


Science vs Evolution

The observable facts that challenge the unobservable myth

www.sciencevsevolution.co.uk

We live at a time in history, and in a country, where the **theory of Evolution**, as popularised by Charles Darwin, is accepted by the masses as an established fact. From school textbooks to the media, young and old alike are continually taught that we are the product of spontaneous generation, chance evolution; and that mankind is the pinnacle of the evolutionary process.




Those who dare to challenge the status quo and question the validity of the theory of Evolution are soon silenced and labelled as unscientific and/or religious fundamentalists.

The word 'theory' can mean a number of things; it can be '*a speculative or conjectural view or idea*'¹, or in scientific terms the word 'theory' is used to denote a working hypothesis, such as with the 'general theory of relativity', or 'atomic theory': Wikipedia states: "*A scientific theory is a well-substantiated explanation of some aspect of the natural world, based on a body of knowledge that has been repeatedly confirmed through observation and experimentation. Scientists create scientific theories from hypotheses that have been corroborated through the scientific method, then gather evidence to test their accuracy.*"²

What will come as a surprise to many, is that, by this definition, the theory of Evolution is **not** a 'scientific theory' at all. It is not well-substantiated; and it cannot be repeatedly confirmed through observation and experimentation. It is merely a *speculative or conjectural view or idea*. There is no observable evidence, nothing that can be tested by the scientific method and repeated. In fact it has never been anything more than just a proposition. Any so-called scientist who promotes it as a fact, is either blissfully unaware of the overwhelming weight of scientific evidence to the contrary, or is living in a state of denial.

Michael Ruse, a preeminent evolutionist, wrote in New Scientist: "*An increasing number of scientists, most particularly a growing number of evolutionists. . . argue that Darwinian evolutionary theory is no genuine scientific theory at all . . . Many of the critics have the highest intellectual credentials.*"³



The Scientific Method

Professor Louis Bounoure, Director of Research, American National Centre of Scientific Research has gone as far as saying: "*Evolution is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless.*"⁴

Evolution is by definition a religion - '*a belief held to with ardour and faith*'; it is a *belief system* about our past, attempting to explain our origins. Sadly, its converts are often so aggressive in the promotion of their faith that it has put a strangle-hold on science from the classroom to the lab, a fact admitted by honest evolutionists themselves.


www.sciencevsevolution.co.uk

Sir Fred Hoyle, a well-respected British astronomer, who demonstrated that evolution is a mathematical impossibility, said: *"The situation is well known to geneticists and yet nobody seems to blow the whistle decisively on the theory.....Most scientists still cling to Darwinism because of its grip on the education system.....You either have to believe the concepts, or you will be branded a heretic."*⁵




Astronomer, Robert Jastrow, who was the founder of the Goddard Space Institute that sent Pioneer and Voyager into space, commented: *"Astronomers are curiously upset by.....proof that the universe had a beginning. Their reactions provide an interesting demonstration of the response of the scientific mind - supposedly a very objective mind - when evidence uncovered by science itself leads to a conflict with the articles of faith in their profession.....There is a kind of religion in science."*⁶

One of evolution's most virulent proponents, Richard Dawkins, stated of religion: *"Religion demands belief in the supernatural"*^{7a}; but nothing exploding and becoming everything, spontaneous generation of life from non-life, one kind changing into a totally different kind is not a *natural* occurrence. Evolution therefore demands belief in that which cannot be naturally observed; so belief in evolution requires belief in the super-natural. Dawkins continues: *"Religion requires belief in things that cannot be verified by science"*^{7b}. As this leaflet will demonstrate, evolution cannot be verified by science. Dawkins concludes: *"The time has come for people of reason to say: enough is enough. Religious faith discourages independent thought, it's divisive, and it's dangerous."*^{7c} Hear, hear Mr Dawkins! By his own definitions, evolution *"requires belief in things that cannot be verified by science"*, so is therefore a religion, and he is absolutely right, evolution *has* discouraged independent thought – see the film 'Expelled' with Ben Stein for a shocking expose of evolution's strangle-hold on academia – and Dawkins is right, it is divisive and dangerous: Hitler used evolution as justification for his actions in extermination of the 'weaker' and less able to survive. Those who preach the religion of evolution are relentless in their 'great commission'; and there can be no doubt, evolution has been marketed so effectively that the average person in the street would not readily question it.



If the question were asked 'do you believe in evolution?' many would happily answer in the affirmative. If it were then asked 'do you believe evolution is a proven fact?' the same response would be given. However, if you then asked for a single piece of scientific evidence, something that is observable, that doesn't have to be taken by faith, you may get a few who will cry 'fossils' (we will address that later), but the majority will be compelled to point you to the text books, the TV documentaries, or the 'scientists' – for they *must* have the evidence, right? The vast majority of those accepting evolution are seemingly happy just to put *their faith* in the 'experts', never stopping to ask questions.



Yet the experts are not nearly as confident as the evolutionary marketing machine would suggest...

One evolutionist, reviewing the work of another, conceded: *"We cannot identify ancestors or "missing links," and we cannot devise testable theories to explain how particular episodes of evolution came about... all the popular stories about how the first amphibians conquered the dry land, how the birds developed wings and feathers for flying, how the dinosaurs went extinct, and how humans evolved from apes are just products of our imagination, driven by prejudices and preconceptions."*⁸


Dr. Colin Patterson, the senior palaeontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, whilst giving a keynote address at the American Museum of Natural History, startled his audience with the following anti-evolutionary remarks: *"One morning I woke up and.....it struck me that I had been working on this stuff for twenty years and there was not one thing I knew about it. That's quite a shock to learn that one can be misled so long.....I've tried putting a simple question to various people: 'Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing, any one thing that is true?' I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology Seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time and eventually one person said, 'I do know one thing, it ought not to be taught in high school.'"*⁹

What are we talking about?

What most people are blissfully unaware of is that there is no single unified theory of evolution. Suggestions go from 'gradual change over millions of years' to 'punctuated equilibrium' (the belief that due to no observable evidence of transitions between kinds, evolution must have happened in big jumps), to 'panspermia' (the belief that life is too complex to have started on earth, so must have been seeded from somewhere else in the universe).

If any one of these theories had the answers, there would be no need for the others!

The other point that should be mentioned is that there are a number of component parts that would have to work together if evolution were to be possible. When most people consider evolution, they have in their mind monkeys evolving into man, or dinosaurs into birds, or possibly even life from non-life. Yet there are at least six distinct categories. See chart below:



Evolutionists are quick to appeal to adaptation within a kind (micro-evolution), which **does** occur and **can** be observed, but from this, the incredible leap of faith is made that assumes all the other links in the chain are therefore proven also! When evolutionists talk of proof, **adaptation** is all they can point to. We **do** see different types of dogs, yet they are all still dogs! We see insects 'becoming' resistant to pesticides (but this is actually a *loss* of genetic information and *not* the addition of new information), yet the insect does not change into a different creature. Even Darwin's finches on the Galapagos never changed from being finches, nor ever could. It *is*

scientifically observable to see adaptation within the kind, everything else, however tightly clung to, is simply a belief.

Nothing exploding and becoming everything, the origin of chemicals (from nothing), formation of the stars and planets (as yet still unobserved and unexplained), the spontaneous generation of life from non-living material, and then (even if we could get that far- which we can't) the transition from one kind of creature to another: all these are taken by faith in the evolutionary process, which we will demonstrate in the following pages, is scientifically impossible!

However, in an attempt to validate the belief that life arose from non-living material millions of years ago (viz. organic evolution), numerous experiments have been conducted to try and 'prove' that the component parts (i.e. the nucleotides of DNA and RNA found inside all living systems, essential to life) could have come into existence by random chance.

Commenting on these experiments Robert Shapiro said the following: *"they [the component parts] have never been reported in any amount in such 'spark & soup' type experiments. Yet a mythology has emerged that maintains the opposite. I have seen several statements in scientific sources, which claim that proteins and nucleic acids themselves have been prepared (i.e. formed by random chance). These errors reflect the operation of an entire belief system. The facts do not support this belief. Such thoughts may be comforting but they run far ahead of any experimental validation."*¹⁰ In other words, so desperate have evolutionists been to provide evidence for their theory, that they have blatantly lied and fabricated evidence for which there is no scientific support.

At least Leslie E. Orgel was honest enough to admit: *"And so, at first glance, one might have to conclude that life could never, in fact, have originated by chemical means"*¹¹

Another example of the deliberate deceit employed by evolutionists can be seen in the proposed evolution of man from primates. Many have been conned into believing evolution has been proven because of the deceitful way school text books, museums, and TV documentaries will present a picture, a stuffed dummy in an exhibit, or a clever animation suggesting that the transitional forms leading to man have been discovered and scientifically verified, yet even one of the world's most prominent evolutionists, Dr Richard Leakey said:



MISSING PERSON

"If pressed about man's ancestry, I would have to unequivocally say that all we have is a huge question mark. To date, there has been nothing found to truthfully purport as a transitional species to man, including Lucy. . . If further pressed, I would have to state that there is more evidence to suggest an abrupt arrival of man rather than a gradual process of evolving"¹².

All of the alleged (yet still taught) transitional forms from monkey to man have long been shown to be figments of the imagination, wishful thinking or deliberate hoaxes. The fossil record knows nothing of the evolution of modern man from a primitive ape-like ancestor.

"Monkey Man" Frauds

Heidelberg Man, 1907 – was built from just a jaw bone.

Nebraska Man, 1922 – discovered by Henry Osborn, was built from just one tooth, later discovered to be from an extinct pig. (Schools should probably stop teaching that one now!)

Pittdown Man, 1912, discovered by Charles Dawson; now known to be from the jawbone of a modern ape. In 1953 this was proved to be a deliberate fraud that had been filed and treated with dichromate to make it look old!

Peking Man, 1921, all evidence has disappeared! Although we do have the lovely picture in our children's text books – that happens to include the whole family. How nice.

Neanderthal Man, 1829, discovered by Phippe-Charles Schmerling in the Neander Valley (Germany). At the International Congress of Zoology in 1958, they concluded that Schmerling's discovery was just an old man suffering from arthritis.

Java Man, 1922, a skull cap was discovered 50ft from the thigh bone, some evidence was concealed until it was revealed the teeth came from an orang-utan.

Dr Vij Sodera, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, in his book, **One small Speck to Man, The Evolution Myth**, comments: *"The fossil record contains only human and non-human bones, with no convincing evidence for any intermediaries. Apes have always been apes and Man has always been Man"* ¹³. p375
Commenting on the lack of human like fossils Dr Sodera continues: *"...Even the impressively-titled 300-page 'Encyclopaedia of Human Evolution' by Jones, Martin and Pilbeam shows only a small sprinkling of human-like fossils, amounting to around just twelve in all. For a work purporting to be an encyclopaedia on the subject, this constitutes lamentably little information. And surprisingly, the Natural History Museum of London's own exhibit on human evolution includes less than ten reproductions of individual human-like fossil skull specimens".* p318 ¹⁴

- **Nebraska Man** -
Artists impression created
from a single tooth of an
extinct pig!

For those who deny a
Creator, Evolutionists are
certainly very creative!



At home with Peking Man
(Artist's impression)



Note: all the
family gathered
around, and
dwelling in a cave

constructed from
... er... well
nothing actually!

In the 150 years since Darwin, NO intermediate stages have been found

What are my options?

The astonishing thing then, is that despite all the propaganda, the theory of evolution can be shown to be false and easily disproved by the average person in the street who has even the slightest interest in biology, physics, chemistry or the information sciences.

Yet we are so often told that *evolution is proven science, but belief in a Creator is merely religion*. This was highlighted in a recent debate with the Rt. Honourable Mr Michael Gove, Secretary of State for Education about the proposed teaching of evolution to primary school children. The Government ignored the scientific questions raised to them and tried to reduce the argument to 'evolution vs. faith', saying: *'The [Education] department accepts that faith may give rise to personal misgivings about including this topic in the primary curriculum for the first time'*¹⁵. In other words, anything that challenges the dogma of evolution is a matter of personal faith! Why was it the government didn't address a single scientific objection raised to them? Because quite simply, on the ground of science, they would lose. The Education Secretary was asked to give just one piece of scientific evidence, something that doesn't have to be taken by faith. Just one thing that is observable, testable, repeatable; just one piece of evidence that would warrant teaching this to primary school children as part of a science lesson. The Rt. Honourable Mr Michael Gove, Secretary of State for Education could not provide a single piece of evidence, but simply replied saying *"The government is very firm in its position. I am sorry but there is nothing more the department can say on the matter"*¹⁵ (Correspondence reference 2013/0049695). Or to put it another way, 'Our mind is made up, don't confuse us with the facts!'

Why then, is evolution so popular and so promoted? Because evolutionists and the government recognise that the only other option is that *'In the beginning God.....'* (Genesis 1:1), and that is something 'educated' scientists, governments and the media are unwilling to face. Francis Crick, one of the two men who discovered DNA, made this telling statement: *"Biologists must constantly keep in mind what they see was not designed, but evolved"*¹⁶. If everything looks like it was designed, if all the evidence points clearly in that direction, why is scientific enquiry not allowed to consider the possibility?

The reality is, that if God can be done away with, then governments are the highest power, scientists are the highest intelligence and the media are accountable to no-one.

The Bible speaks of those who would one day scoff at its teaching; of these people the Bible says they are 'wilfully ignorant'. In other words, they can see the truth for themselves, but they refuse to accept it. The apostle Paul, in writing to the Christians in Rome said: *"For the invisible things of [God] from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse"* (Romans 1:20). Further, Paul launches a damning indictment on 'man's wisdom' saying; *"Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"* (1 Corinthians 1:20). *"because, although they knew God, they did not glorify Him as God, nor were thankful, but became futile in their thoughts, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man--and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things"* (Romans 1:21-23).



Ancient cultures worshipped idols made of wood and stone; however, whilst this must have been insulting to the one true God, today's academia has invented an even more insulting idol, and has attributed all the beauty, symmetry, order, design, scientific laws and the wonder of creation to... nothing!

No longer is it 'In the beginning God created...'. The mantra of today's schools, colleges and universities is 'In the beginning Nothing...'. Then they call the Biblical explanation, with a beginning (verified by science), a universe that has been stretched out (verified by science), an Earth that is a globe (verified by science) hanging on nothing in space (verified by science), a Sun and Moon that exist to enable life on Earth and mark seasons (observable), life that suddenly appears on Earth (observable in the fossil record), creatures that reproduce only after their kind (verified by science and observation), a human race that is degenerating (verified by science), a world-wide flood (observable), a world that once had a uniform climate (verified by science), an ocean with 'pathways' (verified by science), the hydro cycle (verified by science) etc. etc... they call all of this, 'myth' or 'religious belief', but nothing exploding and defying countless laws of nature and violating unnumbered scientific facts, this they call *"scientific knowledge, supported by extensive, robust evidence"*

Again we ask the Rt. Honourable Mr Michael Gove, or any evolutionist, for just one piece of your 'extensive, robust evidence'. Please? Pretty please? Why has it gone quiet? Why have you 'nothing more to say'?

The bigger picture

It may come as a surprise to many, that the theory of evolution is not so quickly embraced as we might assume. For example, Serbia's government ordered schools to stop teaching the theory of evolution, saying that evolution left many questions unanswered and was at best "dogmatic". Serbia's Education Minister, Ljiljana Colic, decided that the teaching of evolution should be suspended. The Cabinet of Serbian Prime Minister Vojislav Kostunica backed the decision saying it was clear that the evolutionary explanation for *"the origin and development of man is full of voids"*. Colic added that science cannot be true science unless it is open to all possibilities, whereas most academic authorities, which are controlled by evolutionists, don't want students to consider anything other than their theory.¹⁷

Dr. Francis Collins, director of the Human Genome Project said: *"40 per cent of working scientists claim to be believers"*. As a believer himself, Collins finds exploring nature to be *"a way of getting a glimpse of God's mind."*¹⁸

"The evolutionists seem to know everything about the missing link, except the fact that it is missing."

G.K. Chesterton

Jerry Bergman, PhD, has compiled a list of almost 3,000 scientists and professors who reject evolution, most of whom hold PhDs in science. He believes that he could easily complete a list of 10,000 names¹⁹.

Even a casual follower of current news stories will have heard of the controversy raging in the USA regarding the proposed teaching of 'intelligent design' alongside Evolution theory in American schools. The cry from the evolutionists is that this is mixing religion with science. Those who say such things should quietly resign as they obviously have no grasp of what science is. Science is knowledge gained by observation using one or more of our five senses.

This is irrespective of our beliefs. However, the way we interpret our observations will depend on our belief systems – either 'Nothing exploded and then it evolved', or 'In the beginning God....' They are the only two options. We should remember that even biologists, chemists and archaeologists have a bias that will shape the way they interpret their observations.

Position	Belief	Basis	Bias
Theist	There must be a god - somewhere	Personal belief in belief	100%
Atheist	No God. Life is a result of chance evolution - Only material things exist	Personal belief there is no God only material things exist	100%
Agnostic Latin: Ignoramus	Don't know, probably can't know don't care. Need proof.	Because I don't know, you can't know either	100%
Revelation	The Bible is God's Word to Mankind & reveals Him as Creator, Sustainer, Judge & Saviour	The Bible - axiomatic, can be proven to be God's Word	100%

Everyone has a bias which determines how they interpret the evidence - But which is the best bias to be biased with?

The elephant in the living room

Again we ask the question: Why then, is evolution still taught in schools and 'peddled' so enthusiastically by the media and many 'scientists' if there is no evidence for it, and scientific laws against it?

The following may go some way to providing an answer:

American columnist George Caylor interviewed a molecular biologist for an article entitled "The Biologist," that ran on February 17th, 2000, in 'The Ledger' (an American magazine/periodical). We join the article mid-way through in the middle of a discussion about the complexity of the human code.

("G" = George Caylor, and "J" = the scientist)

G: "Do you believe that the information evolved?"

J: "George, **nobody I know in my profession believes it evolved. It was engineered by genius beyond genius, and such information could not have been written any other way. The paper and ink did not write the book! Knowing what we know, it is ridiculous to think otherwise.**"

G: "Have you ever stated that in a public lecture, or in any public writings?"

J: "No, I just say it evolved. To be a molecular biologist requires one to hold onto two insanities at all times. One, **it would be insane to believe in evolution when you can see the truth for yourself.** Two, it would be insane to say you don't believe evolution.

All government work, research grants, papers, big college lectures -- everything would stop. I'd be out of a job, or relegated to the outer fringes where I couldn't earn a decent living.

G: I hate to say it, but that sounds intellectually dishonest.

J: The work I do in genetic research is honourable. We will find the cures to many of mankind's worst diseases. But in the meantime, we have to live with the elephant in the living room.


G: What elephant?

J: Creation design. It's like an elephant in the living room. It moves around, takes up space, loudly trumpets, bumps into us, knocks things over, eats a ton of hay, and smells like an elephant. And yet we have to swear it isn't there! ²⁰

Many scientists see the evidence for creation, and they see it clearly, but peer pressure, financial considerations, political correctness, and a religious commitment to their belief in naturalism, force them to look the other way and insist they see nothing. And so, the illogical origins myth of modern society perpetuates itself.' ²¹

This situation is well explored and documented in the 2008 documentary film 'Expelled', where Ben Stein lifts the lid on the great conspiracy to silence any other voice than evolution.

The film interviews scientists who have lost their jobs for being willing to go wherever the evidence leads them – and yes, you guessed it, the evidence will lead away from evolution and toward an intelligent designer.




Dave Hunt, in his book "Seeking & Finding God' (p. 47-48) says:

"It is undeniable that there is neither truth, meaning, nor purpose without an intelligent Creator who, for His own reasons, made the universe and each of us in His image. Yet the world of academia largely rejects this inescapable fact. Professors and students claim to be on a quest for truth while denying that it exists or that anyone could identify it if it did. Such is the nihilistic atmosphere in major universities around the world. It is considered to be too dogmatic for anyone to claim that truth can be known. Then what is the point of research and study, if all we can achieve is a listing of differing opinions, none of which can be declared to be either right or wrong?" ²²

Whilst many evolutionists are sincere and genuine people - people for whom God sent His only Son, that 'if they would believe in Him they would not perish but have eternal life', they are either, simply deceived, wilfully ignorant or deliberately deceitful.

Hidden dangers


Although proponents of evolution rigorously try to deny it, the theory of evolution is actually at the root of numerous social and moral problems. Racism only finds a voice in an evolutionary worldview. In fact, the full title of Darwin's book hints at his racist attitude:



"On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life".

Just who are the favoured races? Does evolution work to eradicate the less favoured races? The suggestion that one group of people are further up the evolutionary ladder, fuels racist attitudes and de-values individuals, ethnic groups and even countries because of the colour of their skin or physical features. Why is it that all artist impressions of apemen, hobbits or any other 'between monkeys and men' transitional forms are depicted as dark skinned? Did evolution only take place in Africa, or the Australian Outback?

As already mentioned, Adolph Hitler used evolution to justify his desire to create a 'master-race'. Sir Arthur Keith was a British anthropologist, an atheistic evolutionist and an anti-Nazi, he drew this chilling conclusion: *'The German Führer, as I have consistently maintained, is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practice of Germany conform to the theory of evolution.'*²³



*"Darwinism by itself did not produce the Holocaust, but without Darwinism, especially in its social Darwinist and eugenics permutations, neither Hitler nor his Nazi followers would have had the necessary scientific underpinnings to convince themselves and their collaborators that one of the world's greatest atrocities was really morally praiseworthy. Darwinism - or at least some naturalistic interpretation of Darwinism - succeeded in turning morality on its head."*²⁴

Richard Weikart, From Darwin to Hitler, Page 233

Lawlessness is also a by-product of evolution as young people grow up in a world with no absolutes and a 'survival of the fittest' mentality. Why should anyone obey those in authority? Surely you can make your own rules, do whatever you choose - after all, that might be the next step in your evolution(?).

What are rules anyway? Who is to determine right and wrong? Atheistic evolutionists will tell us that there are no absolutes - are they absolutely sure? Is rape always wrong? Is murder always wrong? Is theft always wrong? Now, can we have a show of hands for all those who would prefer to live in a world with no absolutes?

With an evolutionary world-view, morality is out of the window as abortions, child abuse, sexually transmitted diseases and the like, continue to increase. With an evolutionary worldview being the only world-view offered to our children through the education system, these things will continue to grow out of control. Evolution is not just a harmless theory; it is eating at the very fabric of society. Is this really what the Government want to include in the 'high quality science education' to be taught to our deeply impressionable primary school children?



"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God"

- The Apostle Paul - 2 Timothy 3:1-4 -

Six impossible things before breakfast

The following excellent article (taken from the Creation Science Movement's information leaflet and written by Dr David Rosevear) hits the nail on the head!

"I can't believe that" said Alice

"Can't you" said the Queen in a long pitying tone, *"Try again; draw a long breath and shut your eyes."*

Alice laughed. *"There's no use trying"*, she said: *"One can't believe impossible things."*

"I dare say you haven't had much practice" said the Queen. *"When I was your age, I always did it for half an hour a day. Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast."*

Alice's Wonderland was frequently hilarious, but such willing suspension of common sense is continued today in the teaching of evolution theory. The consequences for society and the individual are sinister. It is amazing how many things the evolutionist, like the Red Queen in Lewis Carroll's 'Through The Looking Glass', must believe. The evolutionist believes that the Universe exploded into being out of nothing (no less impossible when put fifteen billion years into the past): that clusters of galaxies formed under the influence of Cold Dark Matter which nobody has seen nor can detect: that in some warm pond, chemicals came together by chance to form the first living cell, far more complex than anything man-made.

The evolutionist also believes that the first life diversified, adding new genetic information to its DNA by chance mutations - another impossible thing. He believes that reptiles which have no fewer than six bones on either side of their lower jaws but only a single bone in each ear, evolved into mammals with a single bone each side of the lower jaw and three bones in each ear. It is impossible for 'intermediate forms' to have bones migrating from jaw to ear, for how would they eat or hear?

The Darwinist believes that reptiles also evolved into birds. But this would involve the development of intricate flight feathers and the alteration of the internal structure of the bones for buoyance and, not least, a change from a cold to a warm blooded metabolism.

It takes a lot of blind faith in impossible things to be an evolutionist. Yet this is what is generally taught and accepted today. Our society has been brought up to believe that we got here by chance. Schools, Universities and TV teach evolution as proven fact. In such a survival-of-the-fittest worldview there are no moral constraints and the Gospel itself can seem, irrelevant.

Only 200 years ago Western thought accepted that the Lord God had created this world a few thousand years before Christ; but atheists embraced Darwin's idea and thus lost the basis of morality. Our great grandparents would be incredulous at what we regard as the norm - 500 abortions a day in the UK, school children given sex education stressing hygiene rather than morality, regular sex and violence on TV in our homes. The nation's conscience is being seared.

Ours is a depraved society: a society which urgently needs the washing of God's written Word starting with Genesis and Creation. This is a central issue and it is urgent.

The white rabbit put on his spectacles. *"Where shall I begin, please your Majesty?"* He asked. *"Begin at the beginning,"* the King said gravely, *"and go on till you come to the end; and then stop!"*

And where can you begin? At the account of Creation in Genesis.

We urge you to become a subscribing member of CSM. You need the information we put out every two months for yourself and your family.

"Thinking again?" The Duchess asked. *"I've a right to think"* said Alice sharply, for she was beginning to feel a little worried.²⁵

For more information about the work of Creation Science Movement, visit www.csm.org.uk

In the remainder of this leaflet you will find presented clear rebuttals to the theory of evolution that show, purely from a scientific perspective, that evolution could not have taken place. Furthermore, you do not need to have a doctorate in the sciences to be able to understand these things.

Rebuttals to Evolution

The following are a series of simple problems that the evolutionist has no answer for. Not only do these scientific arguments undermine the theory of evolution as popularised by Charles Darwin (a fact acknowledged by prominent evolutionists themselves), they show Darwin's theory to be unscientific and impossible when put under the spotlight of the laws of chemistry, biology, physics & information science.

The Oxygen Problem


For amino acids and nucleotides to have formed in a primordial 'soup' the atmosphere would have to be void of oxygen because oxygen would 'corrode' these essential building blocks for life. However if there were no oxygen there would be no ozone layer and the ultra violet radiation from the sun would have destroyed the amino acids and nucleotides. Michael Denton in his book, 'Evolution: A Theory In Crisis' comments: *"What we have is sort of catch 22 situation. If we have oxygen we have no organic compounds, the building blocks of life. But if we don't we have none either."*²⁶ This is not an emotional argument against Evolution theory, but a scientific one.

The Left Handed Problem

Proteins are made up of entirely left-handed amino acids. There are 20 amino acids found in living systems but only about 10% of these have been able to be produced in laboratory experiments designed to simulate the earth atmosphere as proposed by evolutionists. Out of the 10% that have been formed by 'random chance' in a laboratory, there has been a mix of 50/50 right and left handed amino acids. Evolutionists have yet to explain how, by random chance, 100% left handed amino acids are found in living systems.

The Right Handed Problem

Whilst the best scientists with the best minds have been unable to produce 'by random chance' any nucleotides (long complex chains of nucleic acids) the building blocks of DNA and RNA the problem that would have to be faced even if this could be done, is that DNA and RNA are made up entirely of right handed nucleotides. If random chance could in some way construct a complex nucleotide chain, how is it possible that these randomly selected nucleotides would all be right handed?



"I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it has been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has"

Malcolm Muggeridge, British journalist and philosopher.

The Law of Mass Action Problem

Proteins are long chains of left-handed amino acids that are built up by adding one amino acid at a time. If, as evolutionists claim, life arose by chance, then long chains of amino acids would have to defy chemical laws to randomly join together to form proteins. If you take one amino acid and chemically combine it with another amino acid you produce what is known as a dipeptide and a molecule of water. In the same way, if you have a molecule of water and a dipeptide, the chemical reaction can go the other way to produce two amino acids. Evolution theory suggests that life began in a 'primordial soup' made up primarily of water.

However, the law of mass action states that a reversible chemical reaction (a reaction that goes both ways), will never go in a direction that produces more of something that already exists in excess amounts. This means that amino acids, which would have to join together in long chains to form proteins, would have to **defy** this law of chemistry because every time they joined together they would produce another molecule of water which would already exist in abundance.


Exactly the same problem exists with nucleic acids that join together to form nucleotides, nucleotides being the building block of DNA and RNA. This fairly simple law of chemistry is yet further proof that the spontaneous generation of life from a primordial soup millions of years ago is science fiction, not science fact.

The Information Problem

Even if proteins and nucleotides could be formed by random chance, a potentially even bigger problem exists; **information**. You need intelligence to produce information. For example, a book consists of ink and pages. Even if the ink fell onto the pages and arranged itself by random chance into letters and words, it is still meaningless. Why? Because the only reason we can read it is because we know what the letter means. Each letter has a shape, which is meaningless unless there is a pre-agreed meaning for the shape. Suppose I were to invent a new alphabet with new letters. Now if I were to write you a poem it would just look like scribble unless I had explained to you what the letters meant etc. In other words information such as contained in a letter, or on a strand of DNA, must come from an intelligent source. The code in the chromosomes within a cell is more complex and holds more information than all the computer programs ever written by man....combined! If typed out, it would fill enough books to fill the Grand Canyon 40 times! And yet all of this information is stored on less than two tablespoons of DNA – no man-made storage system comes close!

In an interview with Richard Dawkins for the documentary '**From a Frog to a Prince**', he was asked "*Can you give an example of a genetic mutation or evolutionary process that can be seen to increase the information in the genome?*"²⁷ Dawkins takes a long time to think, and then changes the subject. Why? There is no process (and it's obvious to anyone gifted with intelligence) from which new information can arise as a result of a mutation. A mutation is a loss of information, or a scrambling of existing information. From the word Christmas you can make a number of other words, but you will never be able to make the words Zebra, Xerox or Queen because the letters are simply not available.

This is not just another problem with spontaneous generation as proposed by evolutionists, it is the end of the road.....unless of course evolution is not science but a religion. "Religion: noun - a belief held to with ardour and faith".




The Fossil Problem

Fossils are often put forward as 'evidence' of evolution and also 'proof' that the earth is billions of years old; in fact, they are one of the strongest evidences against these two assumptions. Fossils do not show any evidence for evolution at all; a fact well recognised by Darwin himself. In his book 'The Origin of the Species' Charles Darwin said: *"But, as by this theory, innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them imbedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?"*²⁸ (page 163).

Darwin added: *"The number of intermediate varieties which have formerly existed must be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain, and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be argued against the theory of evolution"* (Page 323).²⁹

Stephen J Gould, a Harvard University geologist, in an article called "Evolution's Erratic Pace" published in 'Natural History Vol. 5' May 1977 concludes that the well-known **evolution tree**, found in almost all school biology textbooks, that draws on supposed 'evidence' from the fossil record is in reality **made up by 'inference' not evidence**. In other words, because there is no fossil evidence, they have just guessed, or to be more precise, made it up! He comments: *"The extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record, persists as the trade secret of palaeontology"*³⁰.



What he is saying is that geologists and palaeontologists know no evidence for intermediate forms (i.e. one creature changing into another) exists in the fossil record, but they prefer to keep it quiet! He continues: *"We fancy ourselves as the only true students of life's history, yet to preserve our favourite account of 'evolution by natural selection' we view our data as so bad, that we never see the very process that we profess to study"*.³¹


Fossils do not show any transitional forms but rather **variation within kinds** - exactly in accord with the Bible.

One such example of this can be seen with the supposed evolution of the horse: *"The popularly told example of horse evolution, suggesting a gradual sequence of changes from four-toed, fox-sized creatures, living nearly 50 million years ago, to today's much larger one-toed horse, has long been known to be wrong. Instead of gradual change, fossils of each intermediate species appear fully distinct, persist unchanged, and then become extinct. Transitional forms are unknown"*³². Boyce Rensberger


In addition to this, there is a problem in regard to the misconception of the way fossils are actually formed. Evolutionary propaganda has led many to believe the fossils are somehow proof of millions of years etc.

The reasoning goes like this: a particular fossil must be x number of millions of years old because it is found in certain rock layer. We know that the rock layer is that old because we find fossils in it that are x number of million years old! This is circular reasoning, bad 'science', extremely misleading and dishonest.

Nice picture... shame there is no evidence!



Question: Why do we teach this belief to children as if it were proven scientific fact? Isn't that indoctrination?




J. E. O'Rourke, in the 'American Journal of Science' notes: *"The intelligent layman has long suspected circular reasoning in the use of rocks to date fossils and fossils to date rocks"*³³

Larry Azar in 'Bioscience' asks the question: *"Are the authorities maintaining, on the one hand, that evolution is documented by geology and, on the other that geology is documented by evolution? Isn't this a circular argument?"*³⁴

Fossils are almost always formed rapidly by sudden death, burial and extreme pressure being applied to the creature or life form in question. This implies some sort of upheaval or catastrophe (such as the worldwide flood described in the Bible). Very seldom (if ever) will a creature just die and get fossilised, because unless it is covered rapidly it would simply decay or get scavenged by other creatures.

There are many examples of fossils that were obviously buried suddenly, including ones where one creature is in the middle of eating another.



Fish eating fish fossil

In a radio interview on BBC Radio One ('Steve Wright in the afternoon' 27th September 2004), Alan Titchmarsh (best known from the 'Ground Force' gardening program) was commenting on his most recent documentary series that looks at the geographical and geological history of the British Isles. In the interview he stated that there are marine fossils on the top of mount Snowdon in Wales, and went on to say that they are there as a result of glaciers.



It is incredible that an intelligent man can take, without questioning, an explanation like this. Glaciers move slowly. There is no way a slow moving glacier could pick up a fish, push it to the top of a mountain and then bury it quickly! Glaciers may well have covered much of the British Isles but this cannot explain how marine fossils can end up at the top of a mountain. So how else did they get there? Again, the rational answer would point to a worldwide flood where everything was violently turned upside down and

mud and silt would have been deposited at random, combined with the massive upheaval of the land during and following the flood (as recorded in the Bible and corroborated by over 270 flood legends and ancient accounts in almost all cultures around the world).

This would also explain the many geological features like the Grand Canyon in America that have been formed by huge quantities of water flowing through them eroding the softer materials and leaving the harder rock.

There are examples of fossilised trees standing upright through different layers of rock strata, thus clearly demonstrating that all of those particular rock layers were deposited at the same time.

'Recent laboratory experiments have demonstrated that many layers are laid down together, building up crab-wise. Thus fossils in lower strata could have been buried after those in higher strata. Studies of volcanic explosions show that hundreds of feet of stratified sediment can be laid down all at once'

- Dr David Rosevear³⁵


Clearly, geologists need a new theory, or perhaps a return to the Biblical explanations that give answers that do not contradict science or observation.

"Evolution is unproved and unprovable"

Sir Arthur Keith (who wrote the forward to the 100th edition of Origin of the Species)

The Survival of the Fittest Problem:

One of the backbones of evolution theory is the notion of survival of the fittest, only the strong survive etc. However when you actually stop to consider the implications, this is one of the strongest rebuttals to evolution theory possible. Take for example a reptile evolving into a bird. In order for this change to take place, the reptile's front legs have got to become wings with feathers. As this supposed change takes place the reptile reaches a point where its front legs are not now really legs impeding its ability to run away from predators, but they are not yet wings so it can't fly away either. Nor could it hunt very successfully as its claws would by now have given way to its prototype wing structure. What has happened is that it has become less fit and less able to defend itself hence it would not survive. This same problem exists with every proposed transitional form; rather than becoming stronger, it would actually become less able and weaker as it hits the intermediate stage where it is neither one thing nor another. Survival of the fittest is a reality, the strong and most able, that are suited to their environments stand the best chance of survival. This is strong evidence of Design, and another major problem for evolutionists.



The Mutation Problem:

Another vital component in the theory of evolution is the idea that mutations were the mechanism by which one life form changed into another. In many senses the problem is the same as with the 'Survival of the fittest problem' because almost all mutations are harmful to the creature or life form concerned, thus reducing its life expectancy rather than improving it or allowing it to change. However, what evolutionists suggest is that a series of 'beneficial' mutations occurred that allowed the creature to change.

What often is not told is that for every one 'beneficial' mutation that occurs, there would be 10,000 mutations that at best are neutral, but many of which would be lethal! Given the number of mutations required to change one creature into another the odds are clearly stacked against it. Also, a mutation is actually a loss of genetic information, but evolution would require an increase in the genetic information if a life form is to become 'more advanced' (see "The Information Problem"). These two problems combined don't just make evolution unlikely, but according to the science of Information Theory, show that it is absolutely impossible!

Furthermore, how could any creature choose the mutation it needed? For example, let's assume a reptile could change into a bird - **for that we also have to assume it was able to change from warm blooded to cold blooded, change its entire respiratory system, and change its skeletal structure** – how could that reptile choose that its front legs became feathers? Why would this mutation not randomly occur on the rear legs? How could any creature guide the random unguided mutations necessary? Why would the mutation affect both sides of the body in exactly the same way?

"Many experiments have been performed on fruit flies (Drosophila), where poisons and radiation induced mutations. The problem is that they are always harmful. PBS 2 showed an extra pair of wings on a fly, but failed to mention that they were a hindrance to flying because there are no accompanying muscles. Both these flies would be eliminated by natural selection" ³⁶ - Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D


As already noted, from the letters in the word 'Christmas' you can make a number of other words, but you will never make the words Xerox, Zebra or Queen because the letters are not there to choose from. So it is with mutations.



**A mutation is a loss or scrambling of existing information
- It cannot create new information -**

The Entropy Problem:

All but one of the sciences acknowledges the 2nd law of Thermodynamics, also known as the Entropy Law. This law basically states that in a closed system, all spontaneous processes lead to a decrease in order and a loss of information. In other words, things go from order to disorder. We can observe this every time we tidy the house or garage! Have you ever not bothered to tidy the garage for a month and at the end of the month found it tidier than it was at the start? The same is true in the universe around us, everything is going from order to disorder.



That is, unless you are a 'state-trained' biologist. For our education system, from schools to the top universities, disregard this basic law because unless they do, their theories of 'The Big-Bang' and the 'spontaneous generation of life' have to be abandoned.

The suggestion that all this order - the Sun being exactly the right size and distance from the Earth, the Moon being exactly the right size and distance from the Earth in relation to the Sun, the

exact balance of chemicals in our atmosphere, the incredible symmetry in living things, - the list could go on and on - the suggestion that all this order came about as a result of an explosion - which can only create disorder - defies every scientific law and discovery we know.



It has been said that the theory of spontaneous generation of life on earth is equivalent to the idea of a tornado blowing through a scrap yard and producing a Boeing 747 from the scrap parts! No one would believe that this could happen, it's about time that people were told the truth that evolution can't happen either!



We discover there is another nail in the evolutionary coffin in that the human race is suffering from 'genetic entropy'. In his book "Genetic Entropy", Dr J.C. Sanford states: *"One of the most astounding recent findings in the world of genetics is that the human mutation rate (just within our reproductive cells) is at least 100 nucleotide substitutions (misspellings) per person per generation...When an earlier study revealed that the human mutation rate might be as high as 30, the highly distinguished author of that study concluded that such a number would have profound implications for evolutionary theory... But the actual number is now known to be 100-300!"*³⁷


Dr Sanford concludes: *"By now we should clearly see that the Primary Axiom [i.e. the theory of evolution] is not inherently true", nor is it "obvious" to all reasonable parties, and so it is very clear that it should be rejected as an axiom*. Moreover, what is left, the Primary Hypothesis" (mutation/selection can create and maintain genomes), is actually found to be without any support! In fact, multiple lines of evidence indicate that the "Primary Hypothesis is clearly false and must be rejected."*³⁸ *Axiom - Definition: a generally accepted proposition or principle, sanctioned by experience: Collins.

Evolution is anti-science and anti-God

The Great Debate - Evolution's Death Knell

The publication of Darwin's *Origin of the Species* on 24 November 1859 caused ripples through an academic community that, up to that point, had accepted the Biblical explanations of our origins. Sir Isaac Newton (1643 – 1727), among other prominent scientists (including René Descartes), upheld *"that the physical laws he had uncovered revealed the mechanical perfection of the workings of the universe to be akin to a watchmaker, wherein the watchmaker is God"*⁴¹.

Bishop William Paley (1743–1805), in defending the Biblical view, and building on Newton's comments said that the watch, with its gears, springs, and other mechanisms could never arise by the actions of random chance alone; and thus life itself, being immeasurably more complex, could not be the product of random chance either. Scottish philosopher and historian David Hume (1711-1776), who held notoriously ambiguous views of Christianity, responded by saying that *"Living systems only have the appearance of machines, Unless it can be proven that living systems are indeed machines at the molecular level, then Paley's watchmaker argument is irrelevant"*⁴².



This paved the way for The Great Debate at Oxford on June 30th 1860 where Bishop Samuel Wilberforce (1805-1873) stood to defend the Biblical belief in deliberate design by a Designer (often referred to as The Teleological Argument). Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895), nicknamed 'Darwin's bulldog', opposed Wilberforce and sought to champion Darwin's concept of evolution by natural selection, which had been published less than a year before. Darwin had 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. But I can find no such case"*⁴³. Regardless of however unlikely it may seem, If Huxley could prove evolution was possible, Wilberforce's argument for design would break down.

Wilberforce is generally considered to have lost the argument because of the challenge brought by Huxley (some also credit Darwin's friend, the botanist Joseph Hooker). Huxley's argument was simple: using mathematical logic and the laws of probability he argued that if time is infinite, then the probability must = 1. To 'prove' his point he argued that if he be hypothetically given 6 monkeys, each with a typewriter, a limitless supply of paper, and limitless time, the monkeys would, by random key-strokes alone, eventually be able to type all the works of Shakespeare, the 23 Psalm etc. etc. Wilberforce was stumped and it was hailed as a victory for Darwin's evolution by natural selection.

However, it's funny how time brings with it illumination!

6 Monkeys, 6 Typewriters, Limitless Time = The entire works of Shakespeare? Really?




Thanks to the advances in science, and the invention of the electron microscope, we are now able to see a 'simple cell' in a way that Huxley, Wilberforce and Darwin could never have dreamed of.

The Chicken & The Egg Problem


In the scientific arguments we have looked at, we have shown how, for evolution to occur, miracles would have to take place, i.e. things that cannot occur naturally. Thus an evolutionist has to have considerable faith.

However, even if all of the required steps for evolution *could* take place, there is still an unanswerable conundrum. Which came first, Proteins or DNA? To understand how to form DNA, the information system for all life, we have to understand how Proteins are made, because DNA is made of Proteins. To understand this we need to go down to the microscopic world of the cell.




Within the Nucleus a molecular machine starts to unzip the tightly wound DNA molecule, and then a 2nd machine starts to make an exact copy of the DNA, much like a photocopy. This copy is called the RNA, and once the copy is complete the DNA is 'zipped' back up again.

Within the cell there is the Nucleus, which is surrounded by small pores (holes) that allow access to and from the Nucleus (these pores are made up of 50-100 Proteins) and act as 24 hours security guards protecting the Nucleus and the DNA molecule (Chromosome) contained within it.



What staggers the mind is that this unzipping, copying, and re-zipping process (called Transcription), is equivalent to having two lengths of fishing line, 125 miles long, stored inside a football; unzipped, copied and then restored on spools at 3 x the speed of an airplane propeller – all without tangling!




Once the RNA chain is complete, it leaves the Nucleus through the pores – which somehow know what to allow in and out! The (messenger)RNA chain then heads (instinctively!) to another molecular machine called the Ribosome (also made of proteins) where a process known as 'Translation' begins.


"A strong case, then, can be made that the cell has turned out to be a lot more complicated than Darwin or his contemporaries imagined. Not only did they vastly underestimate the complexity of the cell, but it's probably vastly more complex even than we imagine today".

www.evolutionnews.org

While the mRNA chain is en route, yet more machines (transfer RNA) are already starting to bring Amino Acids along, in the correct order. Inside the Ribosome a molecular assembly line starts to build a long complex chain of Amino Acids, each with a lock and key arrangement so only the correct Amino Acid can be added in the correct sequence.



The chain has to be folded in precisely the right way to form the protein



The 'folding dept.' is made up of, among other things, special **proteins!!!**

When the chain is complete (and a simple chain can be around 1500 Amino Acids long), the chain leaves the Ribosome and heads to another molecular machine (made up of Proteins!) to be folded into precisely the right way to form the protein. Chemical reactions should naturally cause the chain to fold in on itself as a result of attracting and repelling forces; however, 'chaperone' proteins assist in preventing our chain from folding into a useless blob. Instead they help mould it in to the correct shape. (See 'The Law of Mass Action Problem'). The time it would take for a small, 100 amino acid, chain to 'randomly' fold into all the possible

permutations, eventually 'hitting upon exactly the right one' (which is what would be required for evolution) is estimated to be 10^{87} seconds. To put this into perspective, there are 'only' 10^{66} seconds in a 16 Billion year old universe!. And thus we have formed our Protein, made with the assistance of...er....well, Proteins!


Dr Vij Sodera comments: *"In fact, the whole process is far more complicated than this, and involves a large number of other associated molecules and enzymes without which the rate of formation of peptide bonds would be very slow. However, the ribosome protein-making factory can speed up reactions a million, or even a million million times. In a typical mammalian cell, more than one million peptide [Amino Acid] bonds are formed each second"*⁴⁹

So, you need Proteins to make DNA, and DNA to make Proteins.

Sorry Mr Darwin, by your own admission, your theory absolutely breaks down, The show's over!

"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. But I can find no such case"

— Charles Darwin —



The population problem:

The evolutionary scientists who believe that man existed for over a million years have an almost insurmountable problem. Using the assumption of forty-three years for an average human generation, the population growth over a million years would produce 23,256 consecutive generations. We calculate the expected population by starting with one couple one million years ago and using the same assumptions of a forty-three-year generation and 2.5 children per family....the evolutionary theory of a million years of growth would produce trillions x trillions x trillions of people that should be alive today on our planet. To put this in perspective, this number is vastly greater than the total number of atoms in our vast universe.



If mankind had lived on earth for a million years, we would all be standing on enormously high mountains of bones from the trillions of skeletons of those who had died in past generations. However, despite the tremendous archaeological and scientific investigation in the last two centuries, the scientists have not found a fraction of the trillions of skeletons predicted by the theory of evolutionary scientists.

Article taken from *The Signature of God*, Grant R. Jeffery³⁹

Think of a problem and double it!

When the idea of life arising spontaneously is considered, one fundamental question is often overlooked. Was it male or female?

Supposing to start with it was asexual and able to reproduce itself, at what point did it separate into a male or female? Supposing it was a male what would it have done? It would obviously need a female to reproduce. However, in order to play out this little scenario, let's believe 'another impossible thing' for a moment, and assume that time and chance had evolved one of each, a male and female, at the same time.

From the point of this separation, every random mutation that changed the male would also have to happen to the female. The supposed mutations which are meant to have caused Mr Lizard to change its front legs into wings, must also have happened to




Mrs Lizard exactly the same, by random chance, at the same time! This is like two people rolling two dice simultaneously and always getting the same numbers, only far

less likely! In addition to this, they would both have to evolve sexual organs that would be compatible with each another, and at the same time; (Mrs Lizard would not have been able to wait around for 150 years while Mr Lizard got the right mutations!), and also hope that Mr Lizard didn't move east while Mrs Lizard moved west, or they would have never got together to produce Lizard Jnr.



The following article from Ray Comfort's 'The Evidence Bible' raises some other interesting questions:



If every creature "evolved" with no Creator, there would be numerous problems. Take for instance the first bird. Was it male or female? Let's say it was male. How did it produce offspring without a mate? If a female also evolved, why did it evolve with differing reproductive organs? Did it evolve by chance, or did it evolve because it knew that it was needed by the male of the species? How did it know what needed to be evolved if its brain hadn't yet evolved? Did the bird breathe? Did it breathe before it evolved lungs? How did it do this? Why did it evolve lungs if it was happily surviving without them? Did the bird have a mouth? How did it eat before it evolved a mouth? Where did the mouth send the food before the stomach evolved? How did the bird have energy if it didn't eat (because it didn't yet have a mouth)? How did the bird see what there was to eat before its eyes evolved? Evolution is intellectual suicide. It is an embarrassment.

⁴⁰ Enough said.

Four times less likely than impossible!

If this isn't convincing enough, various Scientists have recently concluded that due to the immense variety in living systems, one cell would not have been sufficient to provide the genetic information that would be required. It has therefore been postulated that at least four separate cells would be required. This means that for all of the rebuttals that have been presented here, you have to multiply each problem by a factor of four as each cell would have to follow its own unique evolutionary path! Evolution is, without question, like a house built on the sand, and the tide is coming in!



Let's Let Science Speak

*"The basic principle of scientific enquiry is to test an hypothesis against all the evidence. If an hypothesis fails in a number of significant aspects it is likely that the hypothesis is invalid. Now, starting from only simple chemicals, if it can be shown that chemical laws and biological constraints will not allow the evolution of any number of biological systems, organs, and structures, nor allow the conversion of one creature into a quite different creature (for example, a dinosaur into a bird), then we must face the inescapable conclusion that: no matter how much time you give it; no matter with what energy you supply it; no matter what your interpretation is of fossils or of their supposed dates; no matter how much you dislike the thought of it; no matter if you have no alternative working model to present in its place; and no matter what else...the evolution of one type of creature into a different type of creature did not occur, and cannot and will not occur under any circumstances...ever."*⁵⁰

Dr Vij Sodera (fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh) from his book "One small Speck to Man - the evolution myth" www.onesmallspeck.com

*"Scientists who go about teaching that evolution is a fact of life are great con-men, and the story they are telling may be the greatest hoax ever."*⁵¹ Dr. T.N. Tahmisian

*"We have reviewed compelling evidence that, even when ignoring deleterious mutations, mutation/selection cannot create a single gene within the human evolutionary timescale. When deleterious mutations are factored back in, we see that mutations/selection cannot create a single gene, **ever**. This is overwhelming evidence against the Primary Axiom [theory of evolution]. In my opinion this constitutes what is essentially a **formal proof** that the Primary Axiom is false."*⁵² Dr J.C. Sanford "Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome"

*"I reject evolution because I deem it obsolete. The foundation-less, fantastic edifice of the evolution doctrine would long ago have met with its long-deserved fate were it not that the love of fairy tales is so deep rooted in the hearts of man"*⁵³ Dr Albert Fleischmann, Biologist, University of Erlangen

*"What is the mystery of the genome? Its very existence is its mystery. Information and complexity which surpass human understanding are programmed into a space smaller than an invisible speck of dust. Mutation/selection cannot even begin to explain this. It should be very clear that our genome could not have arisen spontaneously. The only reasonable alternative to a spontaneous genome is a **designed** genome. Isn't that an awesome mystery – one worthy of our contemplation?"*⁵⁴ Dr J.C. Sanford "Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome"

*"Atheism is so senseless. When I look at the solar system, I see the earth at the right distance from the sun to receive the proper amounts of heat and light. This did not happen by chance."*⁵⁵ Sir Isaac Newton

The Solution to the Problem

The book of Romans declares that the evidence of God's existence is clearly seen by the things that He has made, so that we are without excuse. God is the one who has made *'the heavens, the earth, the sea and all that is in them'* (Exodus 20:11).

Sadly, because of the foothold that evolution theory has gained, very often when people speak out and expose it, they are accused of being 'anti-science'. This couldn't be further from the truth as has been clearly demonstrated. The more science discovers, from the vastness of space to the tiniest sub-atomic particle, the more in awe we become at the Designer of all these things.

The reason for producing this leaflet is not to attack evolutionists. In this country we have the freedom to choose what we believe. However, this *is* an attempt to challenge thinking people as to *why* they believe what they do. Unlike evolution, faith in the Bible and Jesus Christ is not a blind faith; the apostle Paul continually appealed to reason, and the apostle Peter said that Christians should have a solid foundation for their faith. That's why Paul, Peter, and countless numbers of Christians since, have been prepared to die for their faith in Jesus Christ. Napoleon said: *"I know men and I tell you that Jesus Christ is no mere man. Between Him and every other person in the world there is no possible term of comparison. Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne, and I have all founded empires. But on what did we rest the creation of our genius? Upon force. Jesus Christ founded His empire upon love; and at this hour millions of men would die for Him"*⁵⁶

The Bible makes claims that can be empirically tested and verified. The Bible states that everything reproduces after its kind, and it does. The Bible states there was a beginning, and there was. The Bible says that all people, in their conscience have a God-given knowledge of what's right and wrong. The Bible also records history in advance, and says that, regardless of your belief about our origins, every person will one day stand before God and give an account of every thought, word and deed; and that includes Charles Darwin, Richard Dawkins, you and me.

The Bible shows that we have all fallen short of God's standard (as revealed in the 10 commandments), a cursory look at the world will reveal there is something fundamentally wrong between the Creator and creation. Ask yourself, have you ever lied? What does that make you? A liar. Have you ever stolen anything, irrespective of its value? Then by your own admission you are a thief. Have you ever looked lustfully at another person? Jesus said this is no different to God than if you'd committed adultery. Have you ever taken God's name and used it as a swear word? This is blasphemy and the Bible says that God will not hold him guiltless who takes His name in vain. This is just looking at four of the 10 commandments. When we face God on Judgment day, and He judges us by this standard, would *you* be innocent or guilty? Would *you* go to heaven or hell? If God is good, He has to be just and punish sin. There is no question, all have fallen short of God's standard and are deserving of His judgment. But the Bible reveals the most amazing thing of all; there is *a* way; a way for all of this to be put right. Not by our own efforts, for the Bible also reveals that the heart of mankind is incurably wicked and deceitful, But God Himself, because He so loved the world, was willing to allow His own Son, Jesus Christ, to become the payment in full for all of the sin of mankind. In this way, God was able to satisfy His justice (by ensuring the 'crime' is paid for) and mercy (by saving us from His own judicial wrath), so that now, anyone who turns from living a God-rejecting self-centred sinful life, and puts their trust in the completed work of Jesus, can receive the free gift of 'new life' (quite literally a 2nd chance). In effect, God adopts us as His own child! *"Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God"* (1 John 3:1).

This is the greatest discovery of all.

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John 3:16)

"Therefore whoever hears these sayings of Mine, and does them, I will liken him to a wise man who built his house on the rock: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it did not fall, for it was founded on the rock. Now everyone who hears these sayings of Mine, and does not do them, will be like a foolish man who built his house on the sand: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it fell. And great was its fall." (Matt 7:24-28)

References quoted:

Scripture quotations taken from the King James Bible and from The New King James Version. 1996, c1982 . Thomas Nelson: Nashville

1. HarperCollins Publishers Ltd 2000
2. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_theory
3. Michael Ruse, "Darwin's Theory: An Exercise in Science," New Scientist, June 25, 1981, p. 828
4. Professor Louis Bounoure, Director of Research, American National Centre of Scientific Research: Quotation taken from 'The Evidence Bible', Copyright 2003 Bridge-Logos Publishers ISBN 0-88270-905-4
5. From an interview by AP correspondent George W. Cornall, quoted from Times-Advocate, Escondido, California, December 10th, 1982. Pp. A10-11.
6. Robert Jastrow, "Evolution: Selection for Perfection", Science Digest (December 1981), p.87
7. Quotes from an interview with Richard Dawkins on The Jeremy Vine Show, BBC Radio 2. January 5, 2006
8. Bowler, Peter J., Review In Search of Deep Time by Henry Gee (Free Press, 1999), American Scientist (vol. 88, March/April 2000), p. 169.
9. Quotation take from 'The Evidence Bible' page 1430, Copyright 2003 Bridge-Logos Publishers ISBN 0-88270-905-4
10. Robert Shapiro 1986 - quoted by Dr Mark Eastman, The Creator Series, Koinonia House. <http://resources.khouse.org/products/cd103/>, © 1996 Koinonia House Inc
11. Leslie E. Orgel, "The Origin of Life on the Earth," Scientific American (vol. 271. October 1994), p. 78.
12. Richard Leakey, in a PBS documentary, 1990 <www.wasdarwinright.com/earlyman-f.htm>.
13. Dr Vij Soderia, One small Speck to Man - the evolution myth" p375 - ISBN 0-9531376-1-9
14. Ibid p318
15. Email debate with the Rt. Honourable Mr Michael Gove MP, Secretary of State for Education, July/Aug 2013 Correspondence reference 2013/0049695
16. "Biologists must constantly keep in mind what they see was not designed, but evolved" Francis Crick
17. From an article published in 'New Life', Issue No. 133, page 8. PO Box 777, Nottingham.
18. Dr. Francis Collins, interview with Jon Sweeny, 2007 www.explorefaith.org/speaking_collins.html.
19. Jerry Bergman, "Darwin Skeptics," September 11, 2006 www.rae.org/darwinskeptics.html.
20. Excerpt from article by Daryl E. Witmer of AIIA Institute, text copyright 2004, AIIA Institute. The article can be viewed in full on <http://www.christiananswers.net/q-aiia/aiia-scientists.html>
21. Quotation by Dr. John Morris, president of the Institute for Creation Research, copyright and details as item 20 above.
22. Dave Hunt, Seeking & Finding God, p. 47-48, ISBN: 1-928660-23-1 - <http://www.thebeyondcall.org/content/seeking-and-finding-god-0>
23. Richard Weikart, From Darwin to Hitler, Page 233 - ISBN 1-4039-6502-1
24. IBID.
25. Quotation take from www.CreationScienceMovement.com Also: www.csm.org.uk - PO Box 888, Portsmouth, PO6 2YD leaflet,
26. Michael Denton, Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1985, p. 261
27. From a Frog to a Prince (1995) <http://ukstore.creation.com/catalog/from-frog-prince-p-312.html?osCsid=vnktpk629a14ts49umfttnibv2>
28. Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species: p. 163
29. Ibid p323
30. Stephen J Gould - "Evolution's Erratic Pace" published in 'Natural History Vol. 5' May 1977
31. Ibid
32. Boyce Rensberger, "Ideas on Evolution Going Through a Revolution Among Scientists," Houston Chronicle, Novr 5, 1980, sec. 4, p. 15.
33. J. E. O'Rourke, American Journal of Science, 1976, 276:51
34. Larry Azar, "Biologists, Help!", Bioscience, vol 28 November 1978, pp.714
35. Quotation take from 'Introducing the Creation Science Movement' leaflet, go to: www.csm.org.uk
36. Refuting Evolution 2, by Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D. with Michael Matthews, <http://creation.com/refuting-evolution-2-chapter-5-argument-some-mutations-are-beneficial>
37. Sanford, Dr. J.C., Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome, p34 - ISBN 978-0-9816316-0-8
38. ibid.p111
39. Grant R. Jeffrey, The Signature of God - ISBN 0-921714-28-9 go to: www.grantjeffrey.com
40. Quotation take from 'The Evidence Bible' page 1261, Copyright 2003 Bridge-Logos Publishers ISBN 0-88270-905-4
41. Sir Isaac Newton (1643 - 1727) - quoted by Alexander Dugin, The Fourth Political Theory, p.87, 2012 Arktos Media Ltd, ISBN 978-1-907166-56-3
42. David Hume (1711-1776), Quoted in 'The Divine Watchmaker', The Creator Series, Koinonia House. <http://resources.khouse.org/products/cd103/> © 1996 Koinonia House Inc
43. Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species: p. 189
44. Michael Denton, Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1985, p.
45. Fred Hoyle and N. Chandra Wickramasinghe, Evolution from Space: A Theory of Cosmic Creationism (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), pp. 96-97.
46. Dr Chuck Missler - The Creator Series, Koinonia House. <http://resources.khouse.org/products/cd103/>, © 1996 Koinonia House Inc
47. Sir Fred Hoyle - Nature, 1981, Volume 294
48. Michael Denton, Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (Bethesda, MD: Adler & Adler, 1985, p.
49. Dr Vij Soderia, One small Speck to Man - the evolution myth" p - ISBN 0-9531376-1-9
50. Ibid p
51. Dr. T.N. Tahmisian of the Atomic Energy Commission (USA)
52. Sanford, Dr. J.C., Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome, p - ISBN 978-0-9816316-0-8
53. Dr Albert Fleischmann, Biologist, University of Erlangen
54. Sanford, Dr. J.C., Genetic Entropy & The Mystery of the Genome, p - ISBN 978-0-9816316-0-8
55. Sir Isaac Newton. English mathematician, physicist, astronomer, philosopher & Bible student (1642-1727)
56. Napoleon Bonaparte. 1769-1821, French Emperor (1804-15)

www.sciencevsevolution.co.uk

The observable facts that challenge the unobservable myth

A place you shouldn't visit and a book you shouldn't read!

Evolutionists would love to silence all dissenters, so when a book is written and a museum opened to expose the atheist's religion they would much rather you not visit and not read; for if people start thinking for themselves...



Genesis Expo

Portsmouth - England

www.genesisexpo.co.uk



ONE small SPECK TO MAN the evolution myth

“Anyone who has **no doubt** that apes are our distant cousins, or that fishes and worms share a common ancestry with humans, either has not studied the wealth of **unequivocal evidence** to the contrary...or is living in a state of denial”.

www.onesmallspeck.com

In this outstanding work, Dr Vij Soderstrom draws on his professional background to powerfully demonstrate the scientific impossibility of evolution and to reveal the biological world in a way they don't teach you in school, university, or on the BBC!



Picture This...

There's a ship, the SS Evolution, there are many people aboard. There's a hole in the ship letting in water that everyone seems oblivious to; the ship is going to sink, but the real tragedy is the number of souls that will go down with the ship if no one raises the alarm.

As you look on from the safety of the shore you have a number of options; here's your moral dilemma:

Firstly, you could simply ignore it; after all, you've never really cared for ships like this anyway so it's no great loss, and your motto is that it's best to avoid contention if possible!

Secondly, you could cry out at the top of your voice to warn all the passengers on board; but the problem with this is that no-one will believe you, they will even mock you; after all, *they* can't see the hole and they've been assured their ship is unsinkable.

Finally, you could wade out as far as you can go, try to reason with any who will listen, let them see for themselves the hole, explain just how close they are to the safety of the shore, and throw them a lifeline.

Anyone interested in taking hold of the lifeline, please contact info@sciencevsevolution.co.uk

Further information and resources can be found at www.sciencevsevolution.co.uk

Many churches in the UK have ministers who have been fooled into believing the evolutionary hypothesis, and have been the victims of the poor liberal scholarship that has tried to somehow merge evolution with the Biblical account. However, as has been shown, evolution is not even compatible with science, let alone the Bible. The Bible stands just fine on its own. There are many churches that know this to be so, for a list of some of these churches around the UK, please go to: <http://calvarychapelassociation.com/churches/>
Alternatively, we are able to hold seminars and 1-day conferences to train, teach and equip pastors, ministers, parents and teachers to be ready to demonstrate the scientific impossibility of evolution, and the solid basis for the Biblical account of our origins, our present and our future. If you would like to host a 1-day conference, please email us at info@sciencevsevolution.co.uk

www.sciencevsevolution.co.uk

The observable facts that challenge the unobservable myth