

Evolution & Observation

***A few brief observations indicating that
Evolution is not true***

Author: Scott Wallace Brians
Web Address: www.his-kingdom.net
Version: 12 January 2008
Copyright: Scott Wallace Brians
All Rights Reserved

(1)	Evolution, the Theory	3
1.a:	<i>History and Observation</i>	4
1.b:	<i>The Lines of Evidence</i>	4
1.c:	<i>A Thorough Theory, Please!</i>	7
1.d:	<i>Vestigial Conflicts</i>	9
1.e:	<i>Begging for the Data</i>	10
1.f:	<i>Predictive Power</i>	12
1.g:	<i>Extrapolation and Time</i>	13
(2)	The Theory of Natural Selection vs. Evolution	15
2.a:	<i>The survivability of complex and simple organisms</i>	15
2.b:	<i>The survivability of transition organisms</i>	16
2.c:	<i>The Mystery of Reproduction</i>	17
(3)	Evolution and Observation	19
3.a:	<i>The Fossil's Witness</i>	20
3.b:	<i>The Current Biological Witness</i>	21
3.c:	<i>Evolution per Instantaneous Macro Mutation</i>	22
(4)	Conclusion	22
4.a:	<i>Evolution and Discontinuities</i>	23
4.b:	<i>Interpersonal Consequences</i>	23
4.c:	<i>Eternal Consequences</i>	26

1. Evolution, the Theory

This short essay is primarily written for those who feel their faith in God has been attacked and shaken. After reading this document, the reader should be able to comfortably fluster the humanistic story of creation. We simply ask some common sense questions to test if Charles Darwin was on to something, or just chasing phantoms on the high seas.

The Theory of Evolution is summed up as such:

- (1) Miniscule changes take place in an organism's body compared to its parent. The changes are random.
- (2) Natural Selection demands that traits in organisms better fit to survive do so, while the others are not, and thus do not.
- (3) The result of (1) plus (2) is that traits enhancing survivability are passed on through the generations, while the others are filtered out by means of extinction.
- (4) The result of (3) plus much time is that organisms continually evolve new functions reflected in new bodies, creating a quasi-infinite number of species as a function of increasing time.
- (5) It stands to reason that Evolution began with the simplest of life forms, and as time progressed, more complex life forms came to being.

The process began with a primordial soup of a certain chemical construction, which was zapped by lightning, and presto, out popped a living single cell organism. How one knows what the primordial soup was, that lightning struck it, and how a single cell came out of all this, is a closely guarded secret. As we can see from the very start, the Evolutionist has some explaining to do. He usually begins by saying that "How life began is not the subject of evolution, this is for the abiogenesisist.", and the problem is solved. For the inquisitive mind, the development of life from non-life would seem to be very interesting. Furthermore, it would also intuitively have the appearance that this miraculous occurrence would lend clues on the "how"s and the "why"s of the development of life. A true scientist would not so quickly brush the issue aside.

But let us for the sake of argument a priori assume the existence of the simplest living organism, regardless of the source.

Beyond this, the simple organisms changed and morphed, and after billions of years of Natural Selection, here we are with the breathtaking complexity of life we see today. Reference Genesis chapter one, edited by Charles Darwin.

(a) History and Observation

Classical science rests on the observation of a phenomenon that can be readily repeated. All affecting environmental factors, input and output are clearly defined in a well thought-through theory. Take force equals mass multiplied by acceleration as an example. This theory predicts the acceleration of a mass acted upon by a force. This theory can be easily replicated and verified.

Evolution being a theory of a happening in the past, is therefore not repeatable. Additionally, by Charles Darwin's own indirect admission, he was not an eye-witness to the events. He simply was not alive for billions of years.

Lack of observation is the key. No one has ever seen the evolution of one distinct specie into another. One can seriously question if evolution is science, since we cannot observe it. Suggestive evidence, if there is any, must be indirect.

This is also true of the Theory of Creation by a Designer. Since Creation is historical in nature, cannot be repeated by us and cannot be witnessed by us under our own volition, then any evidence for this theory must also be found indirectly.

So the theories of Evolution and Creation are in the same boat. But one fact that has not escaped my attention is should the evolutionist use the same standard for evidence against evolution as they typically do against the theory of Creation by a Designer, then evolution would not pass measure.

When analysing evolution, we must ask ourselves, what would the universe be if evolution were true?

(b) The Lines of Evidence

Individuals have been searching for the holy grail for 150 years. What have the best minds formulated? Below is a list of typical iron clad, solid proofs for the "fact" of evolution.

(1) the fossil record of horse evolution, whale evolution, and the large-scale evolution of jawless fishes to lobe-finned fishes to amphibians to therapsids to cynodonts to mammals;

2) morphological studies which show essentially the same skull and limb bones in the same basic positions for fish, amphibians, reptiles, and mammals, whether these mammals be aquatic, terrestrial, or avian;

(3) vestigial characteristics found in embryonic development, like the tooth buds of baleen whales or the gills and tails of human embryos;

4) vestigial characteristics found in full-grown animals, like the eyes of certain cave-dwelling fish and salamanders or the purposeless blossoms of dandelions;

5) molecular similarities and differences in proteins like cytochrome c in different groups of living things show great molecular similarity between closely related organisms and less similarity between distantly related organisms;

6) biogeographical evidence, like ring species, hybrid zones, and the distribution of organisms in island chains;

At first glimpse, the evidence seems overwhelming. The knee jerk reaction may be to simply bow our heads in worship of the Evolution god. But as indicated above, let us take a sanity check.

(1) Some of us have a difference of opinion on where the threshold is concerning the amount of fossils required to show evidence. Evolution demands a quasi-infinite number of species. The fossil record does not begin to remotely provide evidence of such. My notes on point (5) apply as well.

(2) While this is to be expected should evolution be true, this is not evidence. If the grass is wet, one should not take that as proof that it rained. One may have run the sprinkler system. My notes on point (5) apply as well.

(3) & (4) There was a time when there were many parts of the human body with unknown functions. These were touted as vestigial characteristics. As research has continued, all but a handful have been identified as having functions. I find it disturbing, but at the same time telling, that one uses ignorance as proof for evolution! Besides, the gills in young humans have nothing to do with breathing. And the scientist who

"discovered" the similarities was condemned for fraud by his peers. His embryonic pictures comparing humans with other animals were out-right scams in a bid for scientific glory.

But I will add one thing, however. If evolution is true, it is to be expected to observe, in the here and now, trillions of vestigial characteristics, not a handful. Every single organism should have a few ... if evolution is true.

5) As evolutionists themselves have placed the species on the organisational chart (showing their relations near or afar as convenient), it stands to reason that the correlation between specie relationships and their traits/molecules would reflect the theory of evolution in a supporting fashion. The placement of organisms on flow charts by scientists cannot be used as evidence for their prized theory.

6) This has to do with the observation that some species appear isolated to one area, presumably allowing them to evolve detached from the rest of the world. This would then be similar to (2) above. But then again, do there exist isolated regions in the world, where species are found there, and elsewhere as well? If so, this would then be evidence to the contrary?

What this author finds intriguing is that if an evolutionist finds diversity, he praises the adaptive ability of evolution. If an evolutionist observes similarity, it confirms the ancestry line. So, no matter what is found, voilà, it is evidence/proof. This comes out somewhat in the six lines of evidence shown above. There are many more "proofs" for evolution, but the reader gets the point.

To strengthen the argumentation as to why the proposed six lines of evidences are useless, we note that the evolutionist had already assumed that evolution is correct. If we assume otherwise, the "evidence" is meaningless. Furthermore, if we assume a God Designer, we can prove that a God Designer is the culprit for life on earth. See below for a demonstration:

(1) The fossil record shows complete referenced organisms. In-between organisms are lacking. This shows that God made a finite number of creatures (If there were quasi-infinite fossils found, one could claim that this shows that God made a quasi-infinite number of creatures).

(2) Morphological studies show that God recycled designs from one creature to the next. It only makes sense to use similar designs for similar functions.

(3) & (4) Vestigial systems: Man does not have all the answers as to how and why God did this and that. This proves He is much more intelligent than we.

(5) God's wonderful order of physics and chemistry is reflected in the similar molecular structure of similar creatures, and vice-versa.

(6) God's sense of variation is shown by placing some animals in isolated zones, but not elsewhere.

As exhibited here, it must be obvious to even the most hardened evolutionist that the revealed claims above by evolutionists are worthless as a means of evidence for evolution. If one claims this methodology as evidence for evolution, then he must likewise claim the same as evidence for the God Designer. This author can assure the reader that this is not the evolutionist's intent. My suspicion is that one can follow this scenario on any provided evolutionary proof.

The evidence is not the issue, but rather its interpretation. Evolutionists have shown that they view the world with bias. Science requires, however, a more even-handed objective approach - at least as much as possible with subjective beings. Otherwise the mistakes made above would have never been made.

The basic, and continually reoccurring, flaw in the evolutionary evidence logic is that *only* evolution accounts for the observed.

(c) A Thorough Theory, Please!

As stated at the onset of this document, evolution demands a quasi-infinite number of species, transforming, adapting, changing. We must not lose sight of the fact that the survivability of the organism is the key. Is the animal functional, or is it not! And the survivability depends broadly on three things: (1) the organism (2) the environment (temperature, atmosphere, other organisms...), and (3) how (1) and (2) interplay. Without the quasi-infinite number of species, there is no evolution.

This being said, for evolutionary theory to be truly fleshed out, it must detail, for every quasi-infinite specie, (1) the physical biological organism with its systems (organs, chemistry...), (2) the environment in which it lived, and (3) why the organism was better at surviving than its peer organisms and its ancestors based upon the environment in which it lived.

By the sheer amount of work this involves, it is difficult to imagine this having ever been done. There do exist, however, charts where a snake and a bird are connected by an arrow. But this is not sufficient, at least not for a scientist. What does the <<1% snake 99% bird>> look like, what was his environment, and was this creature able to function and thrive? Plainly, a certain amount of creative fantasy is required. Repeat this step for every percentage combination. Repeat these steps for every organism that ever allegedly lived.

With the detailing of the situation, evolution is still not adequately a scientific theory. We require a laboratory test in the here and now to see if (1), (2) and (3) are accurate/true. What good are pictures of fantastical animals on foreign landscapes if we cannot test if both ever existed? The question of the century is, in what lab can one go, what procedure can one perform, to test whether the quasi-infinite number of organisms actually existed as demanded by the theory? What evidence can one observe to absolutely - or at least to a great degree - exclude all other possible explanations? It is not obvious, at least to this author, as to how this is to be done.

Either one can describe and test for the existence of the quasi-infinite number of species on the spectrum morphing from one to another as absolutely demanded by evolution, or one cannot. If not, evolution is not science, but rather conjecture, and certainly not a proven fact.

Due to the massive amounts of work involved, one would have to be content with reference point steps, small enough to provide a warm fuzzy that evolutionary progress is conceivable, but large enough to not get bogged down in spinning our wheels. In the end, this is a matter of taste. The less the number of steps analysed, the more room for error and vagueness, watering down the strength of the theory.

Theories on paper are what they are, ideas on paper. There is nothing improper about imagining what might be. There is no advancement in thought without taking the chance of being wrong. But, and this is the rub, before we can claim the idea has merit, it must be taken out for a test drive. We need to see if it can handle the curves where the rubber meets the road. Should the core of evolution ever be analysed, one cannot help to suspect that we may have to call for the services of a wrecker tow truck. Truth be told, the core of evolution has never been tested.

This author has a pointed issue with an arrow skimming over all the interesting animals that lived between known organism A and known organism Z. What did these fantasy animals look like? What kind of biological systems did they have? In what environment did they live? We need proposals scrutinized under peer-review.

When one checks for sources in this direction, one comes home empty handed. The transition section of any evolution book would appear to be the correct place for this. But not by any stretch of the imagination does anyone handle the very focal point of evolution. I find this to be strange.

Many claim that evolution is fact. But for this statement to be substantiated, the theory must be qualitatively and thoroughly thought through. How does one claim a quasi-infinite number of organisms, but then totally forsake the proposing of plausible forms, the analysis of their likelihood and the testing for their actual and factual existence? The allegations appear to ring hollow indeed.

(d) Vestigial Conflicts

Vestigial systems denote non-functioning body parts ("left-overs" from previously functioning systems). For the following text we disregard the comment that the number of proposed vestigial systems by evolutionists is billions less than is expected pursuant evolution. Rather, we assume that they do exist for the sake of argument. The author wishes to show a contradiction in evolution doctrine.

First, we note that vestigial refers to systems on the decline. Certainly, if these body parts are non-functioning on the way out, surely they are just as non-functional on the way in!

Now, the evolutionists claim that vestigial systems exist, they must exist, and that these are evidences for evolution. These examples of non-functioning body parts are body parts which are not prerequisites for life, otherwise natural selection would have selected the creature possessing them for disposal. In this same vein, but to the exact contrary, the evolutionist claims desperately that all body systems that are prerequisites for life are always 100% fully functional for a particular specie. They claim this, otherwise there would be no morphing from one to another, and therefore no evolution. Natural selection would have wiped them out.

The randomness of evolution leads one to suspect a general trend that body parts will typically be less than functional during the nascent and degradation stages; hence, the vestigial argument. If non-essential body parts can/must exist by the admission of the evolutionist, then surely the essential body parts would meet the same fate, and more so, as the essential body parts are more complex than the non-essential body parts. Herein lies an, at least apparent, contradiction.

So what is it? Are there non-fully functioning body parts, or are there none? Or do they only appear when convenient in the eyes of the evolutionist? It seems rather conspicuous that where things are non-crucial, non-functioning body parts must exist, but where things are crucial, they are not allowed to exist. Also disturbing is the lack of explanation as to why this should be the case.

It is not intuitively clear why every essential body system would evolve in a perfect parallel fashion in the organism, and at the same time always be 100% fully functional. The lack of guidance, assumed by the evolutionist, demands that this is most assuredly not the case. While conceptually thinkable, it does come across as highly unlikely. And why a particular trait would be kept before it became advantageous remains a mystery, in contrast to what natural selection demands.

The solution to this problematic: (1) detail every morph of every system of every organism as a conceptual study. Then one must (2) test to see whether this morph is possible, and then test to see if the morph actually did take place.

(e) Begging for the Data

Have evolutionists created diagrams of these imaginary creatures? What was the "evolutionary niche" that allowed this creature to prosper? How do we test to see if this niche ever existed at the same time and same place as when this creature strode the earth? To the best of this author's knowledge, this has never been done.

Without the detailing of specie morphing from A through Z, we can say nothing about the morphing phases, and certainly not reasonably claim that they ever existed. Therefore we must conclude that the very core of evolution has never been studied. We must then reject evolution as a theory if we are to be reasonable and rational.

Aside from the tremendous amount of work required by this, there is another reason this detailing of the core of evolution will never happen, although it seems logical that scientist *must* do this in order to give evolution half a leg to stand on. And this gets to the heart of the issue. Evolution is fantasy!

The morphing stages can only be detailed on account of imagination. This in and of itself will cause a fire-storm of criticism. The headlines will read something like this:

"Dawkins uses proceeds of "The God Delusion" to fund the Oxford Art College: The reason? Advanced, hand selected art students are to propose transition species. It has not yet been decided if the proposals are to be submitted in the form of oil based paint, finger paint, or play-dough sculptures."

"Evolutionists enter the world of fantasy: In an effort to describe the transition organisms, one scientist has already been sued for plagiarism, for his rendition of the snake-bird has a striking similarity to the movie character "Puff the Magic Dragon". Other mythical creatures have been submitted as well. Below, from our inside sources, we have obtained draft depictions of the frog-cat, the bat-dolphin and the elephant-mouse."

The reader may think this is bad. Wait until the proposals hit the street. That is when it really hits the fan...

As can be patently seen, this will get ugly. No self-respecting scientist is going to risk this type of criticism. "Risk" is not the correct word, for there is no "risk" involved. The reaction is guaranteed! The creationists, and you can take this to the bank, are going to pounce on this one - and rightly so. His/her career will be over very quickly.

At this juncture, the true colors of evolution are plain for everyone to observe. Fanciful imaginations and phantom hunting is what evolution amounts to. If the evolutionists cannot show the bonafide, hard facts data, then he has no right to demand we believe his claim.

The core concept of evolution is the slow but sure morph from generation to generation, from specie to specie. Without it, there is no evolution. There has been no study, not by the lowest of standards, as to what these quasi-infinite species along the spectrum of development look like, what their systems look like, what their environment looked like, or how and why the to be proposed organisms prospered.

It is irrational to believe in something, when that something has never been defined. This is equivalent to believing in "nothing". Ludicrous indeed! This author will choose to believe in the transitions, and in turn in evolution, when one effectively describes and justifies a respectable and decent portion of the quasi-infinite transitions. Until such a time, there is nothing to believe in!

It is not expected that the detailing of the transition species will ever be undertaken. Every single thinking person on earth intuitively knows that it cannot be accomplished. Not even the great Dawkins will try this feat, for it is way above his head, and he is intelligent enough to know it. Presumably, only a designer of much greater intelligence and power than we possess could envision a new species. In spite of this knowledge, the believers continue to believe...

One can talk about moths, gene distances, bacteria and virus mutations, bones, primordial soup contents, tremendous amounts of time and whatnot till the cows come home. Such as these are trying to hang christmas balls on a non-existing christmas tree. Until the transition organisms are sufficiently detailed and studied, there is nothing to discuss, nothing to believe.

(f) Predictive Power

Even though evolution attempts to explain the past while purposely avoiding the necessary, but deadly details, some believe it predicts the future. Again, the evolutionists have leaned out the window much too far. So far so that one is not able to test their assertions. We must not forget, evolution wishes to reveal how living organisms originated - from the simplest simple, to the most complex observed today.

Evolution must then predict what organisms are among the living billions of years in the future. Again, we have no means by which to test. Beyond this, it must be manifest to everyone that this is child-like grandstanding. It is accurately described as concept work. The truth is, even if evolution did accurately explain the past, it cannot hope to explain the future. We must not be taken in by every declaration under the sun.

(g) Extrapolation and Time

Successfully examining evolution for validity necessitates looking for the evidence of the endless series of organisms having lived in the past. If these cannot be found, this is either (1) evidence that evolution did not happen or (2) evidence that traces of evidence cannot be found. Should option (2) be chosen, careful examination must research the possibilities of the existence of the quasi-infinite kinds of species. The solution for the evolutionist is extrapolation and massive amounts of time.

Evolution depends on the extrapolation of observed microchanges, or variations, in species. Extrapolation is always fraught with problems, and when truly tested, almost invariably proves false. A proposal as to why one is justified in extrapolating observed microchanges into unobserved macrochanges does not exist. It is assumed a priori. On the other side of the coin, we are greatly justified in questioning this wisdom.

The current evolutionary thought rests squarely on the power of extrapolation. If one were to measure the growth of a tree, one could claim that after "a few million years" the tree would reach the moon. Assuming a priori sufficient extrapolation and time, one could prove very many a thing.

All mechanical and social systems have limitations. A business can only grow so large before its largeness becomes a liability. The same holds true for the size of government. A pencil only retains its function if it can be easily weilded by a hand. There are limits in which a system can function well, outside of which the system breaks down.

Observation of biological systems have not shown themselves to be an exception to the rule. Quite the contrary. All observable tests have concluded that gene variation and beneficial mutations are tightly bounded. When a generation attempts to produce offspring beyond these delineations, the offspring is severely handicapped. In spite of this, evolutionists claim that there are no boundaries, and this without scientific justification. It is simply assumed in spite of observable science. This author does not believe in the evolution of the species anymore than he thinks tree tops will one day touch the moon.

If the theory for extrapolation proved correct, but lack of time did not allow for its course, then we would again have a serious problem. When it comes to dating the earth, this is why there is

a major bias to classify non-evidence as if it were, and to ignore evidence as if it were not. All dating techniques used to show an old earth are construed on faulty assumptions, circular reasoning and contradictions. This paper will not delve into this topic.

2. The Theory of Natural Selection vs. Evolution

(a) The survivability of complex and simple organisms

In Darwin's story of creation lies a contradiction, which the author will show. Orthodox Evolution, in its most basic fundamental tenants and conclusions, contradicts itself. Notice that Natural Selection (1) weeds out those who have a harder time of survival and (2) promotes every increasing complexity of organisms.

In general, all considerations of Natural Selection, the filter mechanism as a means of producing ever increasing complex organisms, have been limited to the ability of the animal to avoid extinction due to predators, and the ability to catch pray, or scrounge for grass, as the case may be. But these qualities alone are likened unto a single "microbe in the petri dish". It is only a small portion out of the pool of the influencing factors on organisms. A simple thought experiment is in order.

Envision a multi-dimensional graph describing the various factors influencing an organism's ability to remain alive till mating season. The axes of the graph are denoted by: oxygen, nitrogen, etc. content and ratios of elements; maximum, minimum and average temperature; electromagnetic radiation levels and duration; force due to gravity; coloring; weight; quickness; endurance; strength; length of night and day; sleep patterns; cloud cover intensity and duration; mating frequency prior to expected death; survival rates as a new born; litter size; position in the food chain relative to others; geographical distance from predators, food sources, symbiotic organisms, vegetation; social habits; etc, etc, etc. Let us create a volumetric graph for every creature known, as we say in old west lingo, "dead or alive". The volume of the graph indicates how survivable the organism is. Natural Selection quickly filters out the organisms associated with small volumes, while allowing those with larger volumes to survive longer.

The question of the century is, "Which organisms are statistically likely to survive as time progresses based upon the multi-dimensional graphs influencing survivability - the simple ones, or the complex ones?" Simple organisms have relatively large volumes, where complex organisms have relatively small volumes, for complex systems are easier to "break".

Consider an ameba and a human. How much more volume does the graph associated with the ameba contain compared to the human? It is "obvious to the most casual observer" that the ameba will, according to the Theory of Natural Selection, survive longer, while the human, according to the Theory of Natural Selection, will be exterminated sooner. As a matter of fact, the ameba will wind hands down by multiple orders of magnitude on any single axis!

Natural Selection demands an ever *decreasing* complexity as a function of time, whereas the "scientists" claim that Natural Selection allows, and even causes, *increasing* complexity as time progresses. One can either believe straight forward logic, or evolutionists, but not both. The bottom line is, if Natural Selection is correct, Evolution cannot happen; niches or no niches!

Morphing into a more complex organism is self defeating, even suicidal. It is doing the organism a disfavor. Furthermore, the best solution is to never be alive, for dead material can never die! Natural Selection then should exterminate all life!

The Theory of Natural Selection from the *abstract* standpoint does not allow the Theory of Evolution to get out of the gate. Evolutionists must identify a different mechanism to explain every increasing complexity.

And now, we take a *practical* glimpse at the Theory of Natural Selection in combination with the "miniscule changes" idea. Again, it quickly filters Evolution from valid scientific thought, due to it being poorly suited for survivability under the rigors of thorough study.

(b) The survivability of transition organisms

The "miniscule changes" over time idea demands the formation of body parts that do not serve function or purpose. Creatures continually change, and therefore always have some body part that is "not finished". Envision, if you will, a mix animal, something between a "this" and a "that". Pick any line on the evolution lineage charts and imagine some "in between" animal, not quite a "this" and not quite a "that".

These transitional creatures have body parts serving no purpose, that in turn consume resources, out of which there exist no immediate "return on investment". It puts said transitional creature at a disadvantage compared to fully formed ones, just

on a resource consumption basis. It is to be expected that these disadvantaged creatures, due to a misallocation of resources, will be exterminated according to the Theory of Natural Selection. But this is not all.

If we take into account other factors, for example an unusable leg to be drug around behind the creature, in water or on the land, the outcome of such appendages is clear - annihilation by predators first in relation to competing potential prey, because these are easier to catch. Only our fantasy limits us to what may disadvantage the poor "between stage" creature: half formed breathing system, dysfunctional hormonal cycles, a circulatory system that does not transport nutrients or waste, a fin that does not swim, a nose that does not breathe, a liver that does not clean blood, fingers that cannot grasp, a bowel that does not eject waste, etc, etc, etc. The reader gets the idea.

Let us be serious. How is a creature trapped in an ill-formed body to survive? It simply cannot. It is pure insult to rational thought to propagate such theories in the public. To present them as fact is criminal.

According to the Theory of Natural Selection, these transition creatures will be wiped out due to traits negatively influencing survivability. If no transitional creatures can exist, their offspring can thus also not exist, nor can the next fully functional organism appear. This means then that organisms have not evolved from one form to another by miniscule changes *with the assistance of natural selection*.

If the Theory of Natural Selection is correct, Evolution *cannot* happen. The pretty diagrams showing the evolutionary lineage are a hoax, based on fanciful and wishful thinking, not to mention deceptive.

It should be clear to the reader that Evolution is not a fact.

(c) The Mystery of Reproduction

Organisms reproduce in one of two ways: there is either a full reproduction capability in a single organism, or a reproduction capability only when two opposite sexed organisms mate (for the sake of this argument, we include plant pollination with animal mating).

We cannot get around the algebraic fact that the reproduction process happens in integer numbers. Numerically this means either 1, or 2, but not real numbers 1.00001, then 1.00002 and

so on till 2.0. To the contrary of observed nature, micro evolutionary changes insists on real numbers with infestimally small increments eventually ending with 2.0. But this is not all. Should Evolution be true, why should reproduction stop at 2.0? Why not go to 3.0, or 13.0?

But, what does "1.49586" mean in the reproduction game? Has anyone ever observed it, or found a fossil of it? How likely is it to achieve its goal? Evolution has no answer, as in all other cases. *What does this mating with 1.7463 organisms look like?* What does the organism itself look like?

We must not loose sight of this pivotal axis in Evolution - the passing of traits from one generation is done through the *reproduction process*. How could the reproduction process itself, so key to the rise and fall of the theory, be left undefined as to how it evolved from mono reproduction to dual reproduction? The author begs for more evidence than, "Well, we are here aren't we?"

Why would there be this evolution, when self reproduction seems advantageous for the survival of a species? An extra variable always causes more complexity, and therefore more chance of error. This author believes the answer is very simple. It is an inconvenient truth where not only natural selection destroys all hopes of any evolution in the area of mating, but so does simple algebra.

Sudden macro Evolution is no real solution. The mating process from a social, hormonal, chemical and biological standpoint is of magnitudes beyond our comprehension. We are asked then to believe that this leap happened in one generation, at the same time, and place, twice - but opposite in gender - and the two "Macro Evolutioned" species overtook the non-mating organisms in number over a period of generations even though this style of reproduction is disadvantaged? And this happened for every specie? Note that if only one female was created, without the corresponding male, then the instantaneous Macro Evolution was for naught, just as if two males were "created".

This problem will never, ever be researched by the evolutionist, for he knows that he has no hope. It appears much more opportune to sweep all evidence contrary to Darwin's golden calf under the rug, shut the eyes, and pretend it is not there.

3. Evolution and Observation

Should one take the standard view, one cannot claim that the Theory of Evolution falls under the category of operational science. Science uses direct observation as the method of validation. The observation is recorded by defining (a) the environment (influencing factors) in which the studied issue takes place, (b) the input and (c) the result. The observation must be readily repeatable, otherwise it must be rejected as unverifiable. It must be noted that there exists truth outside of the realm of science. Science is extremely limited as a source of knowledge in this aspect.

The Theory claims to explain the advancement of life as we experience it as a process having begun billions of years ago. For the very start then, Evolution is a historical account. No historical account can be analyzed using scientific methods. There is no laboratory test man can devise to repeatedly verify an event (an action) that happened in the past.

Since Evolution is a historical account, it is best taught in history class, not in science class, if at all. A sociology case study on the mass hysteria concerning Evolution, and the human's abuse of science in this respect may be insightful, however. The phrase "self-delusion" should be in the title. This is not mean, but an observation.

The fossiles turned and warped in the minds of the evolutionists is were the evidence lies. Bias, preconceived notions, glory and research funding dollars cause them to see things that don't exist, and probably more importantly, to overlook the things that do exist. The pretty pictures of ape-men based upon a few bones of questionable origin, are the workings of a professional artist, not defendable science. The history of bone searching and embryonic comparisons is chalk full of lazy science and schemed bunco.

Taking the primordial soup as an example, the cradle of Evolution, it is clear that this was never observed, never sufficiently defined, and is not repeatable. From the very beginning of the creation story, Evolution is patently unscientific.

Aside from the purely historical aspect, we have the time frame problem. No man has been alive for billions of years to provide his testimony. We have no witness available as to the validity of Evolution.

Additionally, if one does live long enough and does observe evolution (the transition from one distinct animal to a next) now, this does not prove that it did happen in the past. There can always be a first time.

One could however research the earth for marks of Evolution. This would be an indirect method of observation, like archeology. And this is where the much touted proof of evolution is "found". One can simply ask the question, "What would we expect to find should Evolution be true?"

(a) The Fossil's Witness

Much talk has been made of the fossil record. Since fossils only record hard material, erasing the soft tissue, much of the evidence, should it have ever existed, does not exist now. Now and then, soft tissue is found, but this is a rare exception. Be that as it may, it stands to reason that skeletal structures would exist, more often than not, having bony appendages and such that serve no function; for the body of the animal, always evolving in incremental steps, requires these not-yet-finished body parts. But, to this day, not a single skeleton has been found having bony appendages not serving its purpose perfectly.

The pad response rings, "Well, fossils are hard to come by." At this juncture, they have conceded not only that fossil evidence supporting evolution is wholly lacking, but by the very nature of the process of fossilization, none is likely to appear. 150 years is a long time to be valiantly, but in vain, digging around in the dirt, funded often by tax-payer money. Translating this back to the author's theme, in their attempt to avoid admitting the obvious, they have just gone on record that one cannot test to see if evolution ever happened through the fossil record. If the fossil record is *not capable* of producing positive evidence, then it certainly cannot be used to support the Theory.

But their reply only goes so far. For, Evolution by the very claim *absolutely requires* that for all intents and purposes *every single living* animal has continuously been changing. This means that every animal is "never done", or never complete. It is to be *absolutely expected* then, if Evolution is true, that every fossil (found of a certain degree of completeness in terms of the entire organism) must have some skeletal appendage that has no real purpose, or that does not function. Statistically speaking, regardless of how many fossils are not found, the

absolute vast majority we do have *must* show unfinished bone structures. Alas, this is not the case, and this is the assurance to know that Evolution by miniscule change never happened. So witnesses the evidence. Of all the alleged ancestral lineages, not a single chain can be strung from one specie to another. Links are not missing, chains are missing, all of them!

(b) The Current Biological Witness

Fast forward to today. If Evolution is truth, we must expect to find millions, if not billions, of examples of organisms having not only bony appendages, but also soft tissue, (a) not serving any purpose, and (b) not completely serving a purpose.

At this point, scientists typically point to some organ of some body and say, "We don't understand what this does, it is a leftover from Evolution, voilà, Evolution proven." It is tough to prove something on account of ignorance, but this is what the evolutionist does. It is reasonable to expect, that as time progresses, the ignorance will fade, and the reason for the organ shall be comprehended.

Other than that, fish have been found to have "eyes" that do not see, living in areas where there is no sunlight. The idea submitted is that "The eyes at one time did function, but now do not, voilà, Evolution proven." Again, the evidence, if it is to be used as such, shows a degradation of high complexity to less complexity - the exact opposite of the evolutionary claim. But what ever the truth is behind the unusable eye (whether the proposal is true or not remains to be seen), the millions and billions of miniscule change examples by way of non-complete biological systems that *must be observable in the here and now* do not exist. Therefore, we are justified to say that evolution is not happening now.

If evolution is true, then every organism abiding on this planet today must show multiple forms of non-functional systems. The casual observer is fully aware that the demanded billions of functionaries that are not fully formed per evolution are non-existent. The evolutionist is here forced to state that, "Evolution at one point was in effect, but now it is not, and conveniently stopped at a point when every organism on this planet had fully functional soft and hard tissue." What caused

this fabulous phenomena is filed away in a top-secret folder. We are simply asked to believe the unbelievable in spite of the evidence.

We have absolute proof that evolution of biological systems are not occurring now, we also know then that the evolution of species carrying these systems are likewise not evolving now. If species are not evolving now, it stands to reason that they never did.

(c) Evolution per Instantaneous Macro Mutation

In the effort to avoid the above problematic, some have proposed that the transformations happened all at once, per mutations over one generation. A fully functional circulatory system appeared in one single generation is the allegation - along with all the other associated organs and so on. This is so far fetched, it is laughable, at best absurd. This has never been observed and no mechanism has been proposed. Every known mutation beyond very simple functions in very simple organisms has had an enormous net negative effect on the survivability of the animal in the wild, often including the inability to produce offspring. Evolution did not happen per sudden mutation.

4. Conclusion

The fossil evidence indicates that Evolution did not happen. Present observation today proves that Evolution is not happening. Natural Selection demands that Evolution cannot happen.

Here is the logical conclusion as to what we have discovered.

- (1) Natural Selection is not the driver of Evolution, should Evolution have ever happened. A proposed replacement driver has never been submitted. Furthermore, Natural Selection excludes the Evolution of the Species.
- (2) Evolution as an occurrence in history has never been, indeed cannot be, observed directly. It is not operational science.
- (3) All attempts to identify traces of Evolution through the fossil record not only do not support the theory, but speak against it.
- (4) All attempts to identify traces of Evolution in organisms living today not only do not support the theory, but speak against it.

- (5) Neither have the quasi-infinite organisms absolutely demanded by evolution been proposed or identified, nor have their biological systems and environments been described. As evolution has utterly and completely failed to define these necessary transitions, there is nothing to believe in.

The Theory of Evolution contradicts itself, the fossil record, and observance of our biological world. In effect, it explains absolutely nothing. Intellectual honesty must conclude that the belief in the Theory of Evolution is irrational. Daydreaming in tandem with ignoring the observable universe is the flower bed for the belief in Evolution, not rigorous thought.

(a) Evolution and Discontinuities

There are "X" observable facts regarding our universe, including life, that show a "dualism" of nature - that is, two things that are required for nature to work, but at the same time cannot exist separate from each other. This requires that both appeared suddenly and at the same time regardless of its complexity. What came first, the male or the female, protein or DNA, oxygen or no oxygen... What is a half amphibian and half mammal, or a half animal, half plant?

The bottom line is that there exist discontinuities, between which life does not exist, has never existed, and cannot exist. But evolution demands the oposite of what is readily observed!

If the theory does not match reality, it is time to look at other ones. This is all to say that evolution is supernatural. It does not exist in the realm of the natural. This author does not believe in the supernatural, as many scientists most certainly do. What is natural, however, is that an incredibly intelligent, and likewise powerful, designer made all of creation. What we observe and experience is what is rationally to be expected from this totally natural event.

(b) Interpersonal Consequences

Self-sacrifice (altruism) is not supported by evolution. The opposite, however, is. Persistantly and consistantly only looking out for one's self and one's own survival in the spirit of Ann Rand leads to a total breakdown of society. Who wants to

be married to someone like this? Who wants to have friends, or neighbors who's pivot point is their own good to the detriment of the other?

Self-centeredness and self-focus, How can I consume more? Might means right. The power to take is the right to consume. This mentality on the individual scale eventually gives rise to economic interventionalistic (socialistic / marxist / communistic / fascist) styled governments. This is truly the uncompromising, unflinching and unapologetic Kingdom-of-Self à la Ann Rand.

If society is to have any hope of survival, it cannot be built on the "anything goes if it is good for me" motto inherent in and demanded by evolution. Evolution mutually excludes any form of morality or restraint. Seeking the good of thy neighbor has no place; it is in its essence anti-evolutionary.

The evolutionists have used legal arguments to enforce their brand of society on us. They have also protected the favoured philosophy by banning the questioning of evolution in the light of observation. It is very important that we shake off these "thought shackles" put upon our children by the "thought police" under the pretense of science. I fear for an education system that denies the questioning if trees really do grow to the moon, and that teaches our future generation that there is no moral right and wrong.

Science and the so-called enlightenment has promised to solve all of man's problems. It has only served to hurl us head-long into wiping ourselves off the planet. What we believe forms our assumptions and alters our behaviour. If we believe we are the result of a cosmic accident, then we will live as such. We then have no purpose. There is no reason to live. We might as well all commit suicide. This is not the end of it.

With such a mindset, there can be no regard for life. On the contrary, the killing of a fellow human is the substantiation that the dead is less fit for survival, thereby justifying the murder. Stealing from another is verification that he is unfit to own property. Does the reader understand where this is going? A society deeply believing in Evolution must kill and destroy itself.

"The Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of favoured Races in the Struggle for Life" is the title of Darwins famous book. The word "races" unequivocally refers to the "human", notwithstanding empty claims to the contrary that "races" refers to organisms. The point he made was obvious. If evolution is true, then some human races are

more advanced than others, and the others have the right to be killed by the more advanced. More than that, it is the duty of the advanced to kill off the weak so as to make room for the strong! And whoever kills is by definition the stronger, on account of him vanquishing his foe, of course. His book offers a license for mass murder, and he knew it. Some accepted the license. Rivers of blood drip from the author's fingers.

Let us look as to why one is justified in stating that "races" refers to humans, noting that it could possibly mean species in general.

- (1) Scientists are particular about their choice of terms.
- (2) Editors, specialists in written communication concerned about the proper transmission of ideas, are more so.
- (3) Terms in titles are particularly and carefully chosen, magnifying my points (1) and (2).
- (4) Points (1), (2) and (3) lead one to assume that the title is worded with the intent to mean what the author says, and to say what the author means.
- (5) The term "races" refers to humans for the most part. This was true 150 years ago. At that time, it was used in reference to nationalities. The term "races" will most assuredly be construed to mean "humans" by the absolute vast majority of readers.
- (6) Neither the term "specie" nor "organsim" single out humans, and were decidedly not used.
- (7) The author without a doubt knew that his book would be hotly contested and using the word "race" would add fuel to the fire.

The rhetorical question is then, "Why would a non-racist scientist and editor knowingly title a scientific proposal having deadly racists implication using a term that almost must be, and will be, construed as racist by readers, when the term "organism" is truly meant?" Why not simply use the term "organism", or "specie"? Both Darwin and his editor did not choose the word "race" without thinking about it. They knew full well how everyone would naturally read it, and construe it.

And what is the outcome? Millions of dead victims of government policies claiming to have intellectual and scientific backing on account of Charles' marketing of the theory.

Let us take another look at "The Preservation of favoured Races in the Struggle for Life". Assuming the obvious, what else can we glean.

- (1) The verb "favoured" can easily be interpreted to indicate *human preference, opinion or decision*. Natural Selection makes no conscious decisions and has no opinions.
- (2) The phrase "preservation ... of Races" means "ensuring the purity of a race against contamination from other races". This is a common facet of racism. Note that *preservation* is contrary to evolution, which is the *advancement* of an organism. Does Charles believe that humans are the apex of evolution? Also note that only humans have been observed to take measures in ensuring the purity of a race. If a *favoured* race of humans is the apex, it would stand to reason to make sure it is not contaminated with not-quite apex humans.
- (3) "Preservation" also means "to actively take measures to protect from death", which requires, among humans, a military advantage, presumably against the not-quite humans.
- (4) The phrase "struggle for life" is interesting. Notice that the races are in a struggle. A struggle against what or whom? When combined with point (2), it seems the races are struggling among themselves. And only humans do this on a grand scale. This confirms point (3).

You be the judge. What was the underlying message? Even if Charley really meant "organism", the last (4) points, with few minor changes, remain fully in tact! Murder and war are not abuses of the theory of evolution, but the direct logical and inescapable conclusion! War and murder are expressions of the ultimate struggle for life. If evolution is true, there is no moral law and murder is not wrong. The law of the jungle rules!

DNA "science" is going in the same direction. The supposed gay gene, the promiscuous gene and theft gene are justifications for every vile act. This is along the lines of "the devil made me do it". The fad slogan is now, "the genes made me do it". The "scientific" proof lends the aura of authority. It is conspicuous that no one has found a "truth" gene as a basis for honesty! Don't fall for excuses.

(c) Eternal Consequences

There is no right and wrong. And above all, there is no sin. This is the reason Evolution has so many faithful believers. They are using Evolution as a crutch to avoid facing the reality that they will one day provide an account of their words and deeds to their Creator. The universe as it is, is simply not

what they would like it to be. They want to be free to be slaves of their lustful nature, to be their own master, their own judge, alas, their own god.

The true God is not going away on account of the fantasies of a Charles Darwin. Anyone completely honest with himself cannot believe that order came from a "cosmic explosion", nor can he make-believe that life "spontaneously" emerged. Evolution does not explain anything, but that its marketing agent Darwin and his fellow propagators are either deceived, or themselves deceivers.

*2 Peter 3:3-4 First, understand this: during the Last Days, scoffers will come, **following their own desires** and asking, "Where is this promised 'coming' of his? For our fathers have died, and everything goes on just as it has since the beginning of creation."*

*2 Peter 3:5 But, **wanting so much to be right** about this, they **overlook** the fact that it was by God's Word that long ago there were heavens, and there was land which arose out of water and existed between the waters,*

*2 Peter 3:6-7 and that by means of these things the world of that time was flooded with water and destroyed. It is by that same Word that the present heavens and earth, having been preserved, are **being kept for fire until the Day of Judgment, when ungodly people will be destroyed.***

One has to do a lot of overlooking not to see the obvious, *wanting so much to be right*. Right about what? That there is no judgement for following their own desires! This is the prime mover for evolution.

The one acquainted with science will admit that the universe is very ordered, and all pieces fit perfectly together. Alas, science assumes this is so! Should one piece not fit just right, absolutely nothing would work. The universe has all the appearances of "being designed", which is the passive voice of "somebody designed it". There exists no evidence indicating that there was no Master Designer. Quite the contrary!

And this order is what the Evolutionists fear. They have replaced the Person Creator with a Non-Person Creator, the Nature. It would be the greater miracle if the universe happened by chance! So who is engaged in blind faith!? It is nature worship in the most truest sense. Nature is great, Nature can create this and nature can create that, Nature is God! But the Person Creator has His Order of things, and He will not bow to man's order, nor will He bow to man's fantasies. Intuitively, it is very clear, when one reaches against His Order of things,

very bad things happen. Opposing God's Will is counter productive, and dumb. If an evolutionist does not believe me, he should jump off a 10 story building ignoring the power of gravity instigated by God for our benefit.

2 Peter 2:12-13a But these people, acting without thinking, like animals without reason, born to be captured and destroyed, insult things about which they have no knowledge. When they are destroyed, their destruction will be total - they will be paid back harm as wages for the harm they are doing.

God's moral law will not move anymore than His physical, chemical, biological and other various laws. Otherwise chaos would ensue. And for what reason should the universe He created spin out of control and self-destruct? So the created can have his way over and above the Will of the Creator?

And this is what the Evolutionist is running from - his own sin (disobedience against the Will of the Father).

Matthew 10:28 "Do not fear those who kill the body but are powerless to kill the soul. Rather, fear him who can destroy both soul and body in Gei-hinnom.

Hebrews 10:31 It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.

On that final day, the scoffers will meet the One they mocked. They will tremble in fear, but it will be too late, and their eternal destiny will be set. Delusions of haughty arrogance, theories of things that cannot be, will arise no more.

Science is the search for God's law, and its application to make life better for man. Evolution denies the creator, the giver of law, and is therefore not science. It also fails to make life better. On the contrary, it makes life worse.

What would be the kind of person who created an infinitely large universe made of infinitely small "particles" and placed in that universe an infinitely complex biosphere, from the single cell organisms to man, with their interworkings? He would be infinitely grand, I presume.

What would be the just punishment for insulting this infinitely grand and majestic person ever so slightly? What would He do with one who denied His existence, claimed he could live as he wished, and used the universe He created to "prove" the non-existence of the Designer? Standing in the throne room before His Majesty, the Creator of All, I can guarantee that this will not go over very well.

The just punishment for insulting His infinite Majesty would be infinitely severe, would it not? Eternity is a long time. Eternity is infinite. So what will it be? Do we believe in trees touching the moon, or do we admit the obvious, and give Honour to Him?

I imagine that God will mock those who fantasized about a universe that does not need Him. They will be sent to this Him-less universe, to float around in their primordial soup for endless ages to come. Periodically, the Giver of Life will pose the rhetorical question, "Seen any life spontaneously generate?, You've been down there for how many trillions of trillions of years?, Nothing yet? Perhaps your theory needs a slight revision!" Anyone toying with the idea that life spawned from a frayed mix of chemicals of unknown content zapped presumably by Zeus, the god of lightning, is setting himself up for a rude awaking. They will have a very long time to learn their lesson that a universe without the Giver of Live is lifeless.

The proposed Big Bang is constantly being upgraded and fixed in an effort to explain the contradictions between the theory and the reality. It is even claimed, that the laws of physics were different way back when, for we cannot explain it with the universe laws we observe today. At this point, they have just admitted that this universe quite possibly could not come from itself, but required an initiation process by an external force.

It is simply not wise to deny the existence of the One who can deny the "deniers'" existence. Whether they choose to believe the truth then or not in that awful place will not change their condition. It is time to choose to believe the truth now, and act on it, while our beliefs and actions still make a difference. Jesus paid the price as a mortal man, not as a resurrected immortal man.

Claiming that chance and time created that which only the Giver of Life could do will not score any bonus points with God. He will consider this an insult of great magnitude, for the insulter has just degraded God to nothingness.