irrational process that cannot be described in scientific terms ... [nor] challenged by an appeal to observation.'<sup>9</sup> Hoyle's, 'Steady-State theory' and the modern 'Bounce Theory' are also contenders for origins of the cosmos and none has any proof whatsoever. Why do textbooks teach the Big Bang as fact when this is unproven?

Q. Observation of polonium halos<sup>10</sup> in granite rocks demonstrate that the earth was not originally a molten mass. How can evolutionists maintain this position?

---

<sup>7</sup> George Edward Lemaitre originally stated that it was light years in diameter. In 1965 this was reduced to 275 million miles. In 1972 it was reduced again to 71 million miles. In 1974 it was 54,000 miles. In 1983 it was the trillionth of the diameter of a proton and today it equals nothing at all.

<sup>8</sup> As in particle physics, the uncertainty principle and quantum mechanics. Note particularly the theories around the search for the Higgs boson particle (the supposed basis of mass).

<sup>9</sup> *Cosmic Times*, 1955. Helge Kragh; *Cosmology and Controversy: The Historical Development of Two Theories of the Universe*, Princeton University Press, p192.

<sup>10</sup> Polonium halos could have formed only if the rapidly 'effervescing' specks of polonium had been instantly encased in solid rock. The occurrence of these polonium halos implies that earth was formed in a very short

Q. What is the origin of the moon? [The usual evolutionary arguments do not stack up.]

Q. Why are comets still observed if the earth is billions of years old; they should have disappeared by now? [The usual evolutionary arguments do not comply with known facts.]

Q. Where do comets come from? [Not the Oort cloud or any of the other theories.]

Q. Why are there no meteorites in old rocks?

Q. Where did the atmosphere come from?

Q. How do stars form?

Q. In 1988, the Russian spacecraft, Phobos-2, detected gas venting on Phobos and Deimos (the moons of Mars). Enceladus (the sixth-largest of the moons of Saturn) is also venting gas, as are other solar system features. Such venting must have begun recently not millions or billions of years ago. How can evolutionists explain this?

Q. A uniform rate of salination, presumed by uniformitarianism, would make the ocean only 7,000 years old. How can you account for the saline level of the ocean if the earth is billions of years old?

Q. Astronomers have observed that supernovas (star explosions) occur every thirty years or so. Why is it then that we only see less than 300 supernovas; there should be millions of them if the cosmos is billions of years old?

Q. Galaxies have a left-hand spin, amino acids needed for life are left-handed, sub-atomic neutrinos are left-handed.<sup>11</sup> Does this not show intelligent design to provide dynamic stability in the universe?

Q. In the standard model of the Big Bang, how did matter survive since it should have been annihilated by an equal amount of anti-matter?<sup>12</sup>

Q. The standard model of the Big Bang does not explain 80% of the matter in the universe (dark matter) and makes no mention of gravity. Why is it used as a popular explanation of the origin of the universe by most evolutionists?

## Origins of life

### Evolutionary position in simple terms

Life arose on the earth 3.6 billion years ago when the earth was a rock that had cooled down from a molten mass. Rain poured down on this rock forming lakes and in those lakes basic chemical elements arose by chance (perhaps stimulated by gamma rays, hydrogen or lightning) and mixed together to form basic amino acids. These, through some unknown stimulus, eventually made proteins, from whence came a living cell. From this cell all animal life arose.

Other chance cells led to all plant life.

---

time and not on a molten mass which slowly cooled down over millions of years. See Dr. Robert Gentry; *Creation's Tiny Mystery*, Earth Science Associates, Knoxville, (1986).

<sup>11</sup> *New Scientist*, 25 Aug. 2012, p6.

<sup>12</sup> *New Scientist*, 8 Sep. 2012, p30.

## Questions

Q. How did cellular life come into being? How did the first protein form? A basic cell needs hundreds of proteins and amino acids do not suddenly form into protein by accident.

Q. If you take a test tube with some water, some salts, the right heat and all the necessary constituents to support life, and place in that test-tube one living cell, that cell will be able to continue living for some time. If you then use a needle and break open the cell wall and all the molecules within that cell come out, you will not be able to create life from those constituent parts of the cell. You have all that is needed for life, all the molecules are fully formed, but you will still be unable to create life from those molecules. You can break Humpty Dumpty but you can't put him back together again. Therefore the question for evolutionists is, how can it be possible that life emerged from primordial soup of chemicals in a nascent earth?

Q. DNA is essentially a well designed coded sequence or language. Codes always require an intelligent designer and cannot make themselves. Therefore, how could DNA have evolved from nothing?

Q. How did bio-chemicals, involving enzymes in sequential co-operation, evolve? Every tiny machine functioning within a cell requires multiple protein and enzyme components working together. This cannot have occurred by accident.

Q. The motor functions in a cell cannot work until every component is in place and functioning separately; how could such a motor evolve over millions of years within a cell?

Q. Is it feasible to believe that life appeared on the earth at exactly the same moment that oxygen appeared in the atmosphere?

Q. If some vague kind of simple animal evolved from cellular creatures, what did the first animal eat and with whom did it mate?

Q. Why do evolutionists ignore the statements of very eminent scientists who deny this theory? One example is Sir Fred Hoyle, '*Life cannot have had a random beginning ... The trouble is that there are about two thousand enzymes, and the chance of obtaining them all in a random trial is only one part in  $10^{40,000}$ , an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup.*'<sup>13</sup> Hoyle again: '*The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way is comparable with the chance that a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.*'<sup>14</sup>

Q. Ferns have a larger genome than man; are we all evolving into ferns?

Q. Where do insects come from?

Q. Why do textbooks use the example of fruit flies with an extra pair of wings as evidence that mutations lead to evolution? The flies are damaged, not helped, by this mutation; the extra wings had no muscles and the flies would not survive in the wild? It disproved evolution.

Q. Why is the point constantly made in books and films that man came from apes, via ape-like human transitional species, when there is no evidence for this and evolutionists disagree about the ancestry of man?

---

<sup>13</sup> Fred Hoyle and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe; *Evolution from Space*, London: J.M. Dent & Sons, (1981).

<sup>14</sup> Fred Hoyle; 'Hoyle on evolution', *Nature*, Vol. 294, No. 5837 (November 12, 1981), p105.

Q. How do evolutionists get round the law of Mass Action, which means that life could not have formed in a primordial soup of chemicals?<sup>15</sup>

Q. Since amino acids, formed at random in a watery solution, will be either right or left-handed, with some of each [a racemic mix]; and since only left-handed amino acids can be used for life proteins (right-handed proteins in this mixture are fatal); how could they form a functional protein without a designer to sort out the right amino acids?

Q. Why do evolutionists state that life has been created in a laboratory experiment when it has not? [Miller's experiment was supposed to have formed life from gas and water. In fact he proved that life could not begin this way. Although he made a couple of amino acids (out of the hundreds needed to make life<sup>16</sup>) these could not have developed or survived without external action. Miller used gases like methane and ammonia but excluded oxygen. This was because oxygen would have oxidised the amino acids, destroying them. So his experiment required the lack of oxygen. However, he required ammonia, but this would have been destroyed in a primordial world by UV light rays. It requires the ozone layer to block the UV light, which requires oxygen. So the experiment both requires oxygen but also cannot have oxygen in the atmosphere. Furthermore, 98% of the mixture (a sort of tar) was toxic to life and the amino acids bonded with this mixture. In addition, the earth has always had oxygen present in higher levels than today. This is proved by air bubbles trapped in amber revealing 50% more oxygen than today.<sup>17</sup>]

Q. DNA can encode approximately 100 billion DVDs per gram of single stranded DNA. Surely this can be no accident?<sup>18</sup> This is five or six orders of magnitude denser than currently available digital memory.

## The fossil record

### Evolutionary position in simple terms

The fossil record demonstrates evolution in action. The extinct species that we have dug up, such as dinosaurs, are extinct creatures that gave rise to modern life-forms over millions of years. For instance, birds came from earlier lizards.

### Questions

Q. Why are there no transitional fossils? There should be millions of examples if evolution constantly occurred in the past and since we have so many extinct fossil species.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The Law of Mass Action = the rate of chemical reactions depends on the content of the constituents. Any reversible reaction will never continue in a direction to produce what is already in excess. This is because amino acids, combining in a watery environment to form dipeptides (baby proteins), release water - and this action is reversible (i.e. they are destroyed in the water). Even the simplest form of life requires a huge number of these building blocks. The 'primordial soup' process could never come close to building these proteins.

<sup>16</sup> This is like throwing matchsticks on the ground and a few sort of make one or two letters; when to make life is like producing many books of letters in coded sequences, say like the Oxford Dictionary.

<sup>17</sup> See *Time* magazine, Nov 9, (1987), p82. Michael Denton; *Evolution: A theory in Crisis*, p262.

<sup>18</sup> *New Scientist*; 25 Aug. 2012, p8.

<sup>19</sup> Note Stephen Jay Gould [Harvard palaeontologist]: '*The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of palaeontology*'. Evolution's erratic pace, *Natural History* 86(5):14, May 1977. Stephen M. Stanley (an evolutionist) of Johns Hopkins University: '*In fact, the fossil record does not convincingly document a single transition from one species to another.*' *The New Evolutionary Timetable* (1981), p95.

Q. How do evolutionists explain the presence of blood and soft tissue in several dinosaur fossils like T-Rex? <sup>20</sup> [Blood and soft tissue cannot survive for more than a few hundred, or at a stretch, a few thousand years. T-Rex is supposed to be 65 million years old.]

Q. Why are living fossils like the coelacanth unchanged over millions of years?<sup>21</sup>

Q. How did lizards evolve into birds when all their physiological systems are very different? A creature changing its structures would have died since it was neither one nor the other. [The blood system, bone structure, eyes, reproductive organs, heart, body structure are very different. For instance, changing a lizard skeleton to a bird's hollowed out bone structure would have led that lizard to break every bone in his body and be unable to feed.]

Q. Why do we see a sudden explosion of complex life in the fossil record (Cambrian period)? Is this not conducive to the Creationist argument?

Q. Fossilisation rarely takes place in nature, so why are there millions of fossils? Surely this points to a catastrophic global flood?

Q. There are many examples of dinosaur and human footprints in the same rock. How can this be possible?<sup>22</sup>

Q. Why is the evolution of the horse from eohippus still found in textbooks and museum exhibits when it has been known to be a pure lie since 1950?<sup>23</sup>

Why are Neanderthals claimed to be pre-humans when they show intelligence, they interbred with humans (according to a study of the genomes of three cases)<sup>24</sup> and they knew how to self-medicate by eating medicinal plants?<sup>25</sup>

## Natural observations of life on Earth

### Evolutionary position in simple terms

All life on earth evolved from simple single-celled animals that arose in a primordial soup of chemicals which emerged from the action of rain on the rocky earth. Natural selection is the survival of the fittest species; successful species survived, less efficient life-forms became extinct.

### Questions

Q. We now know that even single-celled animals have structures that are immensely complicated. There is no such thing as a simple cell; even parts of the cell (e.g. flagella) are

---

<sup>20</sup> Also in a Hadrosaur bone and a Lambeosaurus. Cells include ligaments, haemoglobin, laminin and collagen. One team brought back over 200 pounds of unfossilised dinosaur bones.

<sup>21</sup> 'The maintenance of stability within species must be considered as a major evolutionary problem.' Gould, S.J. and Eldredge, N.; 'Punctuated equilibrium comes of age'. *Nature* 366:223–224, 1993.

<sup>22</sup> As well as the disputed Paluxy riverbed examples there are (were) also examples in New Mexico, a Turkmenian plateau and Tumbler Ridge in British Columbia.

<sup>23</sup> Eohippus is Hyracotherium, which is not a horse but is like a modern hyrax; the ribs, toes and digestive system is different to a horse. This evolution was made up by Othniel C. Marsh in 1874 from fossils scattered across the world. Modern horses are found in lower layers than 'ancient' horses. GG Simpson said, 'The evolution of the horse family was intentionally falsified', 'Evolutionary determinism and the fossil record', *Scientific Monthly*, Vol 71, Oct. 1950, p264.

<sup>24</sup> *New Scientist*; 4 Aug. 2012, Instant expert 25: Fossils.

<sup>25</sup> *New Scientist*; 28 July 2011, p14.

complex.<sup>26</sup> The most basic cell is more complex than a NASA space shuttle (containing the equivalent of 4,000 books of coded information). How can evolutionists maintain their position?

Q. Does not the massive complexity of cells demand an intelligent designer?

Q. How can termites have evolved since they are dependent upon another creature in their stomach to digest the cellulose that they eat? The evolving termite without the dependent creature would die out from starvation.

Q. What is the mechanism for evolutionary development in an animal? It cannot be mutations since these are usually detrimental to the animal and always involve a decrease or scrambling of genetic information.<sup>27</sup>

Q. Name a life form which has been observed to add information to its genome?

Q. Name an animal that has given birth to another species?<sup>28</sup>

Q. Why is there no observation of evolution going on today?

Q. Why is there information on evolution in many school textbooks which is known to be false (such as the evolution of the horse from eohippus<sup>29</sup> or of recent evolution of peppered moths).

Q. Ernst Haeckel's claims that embryology reveals a former evolution [recapitulation theory] was based upon lies and imagination, such as claiming that folds in a human foetus are gill slits. He was prosecuted for fraud by his own university and his drawings of foetuses are falsified. Why is it that school textbooks still use this argument to support evolution and even publish the fraudulent drawings?

Q. Natural selection is a selective process, which chooses and prioritises existing information (e.g. to cause variations). Why is this considered to be a creative process by evolutionists? It does nothing to create new genes. The death of unsuccessful creatures and the survival of the fittest ones does not explain the origins of the traits that make an organism adapted to its environment.

Q. How did sexual reproduction evolve since it requires two types of physical genitalia to evolve at the same time? Sexual reproduction is also less efficient than asexual reproduction, yet it appears in the higher (more complex) orders.

---

<sup>26</sup> A single cilium (tiny hair used to move a cell) contains over 200 different kinds of proteins and is complex in design, having tubes within tubes, with strands and rods aligned down the length, and a motor powering the cilium within it. Other single-celled animals have a flagellum, a larger organ that acts like a propeller. The motors that drive these appendages are incredibly complicated consisting of the filament (propeller), a universal joint, different types of bushing, rods (drive shaft), rotors, several layers of membranes and so on. These motors are not situated in the filament but in the cell at the base of the filament. Energy is supplied by a flow of acid through the bacterial membrane. It requires about 240 proteins to function.

<sup>27</sup> Mutations are accidental copying mistakes where the DNA code letters get exchanged, deleted or added, genes duplicated, chromosome inversions, etc. Mutations are known for their destructive effects, including over 1,000 human diseases such as haemophilia; they rarely help the host animal.

<sup>28</sup> Stephen J. Gould: *'Every paleontologist knows that most species don't change. That's bothersome....brings terrible distress. ....They may get a little bigger or bumpier but they remain the same species and that's not due to imperfection and gaps but stasis. And yet this remarkable stasis has generally been ignored as no data. If they don't change, its not evolution so you don't talk about it.'* Lecture at Hobart & William Smith College, 14.2.1980.

<sup>29</sup> The former term for hyracotherium, see 'fossils'.



Q. How did a simple life-form based on asexual reproduction suddenly decide to reproduce sexually? In the transition from asexual to sexual reproduction it would have died out since it would have a transitional period of neither organs.

Q. What is the purpose of reproduction in an evolutionary system which is based upon the survival of the fittest individual? Producing more individuals would be competition for resources.

Q. If animals evolve, why have many animals failed to evolve? Horseshoe crabs, coelacanths and many others show no evolution. Indeed coelacanths were thought to be extinct millions of years ago until rediscovered a few decades ago.

Q. How did evolution from chemicals create intelligence and morality?

Q. Does not evolutionary theory lead to nihilism?

Q. If natural selection leads men to virility and fitness to reproduce promiscuously, where do families come from?

Q. If natural selection leads humans to be self-centred and aggressive, fighting for survival, [this is the essence of Darwinian theory, 'the selfish gene'] how do we explain altruism, philanthropy, selflessness, and divine worship?

Q. If the digestive system evolved, how did the stomach and intestines initially manage to resist digestive juices?

Q. Since excretion is not required until a digestive system has been formed, and a digestive system is not required until a mouth and saliva glands have evolved, how did the transitional animal survive with a mouth and no digestion? Richard Dawkin's answer is that, '*Evolution is not like that*'. But it is; a single celled animal had to evolve into a multi-celled animal and, at some point, the simple creature had to evolve a mouth instead of absorbing nutrients through the cell wall. Similar questions could be asked regarding the human respiratory system, or the skeletal and vascular systems.

Q. If a Bombardier Beetle evolved, how could it stop the chemicals it produces for fending off predators (which mix to create an explosion) destroying it before it developed its then necessary chemical inhibitors?

Q. How did insects that live on and pollinate plants survive until the plants arrive? Or how did the plants survive until the insects arrived?

Q. How did animals survive until an immune system evolved?

Q. Many animals live in symbiosis with others. How did these survive before the other evolved?

Q. It has been discovered that simple organisms, such as social insects (e.g. honey bees), have advanced cognitive abilities.<sup>30</sup> How can such advanced brainpower have evolved in a simple organism? Such a brain ought to develop in higher animals later.

Q. How did mimicry evolve?

---

<sup>30</sup> BBC News; <http://goo.gl/huQo4> 8 October 2012.

Q. How did metamorphosis evolve?

Q. How could extremely complex organs (such as the eye, ear, and brain) have evolved gradually?

Q. Why do school textbooks still use photos of peppered moths on tree trunks as evidence for evolution by natural selection? Firstly, even if a variation occurred as a result of industrialisation it is not a change into a new species; they are still moths. Further, it has been known since the 1980s that the moths don't normally rest on tree trunks, that the studies were falsified and that the pictures were staged?

Q. Why do textbooks teach that the changes to beaks in Galapagos finches during a severe drought prove evolution when no new species were created (they all remained finches) and the changes were reversed after the drought ended?

Q. Slime mould is a single celled organism known as a protist. These live on yeast, bacteria and fungi. However, recent studies have revealed that they have a primitive 'brain' possessing an external memory and internal communication abilities.<sup>31</sup> How can such complexity fit in with the evolutionist plan? Such primitive organisms could not have developed interpretation of external conditions, reasoning, memory and decision making properties without an external designer.

Q. Plants have sight, touch, smell, taste and hearing.<sup>32</sup> All these are vital to self-defence, reproduction and growth and all had to be working at the beginning or there would have been no second generation. Does this not completely deny any plant evolution?

## Geology

### Evolutionary position in simple terms

The sedimentary layers of the earth's crust were laid down slowly over millions of years and then eroded by the weather and river formation to form structures like valleys and canyons. These layers are variously named (e.g. Cambrian) to describe ages of earth. In each layer is found a certain type of fossil, which is used to age the strata ('index fossil'); similarly, fossils are dated by the strata that they are discovered in.<sup>33</sup>

### Questions

Q. How can evolutionists defend the idea that sedimentary rock strata were composed over millions of years, thus giving us the geological ages, when polystrate trees appear, in various places, which occur upright in many layers simultaneously?

Q. How can evolutionists still maintain that geological structures were formed slowly over millions of years when we have observed a small Grand Canyon-like feature form quickly over weeks at Mt. St. Helens? Why do evolutionists maintain a theory (uniformitarianism) that have never seen and deny the evidence of something that has been observed and studied by many scientists which contradicts it (Mt. St. Helens)?

---

<sup>31</sup> BBC News; <http://goo.gl/9Mknd> 10 October 2012.

<sup>32</sup> As explained by *New Scientist*; 28 Sept. 1998 and 25 Aug. 2012, p34.

<sup>33</sup> This is circular reasoning.

Q. Rock layers thousands of feet thick (that were laid down separately over supposedly hundreds of millions of years and already hardened) have been folded without fracturing? How can sedimentary layers of solid rock be folded without breaking? Surely this can only happen if they are wet (i.e. in the flood) before they solidified?

Q. Why do we find no complete example of the geological column in nature (if we did it would have to be 100 miles thick)? Surely this is a figment of Charles Lyell's imagination?

Q. How can dormant bacteria be found inside rocks that are supposedly millions of years old and in meteorites that are billions of years old?

Q. How can seashells be found on the top of every mountain range?

Q. Rock expert Johannes Walther concluded that banks (strata) were formed sideways; Particles of sediments flowing from rivers, floods and wind were collecting according to their density. The larger and heavier ones settled first at the top, lighter ones were washed a little farther out and the lightest further still. Particles of sediment sort themselves out as a result of size, forming sideways. The oldest rocks are, therefore, not the lowest. In the 1970-80's, vertical columns were bored in the Pacific sea floor by the Glomar Challenger deep sea boring vessel. The results showed that Walther's discoveries applied to deep-sea sediments. This means that all sedimentary rocks were formed the same way, therefore, banks do not show geological age at all. In fact part of different banks could be of equal age. In 1980, the Mt. St Helens volcano explosion resulted in the same thing: rocks and canyons were formed in hours, all with strata looking as if they were millions of years old. Sedimentologist Guy Berthault has performed a number of laboratory experiments to test these issues. He has discovered that the flow of sand, in all conditions, sorts itself out into alternating deposits of particles that look like layers but are not. Strata are NOT successive layers of sediment. A single layer of sediment can sort itself out into several strata. Strata provide no indication of age. This is why younger fossils can be found in lower strata than older ones at the top. Since this basic principle of uniformitarianism is now defunct, why are evolutionists still using it to age fossils and support their theory?

Q. Why are there unfrozen lakes in Antarctica? How could they remain unfrozen for millions of years?

Q. Why is the earth's magnetic field so large (2,000 times larger than Mercury, Venus, and Mars combined)?

## Conclusion

Awkward questions for evolutionists could be increased ad infinitum since continuing discoveries heap up to embarrass the flawed science. Instead of listing hundreds of questions, we have here limited ourselves to concise key questions that evolutionists cannot successfully answer.

Even if evolutionists could answer some of these questions, there are enough extremely serious, fundamental, unanswerable questions which undermine evolutionary theory. Independent thinkers should evaluate the actual facts and make their own minds up. As one very eminent scientist stated,

Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless.<sup>34</sup>

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2012**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

---

<sup>34</sup> Professor Louis Bounoure, former president of the Biological Society of Strassbourg, Director of the Strassbourg Zoological Museum, Director of Research at the French National Center of Scientific Research. (Quoted in *The Advocate*, 8 March 1984.)