

# The faith of evolutionists

## Introduction

Atheists (but not true scientists) deride Christians for believing in certain things, like creation ex nihilo. Christians are castigated as being irrational; that their faith denies objective reality – thus they are foolish and fit for lampooning. So evolutionists constantly berate Christians for holding a faith position regarding life on earth and the origin of the universe that flies in the face of popular science.

In fact, it is my contention in this paper that it is actually evolutionists that are holding a faith position based upon lies and zero evidence, not Christians. Most people simply do not realise that many of the arguments of evolutionists are based upon pure faith and no scientific evidence whatsoever. More and more this is being realised in the academic scientific community (as I will show).

The reason for this is that the media, driven by establishment agendas, is a propaganda machine for evolution. Everywhere you turn, false information is being pushed down the throats of customers by popular media presenters when there is no evidence for what they are telling you. They will tell you that it is scientific, logical and agreed by most rational thinkers. In fact all these statements are false: many evolutionary arguments are not scientific, not rational and not agreed by most scientists. In fact pure historical Darwinism is now denied by a growing majority of good scientists while more and more hard evidence emerges disproving basic claims of evolutionary theory.

For example: in one of David Attenborough's biological documentaries (possibly 'Life on Earth') he filmed a type of lizard that ate the fruit of a certain tropical tree. This tree was very tall and the fruit was at the top. The bark of this tree had thorny scales that pointed upwards. The lizard had to slowly crawl to the top of the tree, eat the fruit and then manoeuvre down the pointed scales. Attenborough, based on no evidence whatsoever, then had the audacity to say that as a result of the pain caused by the scales, the lizard gradually turned into a bird in order to get to the fruit more easily!!! Yet Attenborough has impeccable credentials as being authoritative and trustworthy about science when, in fact, he makes statements that are pure fiction, that have no scientific support and are, frankly, ludicrous and foolish.

When you garner all the facts regarding origins, the compelling evidence screams for an intelligent creator of life on earth and the origin of the universe. The faith of evolutionists is based upon multiple fables, confused thinking, fraud and downright lies.

There is so much information that could be garnered to wield against evolutionary theory, but all this would make this paper a work of many hundreds of pages. I will restrict myself to a workable amount of data – but each point could have much more evidence for it.

Rather than refer to Christian creationist authors, my purpose here is to, as far as possible, refer to secular scientists and up to date research.

## The faith supposition of evolutionists: a synopsis

In the beginning there was a dot and this exploded in a Big Bang, from which the whole ordered universe sprang into being. No one knows where the original speck of matter came from or what energy powered the Big Bang; neither is it known where the space for the big bang came from. [Some evolutionists dissent from this theory but other alternatives are not much better and the Big Bang is what is taught to children.]

Out of the chaos of this cosmic explosion, the earth emerged in some form that nobody can explain as a ball of molten rock that cooled down. On this dead rock suddenly water appeared from no explainable source.<sup>1</sup>

In an unexplained way, the elements formed out of nothing (not even fusion in stars can create elements); they just appeared. [Thus evolutionists have to believe in creation ex nihilo!]

The earth's geology developed slowly taking millions of years to form mountains, sedimentary rocks and valleys (Uniformitarianism).

Life arose accidentally on earth from rock, rain or hydrogen, or a combination of all three, by a process that no one understands or has witnessed or can reproduce?

In this primordial chemical soup some substances emerged to form basic amino acids and DNA and then proteins in no explainable manner; in fact in a manner that contradicts known science. No one knows where the simple organic molecules came from.<sup>2</sup>

Over time this protein began to form single-celled structures; again with no explanation and also contradicting known science.

The single celled structures somehow began to evolve into basic life forms, perhaps algae and then basic plants.

Over time this algae turned into basic animals then fish. No successful theory to explain these changes to life-forms has emerged.

At some point, gender appeared out of nowhere. Basic animals stopped reproducing asexually and began to reproduce sexually (which is actually an evolutionary step backwards). This meant that, at the exact same time, a male form and a female form had to evolve together, at the same time as oxygen appearing and food appearing for the basic animals. Then again, why did evolution form genders at all?

Over time the fish turned into amphibians.

Over time the amphibians turned into reptiles.

Over time the reptiles turned into birds and mammals.

---

<sup>1</sup> The idea that a passing comet dropped some ice on it is laughable – it couldn't have been enough water, which would have evaporated anyway.

<sup>2</sup> Nick Lane (University College London professor) stated that the primordial soup idea doesn't hold water and is past its expiration date.

Over time some mammals went back into the water (cetaceans) in a retrogressive evolutionary step.<sup>3</sup> [They originally left the water to become more complex animals better equipped to survive.]

Over time land mammals produced apes.

Over time one ape evolved into a primitive type of ape-man. One type of early cave ape-man was the Neanderthal.

Over time primitive ape-men became Homo Sapiens.

## Summary

### *Cosmology*

Big Bang theory: where the Universe began with an explosion.<sup>4</sup>

### *Astronomy*

Stellar evolution is the successive forms taken by the structure of a star from its formation out of the interstellar material to its final state.

### *Biology*

All animal and plant species are related by common ancestry; life evolves by species changing into new forms as a result of natural selection. This is then the foundational assumption undergirding all biological science.

### *Palaeontology and geology*

These have supposedly revealed the time-span of the history of life on Earth (over 3,500 million years), and the sequence of origination of the major groups of organisms in rock strata.

### *Humans*

Humans diverged from ape-like ancestors and took on their present form. The process took at least 5 million years with stages including:

- Australopithecus afarensis.
- Homo habilis.
- Homo ergaster.
- Heidelbergensis.
- Homo erectus.
- Neanderthals.
- Homo sapiens.

Summary of origins of life on earth		
Event	Evolutionary theory explanation	Common sense explanation
Earth is a rock that is cooling down.		
On this rock, suddenly out of nowhere water appears.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This never happened.
Suddenly, out of nowhere, elements appear.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This never happened.

<sup>3</sup> Cetacea: an order of marine mammals that comprises the whales, dolphins, and porpoises. These have a streamlined hairless body, no hindlimbs, a horizontal tail fin, and a blowhole on top of the head for breathing.

<sup>4</sup> Other models include the Steady State Theory, but these are not widely publicised.

Suddenly, hydrogen mingles with water on the rock.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This never happened.
In this primordial soup chemicals appeared.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This never happened.
From these chemicals DNA was formed.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen. DNA is information, like a language. It requires intelligent design.
Proteins were then formed.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen. It contradicts known science.
These proteins developed into simple, single-celled life-forms.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen. Furthermore, single-celled animals are not simple but are extremely complex structures.
From simple life-forms fish emerged.	No certain explanation. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
From fish, amphibians developed.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
From amphibians, reptiles developed.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
From reptiles, birds developed.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
From reptiles, mammals also developed.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
From mammals, cetaceans developed and went back into the sea.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
From mammals, apes developed.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
From apes, a primitive ape-man developed.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen. Furthermore, there is no evidence whatsoever for a transition form between apes and men.
Mankind evolved from ape-men.	Natural selection. Chance and randomness.	This cannot happen.
	Conclusion: natural selection and random chance explains how life began.	Conclusion: evolutionary theory cannot explain how life began. Observation and empirical science demands that an intelligent designer is involved. Life was created.

## Conclusion

Without any further analysis of the details of all this, one can already see that believing this scenario takes many huge leaps of faith and is not scientific in any manner: there is no evidence, there is no observable process to explain it, there is no testable data.

The whole picture depends upon faith in two ways:

- Firstly, the faith to believe all this actually happened when nobody witnessed it.
- Secondly, the faith to continue to believe in this scenario when there is growing, actual evidence that completely disproves it.

## Evolutionary theory is just that - a theory requiring blind faith

Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning, and it is true of evolution still today.<sup>5</sup>

Despite evolution being taught as science in schools, it is a theory about origins that requires blind faith. Evolutionist's faith is blind because it has no provable evidence for it. In fact, many of the supposed evidences for evolution presented in schools have been proved to be frauds, forgeries or errors. For example: Piltdown Man (a forgery), Lucy (a mistake), Java Man (a mistake), archaeopteryx (a mistake), vestigial organs (a false theory), recapitulation theory (a lie),<sup>6</sup> peppered moth evolution (a lie),<sup>7</sup> horse evolution (a false theory propped up by lies) etc.

No one can think of ways in which to test it ... [Evolutionary ideas] have become part of an evolutionary dogma accepted by most of us as part of our training.<sup>8</sup>

My attempt to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for 40 years has completely failed ... The idea of evolution rests on pure belief.<sup>9</sup>

### Pioneers of Evolutionary theory

Most people holding the theory of evolution believe that Charles Darwin was the single originator of this theory and was such a great scientist that he recently topped a BBC poll as the greatest ever Briton. In fact he was a failed scientist and just one in a long line of people that taught evolution, including his grandfather. Previously these people were rejected; Darwin managed to popularise the idea. Darwin was neither a great man nor a great scientist but he was a good promoter of his ideas and had very powerful supporters.

Some of the pioneers of evolutionary theory include:<sup>10</sup>

#### Historical antecedents

Various ideas about the evolution of human life from simple to complex forms had been around for thousands of years. It had been formally proposed by Greek philosophers and scientists, such as Anaximander<sup>11</sup> and had then been taught in various pagan schools of thinking in many different countries.

---

<sup>5</sup> Michael Ruse [an evolutionist science philosopher]; 'How evolution became a religion: creationists correct?' *National Post*, pp. B1,B3,B7 May 13, 2000.

<sup>6</sup> Ernst Haeckel's claims that embryology reveals a former evolution [recapitulation theory] was based upon lies and imagination. He was prosecuted for fraud by his own university and his drawings of foetuses are falsified.

<sup>7</sup> The studies were falsified and that the pictures were staged.

<sup>8</sup> Paul Herlich & LC Birch, 'Evolutionary History & Population Biology', *Nature*, Vol 214 (1967), p352.

<sup>9</sup> Dr N Heribert-Nilsson, (a Swedish botanist) *Synthetische Artbildung*, [The synthetic origin of species] 1953.

<sup>10</sup> Prime source for biographical material here is the Oxford World Encyclopaedia.

<sup>11</sup> Anaximander [c.610–c.545 BC] A Greek scientist, who lived at Miletus. He is reputed to have drawn the earliest map of the inhabited world, to have introduced the sundial into Greece, and to have taught that life began in water and that man originated from fish. He believed that all phenomena result from vortical motion in the primordial substance, and that the Earth is cylindrical and poised in space.

**Jean-Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet Chevalier de Lamarck (1744–1829)**

Lamarck was a French biologist who, among others, anticipated Darwin in conceiving the idea of organic evolution, but accounted for it by the theory that all living organisms are continually trying to improve themselves. Like Darwin, he wrongly believed that characteristics acquired in an individual's lifetime are passed on to its offspring. This was central to Lamarck's theory, but played only a minor part in Darwin's ideas.

**Erasmus Darwin (1731–1802)**

He was a British physician, scientist, inventor, and poet. Erasmus Darwin is chiefly remembered for his scientific and technical writings, which often appeared in poetic form such as *The Botanic Garden* (1789–91). His major work was *Zoonomia* (1796), which proposed a Lamarckian view of evolution. His grandsons (by different wives) included Charles Darwin and Francis Galton.

**Alfred Russel Wallace (1823–1913)**

Was a British naturalist, a founder of zoogeography. He travelled extensively in South America and the East Indies, collecting specimens and studying the geographical distribution of animals.

He independently formulated a theory of the origin of species that was very close to Darwin's, to whom he communicated his conclusions in a letter. Thus Wallace had written down his theory before Darwin did but he could not publish until he returned from the East Indies. Darwin was urged to go to print by Charles Lyell before Wallace returned. In 1858 a summary of the joint views of Wallace and Darwin concerning natural selection was read to the Linnaean Society in London, but credit for the theory has been attached arbitrarily to Darwin.

**Charles Robert Darwin (1809–82)**

Darwin was a British natural historian, geologist and proponent of the theory of evolution by natural selection. He was the grandson of the physician and scientist Erasmus Darwin. He was not a trained scientist since he failed to complete his medical training and only narrowly achieved a theological degree.

Darwin took the post of unpaid naturalist on HMS Beagle for her voyage around the Southern Hemisphere (1831–36), during which he collected the material that became the basis for his ideas on natural selection. On his return he made his name as a geologist, in particular with his accounts of the formation of coral reefs and atolls. In 1858, he and A. R. Wallace agreed to publish simultaneously their thoughts on evolution. He went on to write an extensive series of books, monographs, and papers; *On the Origin of Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man* (1871) changed our concepts of nature and of humanity's place within it.

**James Hutton (1726–97)**

Was a Scottish geologist. Hutton's controversial views became accepted tenets of modern geology, adapted by Lyell and Darwinian evolutionists ever since.

In opposition to Abraham Werner's Neptunian theory,<sup>12</sup> he emphasised heat as the principal agent in the formation of land masses, and held that rocks such as granite were igneous in origin. He described the processes of deposition and denudation and proposed

---

<sup>12</sup> Neptunism: the erroneous theory that rocks such as granite were formed by crystallisation from the waters of a primeval ocean. The chief advocate of this theory was Abraham Gottlob Werner.

that such phenomena, operating over millions of years, would account for the present configuration of the Earth's surface; it therefore followed that the Earth was very much older than was believed. Hutton's views were not widely known until a concise account was published in 1802.

Hutton's theory was called 'Plutonism', i.e. the formation of intrusive igneous rocks was by solidification of molten magma beneath the earth's surface.

### **Sir Charles Lyell (1797–1875)**

Lyell was a Scottish geologist. His textbook *Principles of Geology* (1830–33) influenced a generation of evolutionary geologists. He held that the Earth's features were shaped over a long period of time by natural processes (Uniformitarianism), and not during short periodic upheavals as proposed by the catastrophist school of thought (such as a flood). In this he revived the theories of James Hutton, but his influence on geological opinion was much greater.

Lyell's views cleared the way for Darwin's theory of evolution, which he accepted after some hesitation. Until Hutton and Lyell there was not enough history for evolution to have occurred. With the proposal that the earth was millions of years old, not thousands (as universally accepted), it became possible to conceive that evolutionary changes could have occurred.

The coincidence of Hutton's / Lyell's geological theories with Darwin's / Russel's evolution by natural selection theories enabled the whole process of evolutionary theory to be established.

## **A list of things believed by many evolutionists that there is no evidence for whatsoever: origins of the universe**

### **The 'Big Bang'**

Evolutionists have a huge choice to believe in regarding how the explosion of the big bang began and what it was that exploded. The size of this thing is also said to be:

- Light-years in diameter [George Edward Lemaitre].
- 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.
- Today it equals nothing at all.

Choosing one of these requires faith not facts.

Evolutionists have faith that a Big Bang occurs every 80-100 billion years.

The big bang caused the planets to form, in some inexplicable manner, and logic says that they should all be spinning in the same direction. Yet two planets [Venus and Uranus] are spinning in the reverse direction to everything else and so are six moons (some say as many as 30). This does not hinder the blind faith of evolutionists.

Explosions cause chaos and random activity, yet the evolutionist believes that the big bang was different and created a harmonious universe with perfect structures and order with large spaces between objects instead of being distributed evenly.

The temperature of the universe should be random, having hot patches and colder patches. However, observations show that the temperature of the universe is pretty equal everywhere instead of variable.

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>13</sup> It needs blind faith to ignore this.

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. This requires faith.

Evolutionists teach the Big Bang in schools with confidence, despite many eminent scientists affirming that it is nonsense.<sup>14</sup> This takes a lot of faith.

The First Law of Thermodynamic<sup>15</sup> allows for the conversion of energy from one form to another in the universe, but not the creation of it. The universe could not have created itself by a big bang or anything else. Cosmic structures demonstrate conservation but not innovation of energy. Affirming an evolutionary position requires faith and a denial of known physical laws. Other scientific facts ignored include:

- The laws of physics demand that such an explosion would propel energy and matter radially from its centre; no stellar bodies could have acquired curvilinear motion. But the universe is full of bodies with curvilinear and orbiting motion.
- Explosions produce disorder, not order. The Big Bang, by the laws of physics, should have produced utter chaos, not a beautiful, structured, ordered cosmos.
- If the radiation originates from an explosion the radiation should be the same in all directions. Recent sensitive measurements have shown that this is not the case.
- The theory demands that the universe is uniform within its structure. It is not. There are parts that are empty and parts that are full of matter collected together.
- The explosion does not explain how material could be agglomerated into one location, such as a star. The same event that is still supposed to be forcing galaxies apart is supposed to explain how galaxies were gathered together in a mass.
- The theory contradicts many observed features such as out of place red shifts (e.g. quasars in galaxies or supernovae) or smooth background radiation in space.
- The theory contradicts the 2<sup>nd</sup> Law of Thermodynamics<sup>16</sup> (as does much in evolution, see later). This law of decreasing order and energy decay has the following implications here:
  - In the universe everything is decaying, degenerating, becoming disordered, turning to dust. It is like a wound up clock that is running down.
  - The beginning of the universe is ordered, after billions of years it is less ordered. For instance, the sun is gradually losing heat; stars collapse.

---

<sup>13</sup> *New Scientist*, 8 Sep. 2012, p30.

<sup>14</sup> 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.*' *Cosmic Times*, 1955. Helge Kragh; *Cosmology and Controversy: The Historical Development of Two Theories of the Universe*, Princeton University Press, p192.

<sup>15</sup> The total amount of energy in a closed system (such as the universe) is constant. 'Closed' means that no energy leaves or enters in from outside it.

<sup>16</sup> Energy within a closed system is running down, tending towards entropy – towards randomness, uniformity [where everything is at the same temperature, nothing moving in one direction more than another].



- Evolutionary theory, which requires the universe to be continually gaining structure and order, becoming progressively more complex over millions of years, contradicts the Second Law. The evolutionary universe is winding up not down.

The big bang theory today relies on a growing number of hypothetical entities, things that we have never observed – inflation, dark matter and dark energy are the most prominent examples. Without them, there would be a fatal contradiction between the observations made by astronomers and the predictions of the big bang theory. ... The big bang theory cannot survive without these fudge factors.<sup>17</sup>

The big-bang picture is not as soundly established, either theoretically or observationally, as it is usually claimed to be – astrophysicists of today who hold the view that ‘the ultimate cosmological problem’ has been more or less solved may well be in for a few surprises.<sup>18</sup>

### **Inflation**

This explains why the universe grew so rapidly in its youth. Inflation is a theory designed to explain observed stability of temperature. It states that immediately after the big bang there was a sudden expansion of the universe creating a stable temperature. However, there is no explanation as to what caused this expansion or where the energy for it came from. Despite problems with it, inflation has become the accepted explanation in the standard cosmological model, which is accepted by faith.

### **Dark matter**

Dark Matter is a proposition to explain why the movement of stars in the outer limits of galaxies defies Newtonian laws of gravitation; they move as fast as the stars in the inner portions instead of slower. Dark Matter increases the gravitational energy in the galaxy to explain this. The problem is that this matter must behave unlike any other known particle, having no light nor reflecting any light. Very expensive attempts to find such matter have failed.

This is supposedly the most common thing in the universe (84%); yet no one has ever proved that it exists at all. It exists only by faith.

Some are now positing that Dark Matter is composed of cold and hot matter and that the two exchange energy. Even scientists affirm that this is an auxiliary hypothesis on top of an auxiliary hypothesis.

### **WIMPS**

These are Weakly Interacting Massive Particles. Despite long searches and building special detectors, these have not been observed.

### **Dark energy**

Recent observations have revealed that the universe is not only still expanding but is still accelerating. The Big Bang theory requires the universe to gradually slow down to a stop. Therefore, a new theory was required to explain this acceleration.

The most accepted theory to explain this acceleration is ‘Dark Energy’. This is a hypothetical form of energy permeating space, which increases the rate of expansion of the

---

<sup>17</sup> ‘Bucking the Big Bang’, *New Scientist*, 22 May 2004, p20. Read at [www.cosmologystatement.org/](http://www.cosmologystatement.org/)

<sup>18</sup> Jayant Narlikar, ‘Was There a Big Bang?’ *New Scientist*, 91, 2 July 1981, p21.

universe. It is proposed that dark energy accounts for 73% of the total mass-energy of the universe. As it is a hypothesis, it is accepted by faith.

### **Dark flow**

Observations of background microwave radiation in the universe showed anomalies. The motion of galaxy clusters with respect to the cosmic microwave background should be randomly distributed in all directions. Instead measurements show a cohesive flow of clusters toward a part of the cosmos between Centaurus and Vela. Dark flow theory states that this is caused by the invisible effect of a different universe or a different fabric of space-time, which has to be accepted by faith.

### **Supersymmetry**

Scientists at the University of Paris-Saclay envisage new particles to explain away Dark Matter, inflation and other issues. They propose something called 'Supersymmetry' and hundreds of new particles, none of which have ever been observed. The theory is called SMASH.

### **Particle physics**

Evolutionists posit that a particle can be seen in two places at once, or not in either, and base a branch of science on the existence of a particle which cannot be seen. This requires a huge amount of faith.

### **Multiple universes**

Many eminent scientists affirm,<sup>19</sup> in blind faith, that there are a number of universes operating in parallel and hidden from each other, yet occupying the same space. Thus in your lounge there is your universe, plus a universe where the earth exploded in the past, a universe where dinosaurs still live and so on – but operating in a different dimension and thus hidden. This requires superhuman faith indeed.

### **Speed of light**

Evolutionists blindly accept that the speed of light is constant. However, many researchers have proved that the speed of light has changed since the day of creation, getting slower, and is still slowing down. This fully explains a creation of apparent billions of years when it is only a few thousand years old.<sup>20</sup>

### **Unknowns**

Evolutionists have to retain their blind faith even though they cannot explain:

- How stars form.
- Where the atmosphere came from.
- Where comets came from.
- Where the moon came from.
- Where do compounds come from (e.g. carbon dioxide); certainly not from elements?
- When did compounds arise; during the Big Bang, after the Big Bang, where they there before the Big Bang?
- What was in the primordial chemical soup that is the basis of life?
- Why there is order and beauty in the universe instead of randomness and chaos.

---

<sup>19</sup> E.g. Dr. Michio Kaku.

<sup>20</sup> For details see CSM Pamphlets 262 and 256. Barry Setterfield has done much research on this.

- Why there are so many anthropic features on earth.<sup>21</sup> [E.g. atomic particles are the right size and mass; the Solar System is in the right place in the Milky Way; the Sun's radiation is just right; the Earth is in the right place in orbit round the Sun; the Moon is situated perfectly in relation to Earth; the Earth is the right size and composition so that life can flourish, etc.]

## **A list of things believed by many evolutionists that there is no evidence for whatsoever: Earth**

### **The earth is billions of years old**

This needs a lot of faith since:

- Comets should have disappeared if the universe is billions of years old (they are lumps of ice that break up over time).
- There are no meteorites in old rocks.
- Gas is 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.
- A uniform rate of salination, presumed by uniformitarianism, would make the ocean only 7,000 years old.
- 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?
- Meteoritic dust enters earth's atmosphere at a constant rate i.e. about 14m tons per yr. If earth is billions of years old there should be meteoritic dust 182 feet thick; it isn't there even on the moon.
- The Mississippi River delta deposits 300m cu yds. of sediment into the Gulf of Mexico each year. Calculations determine the delta to be 4000 years old.
- Petroleum and natural gas are contained at high pressures in underground reservoirs. Calculations based on the measured permeability of the cap rock reveal that the oil and gas pressures could not be maintained for longer than 10,000 years in most cases.
- Recession of the moon: if the earth is 5 billion years old, the moon should be much further away.
- Rotation of the earth is gradually slowing due to the gravitational drag of the sun, moon and other forces. If the earth is billions of years old, and slowing uniformly, then the rotation should be zero.
- Atmospheric Helium: if the decay process of uranium and thorium that produce helium has been at the present rate for billions of years, the atmosphere should contain much more than 1 part in 200,000. In fact the observed helium shows a time process of c.10,000 years. Also helium cannot escape into space, in fact, helium is entering the atmosphere from the sun.
- Pleochroic Halos: Polonium 218 has been shown to be present in granite from the beginning. If rock formations gradually cooled over millions of years, Polonium would have decayed into other elements long ago; i.e. evidence points to an instantaneous crystallisation of the host basement rocks of the earth.

---

<sup>21</sup> This term was coined by Cambridge physicist Brandon Cater in 1973 to recognise that all constants (laws) in physics have exactly the values required for the universe to support human life. This posits intelligent design.

- Population growth demonstrates a young earth. Even at a low rate, in a million years (evolution's idea for mankind on earth) the number of people would be 10 to the power of 2100. (NB there are only supposed to be 10 to the power of 130 electrons in the whole universe).
- Comets are assumed to be the same age as the solar system. On every orbit a part is 'boiled off'. Studies show that short-term comets would have totally dissipated in 10,000 years. Since numerous comets still orbit the sun, the solar system cannot be much older than 10,000 years. There is no evidence to discredit this so far.
- Poynting-Robertson Effect: i.e. the sun acts like a giant vacuum cleaner absorbing 100,000 tons of micro-meteoroids every day. The sun's radiation pressure also pushes dust particles into space. At the present rate, the sun would have cleaned up the solar system in less than 10,000 years, and there is no known source of replenishment - yet micro-meteoroids are copious in the solar system.
- Star clusters: Thousands of stars are held by gravity; but in some clusters, the stars are moving so fast that they could not have held together for billions of years, or even millions.
- Super stars: their energy production of hydrogen atomic fusion is so great that the mass required to run this for millions of years is absolutely implausible.

### **The earth was originally a molten mass**

Observations of polonium halos<sup>22</sup> in granite rocks demonstrate that the earth was not originally a molten mass. It takes a lot of faith to ignore this hard fact.

### **Earth's magnetic field**

Evolutionists believe in a world 5 billion years old. However, the speed of the jets within the rotation of circulating molten iron in the earth is 25 to 30 miles per year but this has been speeding up since 2000. Earth's magnetic field (generated by circulating molten iron) has been weakening since 1840 at about 5% per century. Projecting backwards to the evolutionary age of the earth would propose a magnetic field so strong that life would be impossible. Thus the earth cannot be as old as evolutionists think. In response evolutionists, by faith, dreamed up a proposal that the earth's magnetic field reverses from time to time, despite having no evidence for this or bearing in mind that it would eradicate life on earth.

Evolutionists have to have great faith to ignore that fact that the earth's magnetic field is so large (2,000 times larger than Mercury, Venus, and Mars combined).

### **Unique features of the earth**

Evolutionists believe that the features of the earth are a pure accident in space and these features, quite by chance, enabled life to form out of nothing on its own. However, the circumstances of the earth are unique in the universe (at the time of current observations) and contain too many coincidences to be an accident. I will mention just a few of these features.

#### *Diameter of the earth*

The diameter of the earth (8,000 miles) is crucial for the existence of life. A variation in size of 10% either way would make life impossible. Slightly smaller would result in lower

---

<sup>22</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 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).

gravity and the atmosphere would escape into space. Slightly larger would double the weight of the atmosphere and would inundate the planet with water.

#### *Orbit of the earth*

The orbit of 365¼ days and an axial tilt of 23½ degrees provide the seasons. The length of year enables crops to grow and be harvested, but not so long that man cannot survive till the next crop. Note that Uranus takes 84 years to orbit the sun while Mercury takes 88 days.

#### *Distance from the sun*

The average distance is 93 million miles giving exactly the right temperatures suited to life. The mean temperature is 15 degrees Celsius. The average surface temperature of Venus is 470 degrees Celsius while Mars is minus 50 degrees Celsius.

#### *The earth's rotation*

This is perfect for life. A longer period would result in the earth's surface being heated up during the day and plummeting in the prolonged hours of darkness. A faster rotation would result in fierce wind systems. The other planets have much longer or shorter rotation periods (243 days for Venus; 10 hours for Saturn).

The rate of rotation is slowing down at about 30 seconds a century, or lengthening the day by 5 minutes in 1,000 years. If the origin of the earth were as the evolutionists say, then the earth would have been originally spinning round in minutes rather than 24 hours. Encyclopaedia Britannica observes this.<sup>23</sup> The earth cannot be even hundreds of thousands of years old let alone millions or billions. It takes huge faith on the part of evolutionists to ignore this observable data.

#### *The atmosphere*

Only traces of oxygen exist in the solar system yet on earth the atmosphere contains 21% oxygen, which is perfect for life. A higher level would make everything inflammable; even lightning would set things on fire. If the content were only 10% fire wouldn't burn at all.

The oxygen also provides the vital Ozone layer, which absorbs most of the deadly ultra violet rays from the sun. Life would not be possible without this.

The atmosphere also protects the earth from 20 million meteorites that enter each day at speeds of 30 miles per second.

The atmosphere of other planets is either very thin (Mars) or toxic (Venus).

#### *The magnetic field*

The strength of this has been measured for over 100 years, i.e. we have good records. Dr. T Barnes has shown that it is decaying. 1400 years ago it was twice as strong. If you extrapolate back 10,000 years, the earth would have had a magnetic field as strong as a magnetic star i.e. impossible; therefore, the earth cannot be older than 10,000 years. The measurable decrease of the earth's magnetic field means that the earth is only a few thousand years old.

#### *The oceans*

Water filled oceans are exceptional in the solar system. Our oceans moderate the effects of climate. Less water would result in much wider temperature variations. The oceans also

---

<sup>23</sup> Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15<sup>th</sup> edition, vol. 6 p59.

provide a huge range of animals and plants vital to food production and enables rain to fall through forming clouds that carry water vapour.

The ability of water to expand as it approaches freezing means that ice floats and does not sink (as it would if water contracted as other liquids). An increasingly thick ice layer at the bottom of the ocean would gradually kill all life in the ocean.

### *The Moon*

Revolves around the earth causing tides. If the moon were located at 1/5th of its present distance, the continents would be submerged twice a day.

## **A list of things believed by many evolutionists that there is no evidence for whatsoever: Geology**

### **Sedimentary rock strata**

Evolutionists believe in a figment of Charles Lyell's imagination because there is no complete example of the geological column in nature (if we did have an example, it would have to be 100 miles thick)?

Evolutionists show tremendous faith defending 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.

Evolutionists believe that 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?

### *Point of information*

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?

### **Uniformitarianism**

Evolutionists believe that geological structures were formed slowly over millions of years but observational evidence shows that a small Grand Canyon-like feature can form quickly over weeks at Mt. St. Helens? It takes great faith to maintain a theory (Uniformitarianism) that has never been seen and denies the evidence of something that has been observed and studied by many scientists, which contradicts it.

Evolutionists have to have great faith to still believe in Uniformitarianism when dormant bacteria can be found inside rocks that are supposedly millions of years old and in meteorites that are billions of years old.

Evolutionists have amazing faith to still believe in uniformitarianism when seashells can be found on the top of every mountain range.

### **Miscellaneous**

Evolutionists have to have great confidence in their position when there are unfrozen lakes in Antarctica. How could they remain unfrozen for millions of years?

## **A list of things believed by many evolutionists that there is no evidence for whatsoever: origins of life on earth**

### **DNA**

DNA is deoxyribonucleic acid. It is a nucleic acid and the hereditary material of all living organisms except for a few viruses that use RNA. It occurs in every cell and determines the characteristics of the organism by controlling the synthesis of proteins. In plants and animals, the DNA occurs mainly in chromosomes within the nucleus of the cell. The modern concept of the gene is as a length of DNA that codes for a single protein molecule, such as an enzyme, polypeptide, or type of ribonucleic acid (RNA).

DNA is essentially a coded system of information similar to a language; this has to point to an intelligent designer. Evolutionists show great faith in either denying or ignoring this.

Evolutionists blindly accept their position despite many geneticists advocating that DNA requires a designer (e.g. John Sanford, Maciej Giertych, Robert Carter, James S Allen, Matti Leisola and George Purdom).<sup>24</sup>

### **RNA**

Some evolutionists believe that the bridge from inorganic to organic molecules is RNA, which is capable of both carrying genetic information and catalysing some biochemical reactions.

However, RNA is not known to assemble without intelligent direction from outside. [There were no laboratory and biochemists arranging this in antiquity.] RNA cannot perform all the necessary cellular functions currently carried out by proteins. Again, this theory does not explain the origin of genetic information. The first self-replicating life based on RNA would require a molecule 200-300 nucleotides in length. The odds of this occurring by chance are about 1 in  $10^{150}$ ; i.e. impossible.

The sudden appearance of a large self-copying molecule such as RNA was exceedingly improbable ... [The probability] is so vanishingly small.<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, the RNA hypothesis does not explain the origin of the genetic code. In order to evolve into a DNA/protein based life form, the RNA would need to evolve the ability to convert genetic information into proteins, But this process of transcription and translation requires a large suite of proteins and molecular machines, which themselves are encoded by genetic information. Thus essential enzymes and molecular machines are needed to create themselves.

This hypothesis does not hold water and is a mere belief system.

---

<sup>24</sup> These are creationist PhD geneticists who have published in secular peer-reviewed journals.

<sup>25</sup> Robert Shapiro; 'A simpler Origin for Life', *Scientific American*, June 2007, p46-53.

## Cellular life

### *Where do proteins come from?*

Evolutionists need a lot of faith to believe that cellular life just emerged out of nothing by chance. There is no explanation of how the first protein formed, let alone basic life forms which need hundreds of proteins and amino acids. Not only that, it needs left-handed amino acids to form proteins since right-handed ones are fatal. Evolutionists believe that the left-handed ones appeared and dominated by accident.

### *Proteins do not evolve by chance*

Furthermore, new research shows that amino acid sequences which yield stable, functional protein folds may be as rare as 1 in  $10^{74}$  sequences;<sup>26</sup> i.e. the vast majority of amino acid sequences will not produce stable proteins and could not function in living organisms. Mutations could not take one kind of protein and evolve it into another; many changes would have to occur simultaneously.

Axe's results suggest that the odds of blind and unguided Darwinian processes producing a functional protein fold are less than the odds of someone closing his eyes and firing an arrow into the Milky Way galaxy, and hitting one pre-selected atom.<sup>27</sup>

### *Inorganic matter does not change into organic matter*

Evolutionists have faith that life can evolve by chance from inorganic matter. Essentially they have faith that, in the past, a bit of rock plus some water led to a living structure. Anyone suggesting that this can happen today would be referred to a doctor.

Evolutionists believe that simple molecules formed into amino acids in a primordial soup (or some suggest in an underwater hydrothermal vent) and other long chain (polymers) like proteins (or RNA). However, two amino acids cannot join in water as water breaks down protein chains. This first simple step in evolution could not have occurred according to the laws of chemistry.

Evolutionists have such faith that they can ignore the law of Mass Action, which means that life could not have formed in a primordial soup of chemicals?<sup>28</sup>

### *Irreducible complexity*

Evolutionists have faith to assert that single-celled creatures are simple and formed the beginning for later complex life forms when they are actually extremely complex. Even constituent parts of the cell are complex.<sup>29</sup> The most basic cell is more complex than a NASA space shuttle (containing the equivalent of 4,000 books of coded information).

<sup>26</sup> Douglas Axe; 'Estimating the prevalence of protein sequences adopting functional enzyme folds', *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 341:1295-1315 (2004). 'Extreme functional sensitivity to conservative amino acid changes on enzyme exteriors', 301: 585-595 (2000).

<sup>27</sup> Discovery Institute, Casey Luskin; 'The top ten scientific problems with biological and chemical evolution', 20 February 2015.

<sup>28</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>29</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.



Even the genetic components of a single flagellum in a cell are irreducibly complex; these fail to assemble or function if any one of its 35 genes is missing. Thus a mutation couldn't produce the complexity needed to provide a functional flagella rotary engine one incremental step at a time, apart from the fact that mutations usually decrease genetic information (see 'Mechanisms for change: mutations'). A flagellum is just one example of thousands of molecular machines in biology;<sup>30</sup> all irreducibly complex and none could have evolved by stages.

### **Early life forms**

Evolutionists believe that life on earth appeared at exactly the same time as oxygen appeared in the atmosphere quite by chance.

Evolutionists believe that simple animals evolved and developed on a primitive earth despite having no food to eat and no female to mate with. How did sexual reproduction evolve since it requires two types of physical genitalia to evolve at the same time? 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.

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> This is a challenge for the faith of evolutionists.

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>32</sup>

### **Adaptation**

Most evolutionists believe that adaptation is evolution, when it is just adaptation. No one denies that animals can adapt to their environment and circumstances. A common example is antibiotic-resistant bacteria; that is, a simple organism that learned to fight off toxins. This is not evolution; the bacteria did not change into a different type of creature. Thus all the dogs in the world derive from a single pair of dogs (or wolves) but no dog ever turned into a cat. Black bears can become polar bears but they are still bears.

Adaptation does not change the genome by adding more genes (more information). It usually requires less information and a weaker organism; thus some dog breeds are very weak and could not survive in the wild.

### **Mechanisms for change: Mutations**

Many evolutionists believe that they key to evolution is mutation. They often affirm that the mechanism for evolutionary change is random mutations that change the genetic

---

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>30</sup> A recent study has discovered over 250 new molecular machines in yeast alone.

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

<sup>32</sup> Fred Hoyle; 'Hoyle on evolution', *Nature*, Vol. 294, No. 5837 (November 12, 1981), p105.

system. Yet mutations are usually detrimental to the animal and always involve a decrease or scrambling of genetic information – i.e. they cause disease.<sup>33</sup>

New mutations don't create new species; they create offspring that are impaired.<sup>34</sup>

Neo-Darwinists say that new species emerge when mutations occur and modify an organism. I was taught over and over again that the accumulation of random mutations led to evolutionary change [which] led to new species. I believed it until I looked for evidence.<sup>35</sup>

Over 800 Ph.D. scientists have signed a statement agreeing that they '*are sceptical of claims for the ability of random mutation and natural selection to account for the complexity of life*'.<sup>36</sup> At least scientists refused to blindly put their faith in something that has no evidence.

If only one mutation were required that would be one thing, but Darwinian evolution requires multiple mutations simultaneously. Genetic professors, such as Michael Behe, professor of biochemistry at Lehigh University, have affirmed that random mutation and unguided natural selection cannot generate the genetic information required to produce irreducibly complex structures.

Even sane evolutionists admit this: '*simultaneous emergence of all components of a system is implausible*'.<sup>37</sup> Darwin expected this when he said, '*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*'.<sup>38</sup>

Modern biology continues to discover more and more examples where biological complexity negates the possibility of Darwinian evolution by successive steps. Mutations do not generate evolution.

*There is no known law of nature, no known process and no known sequence of events which can cause information to originate by itself in matter.*<sup>39</sup>

Evolutionists affirm evolution despite having never observed it in practice and being unable to name a single life form that has ever added information to its genome, or being able to name an animal that has given birth to another species?

Every palaeontologist 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, it's not evolution so you don't talk about it.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>33</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>34</sup> Biologist Lynn Margulis, member of the National Academy of Sciences; quoted in Darryl Madden, 'Umass Scientist to lead debate on evolutionary theory', Brattleboro (Vt.) Reformer, 3 February 2006.

<sup>35</sup> Lynn Margulis, 'Lynn Margulis: Q & A', *Discover Magazine*, April 2011, p68.

<sup>36</sup> 'A scientific dissent from Darwinism'.

<sup>37</sup> Michael Lynch, 'Evolutionary layering and the limits to cellular perfection', *Proceedings of the US National Academy of Sciences* (2012).

<sup>38</sup> Charles Darwin; *Origin of Species* (1859) chapter 6.

<sup>39</sup> Dr. Werner Gitt. *In the Beginning Was Information*, CLV, Bielefeld, Germany (1997), p64-67, 79, 107.

<sup>40</sup> Stephen J. Gould; Lecture at Hobart & William Smith College, 14.2.1980.

## Complex design

Every aspect of living creatures screams of being designed. Many volumes could be written examining this alone. DNA itself is a code sequence, or language, which requires an intelligent designer. Evolutionists need a lot of faith to hold that DNA just emerged from nothing by chance.

Evolutionists have faith that bio-chemicals (such as enzymes in sequential co-operation) evolved by chance to form multiple complex machines functioning within simple cellular structures all working together in harmony.

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 1040,000, an outrageously small probability that could not be faced even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup.<sup>41</sup>

The motor functions in a cell cannot work until every component is in place and functioning separately; yet evolutionists believe that such a motor evolved over millions of years within a cell?

Structures, such as the eye of humans and other animals, are far too complex to have ever appeared by accident or evolution. The probability of a chance formation of the eye is 1 in  $10^{266}$ ; in other words, statistically impossible.<sup>42</sup>

*To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivances ... could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree.*<sup>43</sup>

## Symmetry

Evolutionists just believe that random forces turned inorganic matter into living matter creating perfect symmetry (one side equals the other) in thousands of animals. Why would chance evolution create beautiful symmetry?

## Different families of creatures

Evolutionists believe that we are evolving all the time into something more complex. Yet ferns have a larger genome than man; are we all evolving into ferns?

Evolutionists have massive faith that reptiles turned into birds when their physiological systems are completely 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.]

## Man

Evolutionists have faith that Neanderthals were primitive sub-human creatures despite the fact that they show intelligence, they interbred with humans (according to a study of the genomes of three cases)<sup>44</sup>, played musical instruments,<sup>45</sup> they had the same brain as

---

<sup>41</sup> Fred Hoyle and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe; *Evolution from Space*, London: J.M. Dent & Sons, (1981).

<sup>42</sup> R.L. Wysong, *The Creation-Evolution Controversy*, Inquiry Press, Midland, 1981, p300-301.

<sup>43</sup> E. Shute, *Flaws in the Theory of Evolution*, Craig Press, Nutley, New Jersey, (1961), p448.

<sup>44</sup> *New Scientist*; 4 Aug. 2012, Instant expert 25: Fossils.

<sup>45</sup> *Creation*, vol. 7. No. 7, p2-3.

modern man,<sup>46</sup> and they knew how to self-medicate by eating medicinal plants?<sup>47</sup> Neanderthals were Homo Sapiens living in northern climes after the ice-age.

Neanderthal DNA has now been sequenced and it is nearer to man than a chimpanzee is nearer to chimps in its own species.

Evolutionists believe that man evolved with intelligence and morality from a bunch of amoral, irrational chemicals lying on rock. Evolutionists cannot explain altruism, philanthropy, selflessness, and divine worship?

### **Insects**

Evolutionists have faith that insects evolved from something even though they have no idea how and why.

Evolutionists believe that termites evolved despite the fact that 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.

Evolutionists believe that certain creatures are simple and yet to evolve. Yet even simple creatures are very complex. It has been discovered that simple organisms, such as social insects (e.g. honey bees), have advanced cognitive abilities.<sup>48</sup> How can such advanced brainpower have evolved in a simple organism? Mimicry is complex. Metamorphosis is complex. Insect eyes are very complex.

### **The horse**

Evolutionists have great faith in the evolution of the horse from the hyrax eohippus despite there being zero evidence for it.<sup>49</sup>

### **All systems must be present**

Evolutionists believe that animals evolved but various systems would not have been present at first and the evolving animal would have died. It requires huge faith to believe that evolving animals survived despite not having yet evolved major necessary organs. There are multiple examples of this.

#### *Digestive system*

For example: If the digestive system evolved, how did the stomach and intestines initially manage to resist digestive juices? 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 and no excretion? Where did the hydrochloric acid digestive juices come from to make the stomach work?

#### *Organ development*

How did organs evolve by slow minute stages? How did simple animals develop a heart but no lungs, or a liver but no kidneys? Can an evolutionist really believe that all the organs

---

<sup>46</sup> New Scientist, 30 July 2016, p10.

<sup>47</sup> *New Scientist*; 28 July 2011, p14.

<sup>48</sup> BBC News; <http://goo.gl/huQo4> 8 October 2012.

<sup>49</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.

slowly appeared at the same time? Why would a simple animal with an efficient functioning system need to grow an entirely new system? For example, why would very efficient fish breathing through gills need to develop lungs? How could it transition from gills to lungs without dying? How could a heart develop before a vascular system? How did animals survive until an immune system evolved?

### *Bombardier Beetle*

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?

### *Plant and animal synergy*

How did insects that live on and pollinate plants survive until the plants arrived? Or how did the plants survive until the insects arrived? Many animals live in symbiosis with others. How did these survive before the other evolved? Evolutionists show great faith in denying that there is some kind of plan in nature.

### *Simple animals are still here and they are efficient*

If evolution is change from a simpler animal to a more complex animal, why do we still have the simple animals living today, such as fish, amphibians, reptiles – they are all very efficient in their environment. This situation denies Darwin's claim that evolution never stands still.

### **Modern ancient animals**

Evolutionists have faith to believe that animals evolve when there is much evidence that they do not but stay the same. Horseshoe crabs, coelacanths, opossums, oysters, crocodiles and many others show no evolution.

### **Embryonic convergence**

Evolutionists have faith that common ancestry is illustrated in the patterns of the development of vertebrate embryos. It is claimed that different groups of vertebrates start embryonic development in a very similar fashion, reflecting their common ancestry. This is just blind faith.

Biologists that have studied this claim contradict this theory. Multiple studies have shown that there is a remarkable divergence between related species both in early, middle and late in development.<sup>50</sup> Embryos show differences in major traits that include: body size, body plan, growth patterns and timing of development.

### **Animal facts that evolutionists cannot explain**

- *Migration*: many animals migrate, not just birds. Some seabirds fly from one polar area to another; many birds fly from sites in Britain to a specific tree in Africa every year, and back again. 3.5 trillion insects migrate above the UK every year (e.g. aphids, midges, hoverflies, beetles, butterflies and moths).<sup>51</sup> Insects have been shown to measure wind direction and speed before taking off. All these migratory animals have an internal compass mechanism and are able to relate direction to the wind and make adjustments. The complexity of this is enormous. It takes huge faith to believe that all these hundreds of migratory animals developed this independently by chance without

---

<sup>50</sup> Andres Collazo; 'Developmental variation, Homology, and the Pharyngula Stage, *Systematic Biology*, 49 (2000): 3. Michael K Richardson et al.; *Anatomy and Embryology*, 196:91-1016 (1997). Brian K Hall, 'Phylotypic stage or phantom: is there a highly conserved embryonic stage in vertebrates?', *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 12 (12):461-463 (December 1997).

<sup>51</sup> BBC News, 23 December 2016. Creation magazine, 19.5 (Feb 2017), p4-5.

training. How would millions of years of attempting this avoid them getting lost and perishing?

- *Navigation*: The Orchid bee (*Euglossa imperialis*) navigates its way through dense rainforests whatever the illumination, weather or vegetation conditions.<sup>52</sup> Bees have compound eyes and also simple eyes (ocelli). This bee has two distinct fields in its ocelli with one sensitive to polarised light. Thus it possesses compass information and a delicate polarisation analyser.
- *Co-existence*: there are many examples of this. The dung of whales brings nutrients to surface waters, which generates more food for fish by stimulating the growth of phytoplankton. These tiny organisms are then eaten by krill, which are eaten by fish.
- *Long flight*: Common Swifts (*Apus apus*) spend 10 months of the year on the wing without landing. They only land for 2 months to breed. Thus they eat and sleep during flight, possibly half conscious.
- *Lack of sleep*: Dolphins and killer whales go for four months without sleep after birth.
- *Brazilian free-tailed bats* have achieved speeds of over 140 km/h (88 mph) in level flight (faster than Swifts).
- *Biogeographical problems*: How did platyrrhine monkeys travel to South America? Evolutionists believe that these are descended from 'Old World' African catarrhine monkeys but (by the evolutionary timetable) the South American monkeys split off from African monkeys long after the continents separated (see 'Stunningly stupid faith remarks' later). How did certain lizards and rodents also get to South America? How did bees, lemurs and other mammals arrive in Madagascar? How did elephant fossils get to many islands? How did freshwater frogs arrive on isolated oceanic islands? Why are there iguanas on the Fiji islands?
- *Human behavioural and cognitive abilities*. Evolutionists cannot explain why humans have so many faculties that offer no apparent survival advantage. These include morality, altruism, religion, kindness, art, poetry, music, complex language, intellectual investigation (science), self-sacrifice and love.

We could add many thousands more similar facts.

### **An example of necessary changes**

Evolutionists have faith that mammalian cetaceans (whales, dolphins) left the land and became aquatic creatures about 55 million years ago. This has been called, '*the poster child for macro-evolution*'. To achieve this the following changes would be necessary:

- Emergence of a blowhole, with musculature and nerve control.
- Modification of the eye for underwater vision.
- Ability to drink seawater.
- Forelimbs transformed into flippers.
- Ability to nurse young underwater.
- Emergence of tail flukes.
- Creation of blubber for insulation.

These would require multiple, simultaneous genetic changes – which I have already demonstrated, cannot occur by chance.

---

<sup>52</sup> Current Biology, Dr Gavin Taylor (Lund Univ.); [goo.gl/sjHDZR](http://goo.gl/sjHDZR).

The fossil record demands that the evolution of whales from mammals had to take place in less than 10 million years. This is dramatically too short a period for such genetic changes to have occurred. Even a hundred million years would not be long enough.

In the case of the transition from reptiles to birds the changes are even more numerous and complicated.

### **Plant life**

Evolutionists have no explanation for complexities that include:

- Why some sunflowers track the sun but others don't.<sup>53</sup> If they evolved from a common organism they should all be the same.
- Synergy: evolution cannot explain the synergy that exists between many plants and animals. This synergy is vital for reproduction. For example: bees pollinate a huge range of plants, including many agricultural products, like almonds in California. Without bees there are no almonds. This being so, how did the plant or the animal survive before they were both present, while they were both evolving?
- Many plants are exactly the same as they are in the fossil record having not evolved at all.
- Why do complex plants all arrive at the same time with no previous intermediate forms just like animals?

### **Survival of the fittest**

Evolutionists have faith that the survival of the fittest is an accurate summary of the diversity of life today. However, just as Darwinian evolution cannot explain the arrival of species, neither can it really explain the survival of species with new traits.

If an animal is born with a mutation that is advantageous (such as a brown-haired predator gaining white hair in a snowy region) there is no certainty that this animal will survive long enough to pass on this mutation to its offspring. Events can prevent a trait from spreading through the population and these events are called 'genetic drift'. When the mathematics of this are calculated biologists find that genetic drift will overwhelm the force of selection and prevent adaptations from spreading.

Random genetic drift can impose a strong barrier to the advancement of molecular refinements by adaptive processes. ... [It] discourages the promotion of beneficial mutations'.<sup>54</sup>

There is no compelling empirical or theoretical evidence that complexity, modularity, redundancy or other features of genetic pathways are promoted by natural selection.<sup>55</sup>

The fact is that neither non-random forces like natural selection, nor random forces, like genetic drift can explain the origin of many complex biological features.

---

<sup>53</sup> New Scientist, 13 August 2016, p13.

<sup>54</sup> Michael Lynch; 'Evolutionary layering and the limits to cellular perfection', Proceedings of the US National Academy of Sciences (2012).

<sup>55</sup> Michael Lynch; 'The evolution of genetic networks by non-adaptive processes', Nature Reviews Genetics, 8:803-813 (October 2007).

## A list of things believed by many evolutionists that there is no evidence for whatsoever: Genetics and the Darwinian tree of life.

We have already covered many aspects of genetics as it relates to other headings but here I want to consider the long struggle to erect a genetic tree that shows the common ancestry of animals and thus proves Darwinian evolution, as demonstrated in the tree of evolution shown to every kid in school. This tree is based upon morphology; i.e. the form and structure of animals.

Studies in this genetic research area follow a strict Darwinian paradigm rather than being open minded; thus multiple assumptions keep being made without evidence. So, the underlying assumption is gradual change from one species to another interpreted through molecular similarity.

Despite this, the findings of these studies have not conformed to evolutionist's expectations. We can summarise some of these as follows:

- After it became possible to sequence genes, even bacterial genes, evolutionists expected DNA sequences to confirm the RNA tree. Sometimes they did but sometimes they did not.
- The standard mammalian evolutionary tree places humans as more closely related to rodents than elephants but the genetic tree suggest the opposite: humans are closer to elephants than rodents.
- Incongruities to the evolutionary tree are found everywhere in genetic studies, from the root to the major branches and from the various taxa<sup>56</sup> and even to the make up of the primary groups. In other words, the whole thing is a mess.
- Textbooks claim that common descent is supported using the example of a tree of animals based upon the enzyme cytochrome c, which matches the traditional tree, based on morphology (shape). What they do not mention is that a different enzyme, cytochrome b (the most commonly sequenced gene in vertebrates), conflicts with the standard evolutionary tree. In the latter, cats and whales are primates.
- Rather than admit that Darwin was wrong about the tree of life, evolutionary biologists usually make excuses for the results blaming: 'horizontal gene transfer', 'long branch attraction', 'rapid evolution', 'coalescent theory' etc. The fact is that the tree does not exist in real life.
- Fruit flies (*Drosophila melanogaster*) share two-thirds of the genes of human beings. Acorn worms (*Ptychodera flava* & *Saccoglossus kowalevskii*) share about 70% of the human genome. Evolutionists have thus stated that humans share a common ancestor with both!!! [See 'Stunningly stupid faith remarks'.]

For a long time the Holy Grail was to build a tree of life ... But today the project lies in tatters, torn to pieces by an onslaught of negative evidence.<sup>57</sup>

We've just annihilated the tree of life.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> 'Taxa' is the plural form of 'taxon'. It refers to a taxonomic group of any rank, such as a species, family, or class.

<sup>57</sup> *New Scientist*, Graham Lawton; 'Why Darwin was wrong about the tree of life', 21 January 2009.

<sup>58</sup> Michael Syvanen (a microbiologist); Lawton op. cit.



I've looked at thousands of microRNA genes, and I can't find a single example that would support the traditional tree. ... The microRNAs are totally unambiguous ... they give a totally different tree from what everyone else wants.<sup>59</sup>

## A list of things believed by many evolutionists that there is no evidence for whatsoever: Palaeontology

### The fossil record in general

Evolutionists believe that fossils support the theory of evolution; n.b. '*Most of the evidence for evolution comes from the fossil record*'.<sup>60</sup> In fact the fossil record demonstrates the exact opposite of everything evolutionists would expect. Thus life does not appear gradually over long periods but appears all at once. It shows no transitional species. It shows animals in supposedly older strata that are the supposed ancestors of younger animals. It shows dinosaurs living at the same time as humans. It shows objects transitioning several strata at once (supposedly millions of years apart).

### No transitional fossils

Evolutionists have faith that one species evolved into a different more complex species, despite the complete lack of any evidence for this in the fossil record after over a hundred years of digging up fossils. There are no transitional fossils; no intermediate forms? There should be millions of examples if evolution constantly occurred in the past and since we have so many extinct fossil species.<sup>61</sup>

*It is not even possible to make a caricature of evolution out of paleo-biological facts. The fossil material is now so complete that the lack of transitional series cannot be explained by the scarcity of the material. The deficiencies are real, they will never be filled.*<sup>62</sup>

*The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of palaeontology. The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference ... not the evidence of fossils.*<sup>63</sup>

Darwin noted this problem in his lifetime (it is much worse now) when he said, '*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*'.<sup>64</sup>

### Evidence of dinosaurs living at the same time as man

Evolutionists have faith that dinosaurs lived millions of years before humans despite human footprints appearing in the same rocks as dinosaurs<sup>65</sup> and T-Rex blood being discovered that can only be a few thousand years old.

---

<sup>59</sup> Kevin Peterson in Elie Dolgin, 'Rewriting Evolution', *Nature*, 28 June 2012, 486:460-462.

<sup>60</sup> BBC, Bitesize, Science, Theory of Evolution, page 1.

<sup>61</sup> 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.

<sup>62</sup> Prof. N Heribert-Nilsson, in Francis Hitching, 'Was Darwin Wrong?' *Life Magazine*; vol. 5, no 4, Apr 92, p48-52.

<sup>63</sup> Prof. Stephen Jay Gould, 'Evolution's Erratic Pace', *Natural History*, Vol 86, May 1977.

<sup>64</sup> Charles Darwin; '*The Origin of Species*', Penguin reprint (1985), p292.

## Evidence of dinosaurs living until a few thousand years ago

### *Blood and soft tissue*

Evolutionists use all their faith to ignore the fact that blood cells and body tissue can only survive for no more than 10,000 years in a buried state; yet dinosaur blood, stretchy blood vessels, collagen, tissues and proteins have been discovered.<sup>66</sup> The degradation of blood and proteins is a reproducible, observable, tested fact (i.e. good science); they cannot survive degradation for millions of years. This data alone destroys the theory of evolution. The science of protein decay is a provable, testable fact; the tissues in these fossils are not even one million years old.

As time went on the number of extinct animals that revealed blood vessels and soft tissue inside fossils included Tyrannosaurus Rex, Hadrosaurs,<sup>67</sup> Mosasaur,<sup>68</sup> Triceratops and others over multiple continents. DNA and amino acids have now been found for a number of dinosaurs and the discovery has been repeated in multiple universities (including verification at Harvard). These fossils can only be a similar age of Egyptian mummies.

### *Triceratops*

The soft tissue found in a 22-inch long Triceratops horn is 8-inches long – utterly denying the evolutionist belief that soft tissues are bacterial corruption.<sup>69</sup> The horn was found in Hell Creek, Montana.

### *Beard worm*

Original soft tissue has also been found in Pre-Cambrian form of beard worm (Siboglinidae; a type of tubeworm) fossil called Sabellidites cambriensis that are supposedly half a billion years old. In addition chitin has been identified in one of the fossils; another substance that cannot be over a million years old.<sup>70</sup>

### *Mosquito*

Scientists found blood remnants, including haemoglobin, in a mosquito fossil trapped in a '46-million' year old rock.<sup>71</sup>

### *Mammoth*

Scientists have been able to find 126 proteins from a frozen woolly mammoth; they have found large numbers in other mammoths. This mammoth was supposed to be 43,000 years old but the protein could not have survived anything like that time period.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>65</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>66</sup> M. Schweitzer & T. Staedter, 'The Real Jurassic Park', *Earth Magazine*, June 1997, p55-57. *Science*, vol. 324, p626; *ScienceDaily*, 1 May 2009, and *Fossil Science*, 3 May 2009. *Creation ex nihilo Magazine* Vol 19.3, June-August 1997, p49; Creation Science Foundation (UK), PO Box 5262, Leicester, LE2 3XU.

<sup>67</sup> Hadrosaur is a large herbivorous mainly bipedal dinosaur of the late Cretaceous period, with jaws flattened like the bill of a duck.

<sup>68</sup> Mosasaur is a large fossil marine reptile of the late Cretaceous period, with large toothed jaws, paddle-like limbs, and a long flattened tail, related to the monitor lizards.

<sup>69</sup> Armitage & Anderson; 'Soft sheets of fibrillar bone from a fossil of the supraorbital horn of the dinosaur *Triceratops horridus*', *Acta Histochemica*, 13 February 2013.

<sup>70</sup> Moczydlowska, Estall and Foucher; 'Microstructure and Biogeochemistry of the organically preserved Ediacaran Metazoan *Sabellidites*', *Journal of Palaeontology*, 88 (2):224-239 (2014).

<sup>71</sup> Greenwalt et. al.; *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 14 October 2013.

<sup>72</sup> Cappellini et. al.; 'Proteomic analysis of a Pleistocene Mammoth femur reveals more than one hundred ancient bone proteins', *Journal of Proteome Research*, 21 November 2011.

### *Not corruption*

These are not corrupted samples but facts that are found in multiple tested samples. Neither does the claim that 'iron preservation' explain this hold any water. There is no evidence of iron preservation in the soft tissues. Iron chelation<sup>73</sup> doesn't protect soft tissues anyway. There is no known method that can preserve soft tissues for millions of years.

### *Carbon-14*

Carbon-14 deteriorates slowly over time; its half-life is 5,730 years. It cannot be found in dinosaur fossils if they are 65-80 million years old.

Carbon-14 has been found complete inside dinosaur bones absolutely proving that the fossil is less than a million years old. Scientists studied seven dinosaur bones from Canada and Oklahoma. Five different commercial and academic laboratories detected carbon-14 in all the samples, whether from the Cenozoic, Mesozoic or Paleozoic source rocks.

There are multiple other discoveries of features in dinosaur fossils that cannot be more than a few thousand years old. These have been recorded in scores of scientific journals for the past few decades and yet the implications of this have not made any significant news.

### **The sudden appearance of life**

Evolutionists have great faith to ignore the fact that complex life arose on earth all of a sudden in the fossil record (e.g. the Cambrian period). All life forms from algae to man appear suddenly in various rock strata.

They also ignore that fact that fossilisation rarely takes place in nature, so why are there millions of fossils? This is faith that a global flood never occurred, despite geological evidence for it.

### **Hominid fossils**

The simple fact is that there is no fossil evidence whatsoever for the evolutionist's faith claim that there are skulls and bones suggesting a transition from apes to man. Hominid fossils fall into two clear groups: ape-like species and human species with a large gap between them.

Notwithstanding this, evolutionist's claim that Homo Sapiens derived from a creature known as Australopithecus afarensis ('Lucy'), despite only having fragments of 47 of 207 bones and the skull is shattered.<sup>74</sup> There are scores of different interpretations as to what Lucy looked like. The fact is no one can say what these bones represent, ape or human; everything depends upon subjective interpretation.

One also has to bear in mind that occasionally one can find a human skull that has deformed features through disease; in the past these have been claimed to be ape-men until the lie was revealed. Another factor to be borne in mind are the deliberate frauds that have been perpetrated by evolutionists, such as Piltdown Man, virtual frauds (Java Man), the skulls of monkeys (Pekin Man), a mixture of human and ape bones (Homo Erectus) or just plain human skulls.

---

<sup>73</sup> Chelation is the process by which metal atoms or ions are held by organic molecules that have two or more points at which they can link to the atom or ion (hence the name, from the Latin word *chele*, 'claw'). The metal atom thus becomes part of a ring of atoms. Chelation occurs naturally in soil, where organic compounds released by plants combine with metal ions, such as iron and aluminium. Chelation increases the rate of weathering.

<sup>74</sup> Australopithecus is a fossil bipedal primate with both ape-like and human characteristics, found in Pliocene and Lower Pleistocene deposits (claimed to be c.4 million to 1 million years old) in Africa.

There is no evidence for an intermediate creature between ape and man whatsoever.

## Miscellaneous

### Stunningly stupid faith remarks by evolutionists

- Scientists at the University of Oxford asserted that, *'hip pain may be a hangover from evolution'*.<sup>75</sup> This is presumed to be caused by man starting to stand up straight on two legs after millennia running on four limbs. No evidence was provided.
- The same scientists claimed that lower back pain was caused by people having a spine closer in shape to *'our nearest ape relative'*.
- *'Life may have started not once but many times right here on Earth'*.<sup>76</sup>
- For many years 98% of DNA was called *'junk leftovers from evolution'* because evolutionists did not know what to make of it. It is now known that most of these are chemical tags that attach to genes to switch them on and off. Other non-protein-coding DNA: repair DNA, assist in DNA replication, regulate DNA transcription, aid in folding and maintenance of chromosomes, control RNA editing and splicing, help to fight disease, and regulate embryological development.
- Certain human organs were believed to be *'vestigial'* (e.g. human appendix, tonsils, coccyx, thyroid) and had no function. This was taught in schools for decades until it was found that they all had a precise purpose. One biologist (Horatio Hackett Neman) said that over 180 vestigial organs and structures existed in the human body; every one a mistake.
- *'There are no weaknesses in the theory of evolution'*.<sup>77</sup>
- Richard Dawkins: *'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).'*<sup>78</sup>
- The solution to the problem of African monkeys present in South America is resolved by the theory that they travelled there on a raft in sufficient numbers to start a population!<sup>79</sup> This is a journey of 2600 km without food or water. Monkeys have high metabolisms and require large amounts of food and water.
- Richard Dawkins: *'creationists might spend some earnest time speculating on why the Creator should bother to litter genomes with untranslated pseudogenes and junk tandem repeat DNA'*.<sup>80</sup> [See earlier.] This idea of junk DNA is now known to be completely false; it all has a purpose. The words *'egg'* and *'face'* come to mind.
- *'Over 500 million years ago, humans and certain worms shared a common ancestor.'*<sup>81</sup>

### Wicked repercussions of evolutionary theory

#### *Eugenics*

Eugenics is the logical conclusion to evolutionary theory: improve society by getting rid of bad genes. Many evolutionists have believed in Eugenics, especially in the early years of the theory becoming popular.

---

<sup>75</sup> BBC News; [goo.gl/vFgJpV](http://goo.gl/vFgJpV).

<sup>76</sup> New Scientist, 20 August 2016, p26.

<sup>77</sup> Eugene Scott (head of the Darwin lobby in Texas); Dallas Morning News, 22 January 2009.

<sup>78</sup> Dawkins quoted in Phillip E Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, Monarch, p9.

<sup>79</sup> Adrienne L Zihlman, *The Human Evolution Colouring Book*, Harper Collins (2000), p4-11.

<sup>80</sup> Dawkins; *'The Information Challenge'*, The Skeptic, 18 December 1998.

<sup>81</sup> Live Science, Mindy Weisberger (Senior Writer); *'You share 70% of your genes with this slimy marine worm'*, 18 November 2015.

In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century several US states legislated to sterilise the ‘feeble-minded’. Some would point to appalling measures used by the US, such as dropping carcinogen substances on poor Black areas of towns.

### *The selfish gene*

Dawkins has written about this. Indeed it is a logical progression from basic evolutionary theory of the survival of the fittest (‘natural selection’). Evolutionary theory is based upon selfishness and self-preservation above all else.

Evolutionists cannot answer why altruism develops in society (see ‘Human behavioural and cognitive abilities’).

## **Brain power**

It requires more brains to believe in God than to be an atheist.

The media and education systems constantly berate Christian creationists with the strong added implication that they are delusional fools that are not as intelligent as rational atheists are. Well, we now have scientific proof that the reverse is the case.

A study performed by the University of York used targeted magnetism to shut down part of the brain. The result was that belief in God disappeared in over 30% of participants. The part that was shut down was the posterior medial frontal cortex – the part that is associated with detecting and solving problems; i.e. reasoning and logic.

When you shut down the reasoning processes in the brain you get greater levels of atheism.

Spanish specialists have affirmed that today’s scientific knowledge, if analysed without materialistic and atheistic interpretations is not at all incompatible with Christian doctrines.<sup>82</sup> In fact they affirm that, *‘science has been employed to build ideologies (faith systems) that go way beyond what is allowed by empirical data ... the positivist scenario that proclaims the death of religion as a result of science has both failed to materialise and does not look like it will ... It is wrong to assume that the starting points of religious thought are rooted in ignorance of science’*.

Creationists are not stupid, vacuous people but are folk who place their trust in God’s word – something that has been authenticated time after time for centuries. This word has been proved to stand up to all genuine scientific discoveries and observations; in fact science is frequently found to support Biblical axioms. Furthermore, the Bible has often revealed something only accepted by the scientific community long afterwards (such as the earth being a sphere: Isa 40:22 or the existence of the Hittite Empire: Gen 15:20). Not only that but many of the great pioneering scientists who discovered important laws and features of nature were Bible believers – including Isaac Newton,<sup>83</sup> Johannes Kepler,<sup>84</sup> Blaise Pascal,<sup>85</sup> Lord Kelvin,<sup>86</sup> Robert Boyle,<sup>87</sup> Michael Faraday,<sup>88</sup> William Harvey,<sup>89</sup> Ronald Ross<sup>90</sup> and many more.

---

<sup>82</sup> Manuel Alfonso et. al.’ ‘60 Questions on Science and Faith answered by 26 University Professors’, Editorial Stella Maris, Spain (2014).

<sup>83</sup> Founder of Classical Physics and Infinitesimal Calculus.

<sup>84</sup> Founder of Physical Astronomy and Modern Optics

<sup>85</sup> Discovered Hydrostatics, Hydrodynamics, and the Theory of Probabilities.

<sup>86</sup> Discovered Thermodynamics and Energetics.

<sup>87</sup> Founder of Modern Chemistry.

On the contrary, Darwinian evolutionists are ideologues who refuse to accept plain facts when they are staring them in the face. They have to be ideologues since they affirm that a theory is a scientific fact when it is just an unproven hypothesis; in fact it is a hypothesis that flies in the face of multiple scientific facts opposing it. The atheistic scientific community's response to multiple discoveries of soft tissue, blood and proteins from dinosaur fossils is a classic example of this. It is abject denial of the facts in front of their eyes.

When Richard Dawkins was asked if he could name one example of an organism adding information to its genome, he was silent for a long time before answering, 'No'. Since this is the basis of all evolution, any sane person would only hold this idea as a possible hypothesis awaiting evidence instead of being a crusading champion insisting that evolution is true. In another interview Dawkins was asked if a creationist had ever asked him a question that he could not answer. He, without hesitation, said, 'No'. That just about sums up evolutionary theory apologists.

## Conclusion

There can be no doubt about it; being an evolutionist requires a huge amount of faith. It seems to me that any rational and sane perusal of the facts about origins and development of life on earth eliminates any thought of evolutionary theory – even if one refuses to accept the creationist position.

Instead of people gullibly accepting the nonsense they are taught by the media, and particularly the BBC, one should at least hold an agnostic position and give equal opportunity to alternative viewpoints in education. Castigating creationists when they often have a better explanation of some feature is not scientific and not rational.

Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless.<sup>91</sup>

*My attempt to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for 40 years has completely failed ... The idea of evolution rests on pure belief.*<sup>92</sup>

*[Evolutionary theory] is universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible.*<sup>93</sup>

*If by evolution we mean macroevolution ... then it could be said with the utmost rigour that the doctrine is totally bereft of scientific sanction ... there exists to this day not a shred of bona fide scientific evidence in support of the thesis that macroevolutionary transformations have ever occurred.*<sup>94</sup>

<sup>88</sup> Discovered Electronics and Electro-magnetics.

<sup>89</sup> Founder of Modern Medicine.

<sup>90</sup> Nobel Laureate in Medicine and Physiology.

<sup>91</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 Centre of Scientific Research. (Quoted in *The Advocate*, 8 March 1984.)

<sup>92</sup> Dr N Heribert-Nilsson, (a Swedish botanist) *Synthetische Artbildung*, [The synthetic origin of species] 1953.

<sup>93</sup> DMS Watson, (an evolutionist) 'Adaptation', *Nature*, Vol 123 (1929), p233.

<sup>94</sup> Wolfgang Smith (Professor of Mathematics at Oregon State University), *Teilhardism and the New Religion*, Tan Books 1988, p5.

Not only is the theory incapable of proof by normal scientific means, the evidence is ... far from compelling.<sup>95</sup>

## Select bibliography

### *Papers*

- I have taken swathes of data from my paper, 'Questions for evolutionists' for use in this paper.
- Paul Fahy; *Simple killer arguments against evolution*.
- Paul Fahy; *Recent Cosmology*.
- Geoff Chapman; *Our unique planet*, Pamphlet 251, Creation Science Mvt.
- Discovery Institute, Casey Luskin; 'The top ten scientific problems with biological and chemical evolution', 20 February 2015.

### *Media*

- BBC News.
- National Post.

### *Journals*

- Acta Histochemica.
- (The) Advocate.
- Anatomy and Embryology.
- Cosmic Times.
- Creation [Creation Science Movement].
- Creation ex nihilo Magazine.
- Current Biology.
- Earth Magazine.
- Journal of Molecular Biology.
- Journal of Palaeontology.
- Journal of Proteome Research.
- Life Magazine.
- Natural History.
- Nature.
- New Scientist.
- Science Daily.
- Scientific American.
- Scientific Monthly.
- Systematic Biology.
- The Skeptic.
- Trends in Ecology and Evolution.

---

<sup>95</sup> Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory In Crisis*, p76.

*Books*

- Steven M Stanley; *The New Evolutionary Timetable*, Basic Books, (1981).
- Sir Fred Hoyle and Chandra Wickramasinghe; *Evolution from Space: A theory of Cosmic Creationism*, London: J.M. Dent & Sons, (1981).
- Dr. Robert Gentry; *Creation's Tiny Mystery*, Earth Science Associates, Knoxville, (1986).
- Helge Kragh; *Cosmology and Controversy: The Historical Development of Two Theories of the Universe*, Princeton University Press, (1997).
- Wolfgang Smith (Professor of Mathematics at Oregon State University), *Teilhardism and the New Religion*, Tan Books 1988.
- Dr. Werner Gitt; *In the Beginning Was Information*, CLV, Bielefeld, Germany (1997).
- E. Shute, *Flaws in the Theory of Evolution*, Craig Press, Nutley, New Jersey, (1961).
- R.L. Wysong, *The Creation-Evolution Controversy*, Inquiry Press, Midland, 1981.
- Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory In Crisis*, Burnett Books Ltd. (1985).

*Reference works*

- Encyclopaedia Britannica.
- Oxford Dictionary.
- Oxford Encyclopaedia.

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version  
© Thomas Nelson 1982

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2017**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>