

Evolution & Observation

A few brief observations indicating that
Evolution is not true

Author: Scott Wallace Brians
Web Address: www.his-kingdom.net
Version: 20 October 2013
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>	5
1.c:	<i>A Thorough Theory, Please!</i>	8
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>	12
1.h:	<i>With enough 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
(3)	Evolution and Observation	17
3.a:	<i>The Fossil's Witness</i>	18
3.b:	<i>The Current Biological Witness</i>	19
3.c:	<i>Evolution per Instantaneous Macro Mutation</i>	20
3.d:	<i>Evolution and Discontinuities</i>	21
(4)	Alternatives	21
(5)	Interpersonal Consequences	24
(6)	Eternal Consequences	28

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 disregard the humanistic story of creation. We simply ask some common sense questions to test if Charles Darwin was on to something.

"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 out no such case."

- Charles Darwin

Not knowing Charles Darwin personally, I simply assume he was stating an honest opinion in his last sentence. However, one wonders how much effort he put into looking for organs that could not be formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications. Looking for organs that *could not* have been thusly formed demands that one look for organs that *could*. I have not come across a single instance where these modifications have been described for a single simple organ, much less a complex one.

This fact is very telling. Since this is the case, one is justified in questioning how serious one should consider evolution.

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 long periods of 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 hit by lightning, and as a result, we have 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 thus the problem is solved.

For the inquisitive mind, the development of life from non-life would be very interesting. Furthermore, it would also likely follow that this occurrence would lend clues on the hows and the whys 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 complexity of life we see today.

(a) History and Observation

Classical science rests on the observation of a phenomenon that can be readily repeated. The observer, in a well thought-through theory, clearly defines all affecting environmental factors, inputs and outputs. 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.

Lack of observation is the key. No one has ever seen the evolution of one distinct specie into another. One can justifiably 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, then any evidence for this theory must also be found indirectly. As a consequence, the theories of Evolution and Creation are in the same boat.

When analysing evolution, we must ask ourselves, what should we observe if evolution were true?

(b) The Lines of Evidence

Individuals have been searching for evidence for 150 years. What have the best minds formulated? Below is a list of typical iron clad, solid proofs suggesting 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. But 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 of the evolving of one specie to another. 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, some of our ignorance has been erased. 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 organizational 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 supporters of evolution cannot be used as evidence for their 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. Furthermore, do there exist isolated regions in the world, where the some specie is 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, it is presented as evidence/

proof. This comes out somewhat in the six lines of evidence shown above. There are many more "proofs" for evolution we could analyze, but the reader gets the point.

To further show why the proposed six lines of evidence are useless, we note that the evolutionist had already assumed that evolution is correct.

If we assume otherwise, that is, we assume a God Designer, we can prove that a God Designer is the creator of life. 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. Every design engineer does the same.

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

(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.

As exhibited here, it must be obvious that the revealed claims above by evolutionists are not evidence for evolution. If one claims the above 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 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 flaw in the evolutionary evidence logic is the assumption 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. Charles Darwin said as much. Without the quasi-infinite number of species, there is no evolution.

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.

This being said, for evolutionary theory to be truly fleshed out, it must detail, for every quasi-infinite specie, (1) the organism with its physical 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.

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 as evidence.

What does the "1% snake, 99% bird" look like, what was his environment, and was this creature able to function and thrive? Respiratory systems, circulatory systems, digestive systems, and the like must be identified. Plainly, a certain amount of creative fantasy is required. This creature exists only in the mind of the evolutionist.

Then, 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 either 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, evolutionists must lower the bar and look for circumstantial evidence.

The absolute core of Evolution is the existence, or not, of the quasi-infinite successive species. Evolution stands or falls on this point. Truth be told, the core of evolution has never been investigated beyond placing arrows between known species.

(d) Vestigial Conflicts

Vestigial systems denote non-functioning body parts ("left-overs" from previously functioning systems). The most famous of these are the incomplete eye structures in fish living deep in the sea where light does not penetrate.

For the following text we ignore for the moment the fact that the number of proposed vestigial systems by evolutionists is billions less than is expected pursuant evolution. This alone is a cause for a pause. But for the sake of argument, we assume that they do exist for the reasons evolutionists claim. The author wishes to show a contradiction in evolution.

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, the evolutionist conflictingly claims 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 of a specie from one to another, and therefore no evolution. Natural selection would have wiped them out.

The randomness of evolution demands 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.

Evolution has a serious problem. If it does not allow '*numerous, successive, slight modifications*' there is no evolution. If it does allow '*numerous, successive, slight modifications*', the prerequisite organs are by definition non-functional, not allowing the organism to survive. Thus, there is no evolution.

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 body parts are non-crucial, non-functioning body parts must exist, but where body parts are crucial, they are not allowed to exist. This stance is self contradicting.

The problem becomes even larger. The respiratory and circulatory systems in snakes are optimized for snakes, while the same systems in birds are optimized for birds. These two systems are interrelated: the lungs transfer oxygen to the blood, and the circulatory system transfers carbon dioxide to the lungs. 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 in their own right, and in the interworking.

The lack of guidance, assumed by the evolutionist, demands that this parallel development is most assuredly not the case. While conceptually thinkable, it does come across as impossible.

And why a particular trait in these biological systems (be it respiratory or anything else) would be kept while degrading the ability of the organism to survive and reproduce before it became advantageous remains a mystery. This is 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, (3) test to see if the morph is an advantage, and (4) then test to see if the morph actually did take place.

There is another possible explanation for vestigial body parts. Pottenger's did experiments with cats. He was able to, at will, produce sickness in cats by removing vitamins from the diet. Interestingly enough, one of the sicknesses Pottenger generated was blindness. And even more intriguing, the eyes were not fully developed, and therefore did not work.

Pottenger's experiments, which are repeatable, show the exact same phenomena observed in the most famous vestigial. It is then justifiable to believe that these fish are simply not getting the correct nutrients required to form properly working eyes. On account of this, they tend to only be viable where eyes have no use, that is, deep in the sea where no light penetrates.

(e) Begging for the Data

Have evolutionists created descriptions of these imaginary in-between creatures? Those having '*been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications*'? 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, or even attempted.

Without the detailing of specie morphing from A through Z, we can say nothing about the morphing phases, and certainly not reasonably claim that the morphing organisms ever existed. Therefore we must conclude that the very core of evolution has never been studied.

Aside from the tremendous amount of work required by this required investigation, there is another reason this detailing of the core of evolution will never happen. This point has all the more force as science demands that when a study can be done to investigate a theory, the investigation must take place. In spite of this, no one bothers to work on the core issues of evolution. And this gets to the heart of the issue. Evolution is fantasy in the very truest sense of the word, as degrading as it may come across.

The morphing stages can only be detailed on account of imagination. This in and of itself will cause a fire-storm of criticism.

No self-respecting scientist is going to risk this. The creationists are going to pounce on this one - and rightly so. The scientist who proposes the imaginary creature will find his credibility demolished, and his career over.

At this juncture, the true colors of evolution are plain for everyone to observe. Fanciful imaginations is what evolution amounts to. If the evolutionists cannot show the bonafide, hard facts data, then Evolution collapses.

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 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. This author will choose to believe in the transition organisms, and in turn in evolution, when one effectively describes and justifies a respectable and decent portion of the quasi-infinite transitions.

It is not expected that the detailing of the transition species will ever be undertaken. Everyone intuitively knows that it cannot be accomplished. Presumably, only a designer of much greater intelligence and power than we possess could envision a new specie.

One can talk about moths, gene distances, bacteria/virus mutations, bones, primordial soup contents, tremendous amounts of time and whatnot till the end of eternity. Until the transition organisms are sufficiently detailed and studied, there is nothing to discuss, nothing to believe.

(f) Predictive Power

Some believe Evolution to have predictive power. This is quite an odd assertion. Evolution has purposely avoided predicting the quasi-infinite in-between species.

(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 mechanisms that might cause 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.

The current evolutionary thought rests squarely on the power of extrapolation. If one were to measure the growth of a young tree, one could claim that after "a few million years" the tree would reach the moon.

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 wielded 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 this 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. These organisms can only live if and only if they are cared for in terms of protecting them from predators and providing them nutrition.

In contradiction to the observable facts, evolutionists claim that there are no boundaries. 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 demand that the earth is old, ignoring all solid evidence to the contrary. 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.

(h) With enough time ...

One of the standard proofs for evolution is that with enough time, anything can happen.

However, if a man were to jump as high as he could for many trillions of years, would he ever jump over the moon?

Before one can claim that evolution can happen given enough time, he must first show that it is even possible via a working mechanism.

We discuss the proposed mechanism of Evolution in the following pages.

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 a very limited set of variables determining what it takes to survive. 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 relationships, 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 more 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 given axis!

Note that there may be a particular variable where the human wins, however, after all is tallied, the human loses.

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. The bottom line is, if Natural Selection is correct, Evolution cannot happen.

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! Taking this thought to its logical end, 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.

(b) The survivability of transition organisms

"Minuscule changes" over time 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 mixed 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 poor creatures are easier to catch. Only our fantasy limits us to what may disadvantage the poor "in-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, reproductives systems that do not allow reproduction, 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.

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.

3. Evolution and Observation

One cannot claim that the Theory of Evolution should be categorized under operational science. Operational 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.

Evolution 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 might be best taught in history class, not in science class. To wit, Evolution is taught as a history class.

The pictures of ape-men based upon a few bones of questionable origin, are the workings of an imaginative artist, not defensible science. The history of bone searching and embryonic comparisons is chalk full of lazy science and schemed bunco. The fossils turned and warped in the minds of the evolutionists is where 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.

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.

One could however research the earth for marks of Evolution. This would be an indirect method of observation, like archeology. 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 typical response is, "Fossils are hard to come by." At this juncture, they have conceded not only that fossil evidence supporting evolution is 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. 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 explanation 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 (assuming enough of the organism is found 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. This is the witness of 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." 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.

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. 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 phenomena is filed away in a top-secret folder.

We have, it seems, absolute proof that evolution of biological systems are not occurring 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 - along with all the other associated organs. This approach is very far fetched. 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.

(d) 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, the chicken or the egg ... ? The most simple organism cannot exist without a symbiotic relationship with more complex organisms. Simply stated, the more complex had to exist prior to the less complex. This observable fact is a direct contradiction of Evolution. So much worse for the facts!

The bottom line is that evolution demands situations that do not exist, have never existed, and cannot exist. The protein cannot exist without DNA. But the DNA cannot exist without protein. The one cannot exist prior to the other. They both have to coexist, appear at the same time. How is this explained by Evolution while at the same time demanding '*numerous, successive, slight modifications*'? Evolution demands a serial lineage. Observation demands parallel, instantaneous creation.

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; many scientists share the same sentiment. 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. If the story fits, it fits, regardless of our feelings for or against it.

If evolutionary theory does not match reality, it is time to look at other ones.

4. Alternatives

Summing up our previous thoughts, here is what we have discovered.

- (1) Natural Selection excludes the Evolution of the Species.
- (2) As such, Natural Selection is not the driver of Evolution, should Evolution have ever happened. A proposed replacement driver has never been submitted.
- (3) Evolution as an occurrence in history has never been, indeed cannot be, observed directly. It is not operational science.
- (4) All attempts to identify traces of Evolution through the fossil record only serve to speak against the theory.
- (5) All attempts to identify traces of Evolution in organisms living today only serve to speak against the theory.
- (6) All proofs of evolution can be used to support competing theories. Furthermore, the proofs can be explained with less complex, readily observable, and therefore more believable mechanisms.
- (7) Neither have the quasi-infinite organisms absolutely demanded by evolution been proposed or identified, nor have their biological systems and environments been described. Because proponents of evolution have failed to define these necessary transitions, there is nothing to believe in.

There is an alternative explanation for life. This is the Intelligent Design theory.

This theory is vilified in many circles as unscientific. I have until now not seen a thoughtful reason for stating why this might be the case; it is simply stated. Feel free to email me through my website if you have a different experience. I do have my theories as to why some maintain that Intelligent Design is unscientific.

One reason might be the fact that the Intelligent Designer is a huge paradigm shift. Change has a way of making people nervous; like being in a strange country, surrounded by people of a different appearance, speaking a language they do not

understand. Being outside of the box, expanding into new areas has a way of making one uncomfortable. It is a psychological/emotional issue.

Another reason might be the fact that the consequences of the theory of Intelligent Design make the person feel uncomfortable on a moral basis. The person's conscious judges him, and the person believes that the Intelligent Designer will likewise judge him. The laws that the scientist sees in the universe portends the consequences of moral laws. He duly notes that the laws of the universe are immutable, unchanging, and unbending; bad things happen when one brushes against the laws. It is less stress on the person to simply not deal with the problematic. Ignoring the problem is then the solution.

In both cases, we invite the person to allow the evidence to lead where it leads, regardless of how uncomfortable it might be.

The Intelligent Design theory has existed forever. It is very straight forward. It identifies the universe as having systems: complex structures and complex patterns that all work together. Experience tells us that complex structures, patterns and systems have a designer; without exception.

If we were dragging ourselves through the hot jungle, and stumbled across a pyramid, we would likely conclude that the pyramid had a designer. It has all the appearances as having been planned and built. The structure has a goal, as defined by the designer.

Furthermore, we uncover behind the overgrowth of bushes and vines symbols that clearly make up letters, words and sentences. There is thoughtful communication from the messenger to the listener.

We conclude that there is a low probability that these structures and messages could have appeared by chance. It is much more likely that intelligent design is the source of the structures and the messages.

As a matter of fact, intelligence is measured by determining how well a student can recognize patterns and structures, how to interpret them, and how to use these patterns and structures to

create other patterns and structures. The more advanced patterns and structures in math, languages and history are only understood by more intelligent students.

The reader should understand that students who recognize patterns and structures, and know how to use those patterns and structures, are considered intelligent, while those students who cannot are considered less intelligent. Those who cannot identify the more obvious patterns and structures, even if it is not understood how it works, are considered stupid. "Why cannot you not see the obvious, you numbskull!" screams the teacher.

Going back to our march through the jungle, we may call the designer "Aztecs" or "Mayans". If we were in the desert, we might call them ancient "Egyptians". No person guided by common sense would challenge the theory claiming that intelligent design created these pyramids and messages. We might dispute the name of the designer, but would never doubt the existence of the designer.

We also define those who build pyramids as more intelligent and powerful than those who build mud huts; for more intelligence and power is required to plan and build more complex structures.

We may not know who those designers were, or their names, but we do know that they existed. The more complex the patterns and structures, the more intelligent the designer must be to have thought it through; and more powerful the builder must be to have carried it out.

Furthermore, the study of archeology uses the artifacts (buildings, art, tools, etc.) left by the designer to study those who made them. The traits of the designer are expected to be found in the traits of the designed.

There is nothing anti-science to be found here. On the contrary, this is common sense in action.

The difference between evidence pointing to a creator of ancient civilizations and a Creator of the Universe is that there is neither a large paradigm shift (we all understand that civilizations lived prior to us) and there is no chance that these that went on before us are going to judge us. Therefore, there is no reason to malign the common sense theory that the pyramids were designed.

The more complex the patterns and structures, the greater the likelihood of the existence of a designer of said patterns and structures.

If the detractors of Intelligent Design in the evolution camp wish to be consistent, they must believe that the pyramids and languages we have discovered in the jungles of Central America, and in the deserts of Egypt, have evolved over time. They also must believe that cars and any other mechanical system has evolved as well.

There is no disputing that the universe shows complex patterns, structures and laws. Science, in fact, is the study of these patterns, structures and laws. Those who have a deeper understanding of the more complex patterns, structures and laws are considered smarter scientists. There seems to be no end, quite literally, in the patterns, structures and laws yet to be uncovered. One could say that the complexity, structures and laws of the universe are infinite.

Noting that increased complexity of pattern and structure decreases the chances that the pattern and structure occurred by chance, and increases the chances that the pattern and structure was the product of intelligent design, and the complexity is infinite, then the infinite *must* have had a designer and builder.

Furthermore, the complexity and depth of the patterns and structures are in proportion to the intelligence and power of the designer. Therefore the the Designer of the Universe most assuredly *is* infinitely intelligent and powerful.

Psalms 19:1-4 The heavens declare the glory of God; the sky displays his handiwork. Day after day it speaks out; night after night it reveals his greatness. There is no actual speech or word, nor is its voice literally heard. Yet its voice echoes throughout the earth; its words carry to the distant horizon. In the sky he has pitched a tent for the sun.

David, the author of the text above, summed it up quite nicely. Not bad for a shepherd. Although, I have noticed, that sometimes the intelligent outsmart themselves.

5. Interpersonal Consequences

Self-sacrifice (altruism) is not supported by evolution. The opposite, however, is. Persistently and consistently 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 mean right. The power to take is the right to consume. This mentality on the individual scale eventually gives rise to economic interventionallistic (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.

The evolutionists have used the courts to enforce their brand of society on us. Apparently, they don't feel they can argue their case on equal footing, but need the power of coercion to make their case. They have also protected the favored philosophy by banning the questioning of evolution from the light of observation in scientific circles by vilifying those who question the golden calf, and threatening them with early retirement.

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 questioning like, "Do trees readily grow to the moon given enough time?", and that teaches our future generation that there is no moral right and wrong.

Some claim that science and enlightenment shall solve all of man's problems. It has only served to hurl us head-long into wiping ourselves off the planet. Science provides the bombs. Enlightenment provides the moral justification to use them.

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. By default, 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 the victim is unfit to own property. I have met people who think like this. There are politicians who think like this. 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 have 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" would have most assuredly be construed to refer to "humans" by the absolute vast majority of readers.
- (6) Very telling is that neither the term "specie" nor "organsim" single out humans; these terms 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 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. This is the reason governments, who have a record of human rights abuses, all vilify those who believe in God or question evolution as "scientific fact", and force all education to teach evolution. Noting this, any court that forces Evolution as the preferred view point is stepping onto a slipper slope.

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. There are a few political leaders in the pages of world history that took these thoughts to their logical conclusion.
- (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 Charles Darwin 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 in the evolutionary context. 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, 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". There has always been a tendency to run from the responsibility of one's actions in the human. The "scientific" proof lends the aura of authority.

It is conspicuous that no one has found a "truth" gene as a basis for honesty. Those who tell the truth understand that telling the truth is a decision, not a DNA molecule. Don't fall for excuses.

6. Eternal Consequences

There is no right and wrong. And above all, there is no sin. This is, I suspect, the reason Evolution has so many believers. The evolutionist can do what he wants to anyone he wants without consequences. He uses 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 human nature, to be their own master, their own judge, alas, their own god.

The true God is not going away on account of the theories of 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 the marketing agents for Darwin 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.***

Those are strong words. The Apostle Peter likely had many discussions where the listener desperately denied the obvious: there is a creator of all, He is all knowing, all powerful, and will judge those who live their lives against His will.

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 motivation for believing in evolution. Perhaps this does not occur at the conscious level. However, this is the logic. Scientists that come out of Evolution testify to the veracity of Peter's statements.

The one acquainted with science will admit that the universe is very ordered, and all pieces fit perfectly together. Alas, science shows this is so! Should one single 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".

And this order of things is what the evolutionist fears. They have replaced the Person Creator with a Non-Person Creator, the Nature God. This is reminiscent of the nature religions, that for the most part demanded human sacrifices. These are quite barbaric, and are in line with the words penned above about the murderous implications of Evolution.

Moving on, it would be the greater miracle if the universe happened by chance! Now we are justified by asking who is engaged in blind faith? It is nature worship in the most truest sense. 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.

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 be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Instead, fear the one who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.

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

Engineers are offended, and rightfully so, when others take credit for their own creations. Lawyers and judges get involved, patent disputes are raised, fines and other punishments are meted out. Those who bowed their thoughts to the Nature God will find that they have offended the true Creator. Offending the infinite creator requires an infinite punishment.

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? Infinite is eternity. Eternity is a long time. So what will it be? Do we believe in trees touching the moon, or do we admit the obvious, and give Honor to Him?

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.

The Creator of all simply asks that those who have insulted Him be repentant. The repentant shall be saved.