

50 Facts versus Darwinism

1] The First Law of Thermodynamics is that matter or energy can not be created or destroyed. This is one of the most accepted and proven laws of science and is one of a number of serious problems for Big Bang cosmologies. Isaac Asimov referred to the First Law of Thermodynamics as “one of the most important generalizations in the history of science”. Basically stated, the First Law of Thermodynamics is that the total quantity of matter and energy in the universe is always constant, even though energy can be transformed into other forms of energy.

This law, also referred to as the Law of Conservation of Mass and Energy, reveals that the universe could not have created itself as required by the Darwinian oriented theories. All the observed changes throughout human history, whether caused by natural forces or by mankind, have resulted from the rearranging of the energy and matter that had already been in existence. Never has an observed change occurred that was the result of the creation of new matter or new energy.

The First Law of Thermodynamics is a major problem for all theories which attempt to explain how the universe developed itself without outside input. In other words, the universe could not have burst into existence during a Big Bang from a tiny speck of matter.

A letter signed by dozens of scientists appeared in New Scientist on May 22, 2004 titled “Bucking the big bang.” The letter included statements such as: The big bang theory can boast no predictions that have been validated by observation. Claimed Successes consist of retrospectively making observations fit by adding adjustable parameters. The big bang relies on a growing number of never observed entities, inflation, dark matter, dark energy...and can't survive without these fudge factors...In no other field of physics would this continual recourse to new hypothetical factors be accepted.

2] Had a big explosion occurred 13-20 billion years ago, stars should be evenly distributed throughout space. However, they are found in tightly wound balls or spiral galaxies. They haven't had time to spread out.

The stars that make up the Milky Way Galaxy, the galaxy in which we live, rotate about the galaxy's center at various speeds. However, the inner stars rotate faster than the outer stars do. The speeds at which these stars rotate are much too fast to allow for an old universe. The stars rotation speeds, which have been scientifically observed, are so fast that if our galaxy were more than four hundred million years old, it would be a featureless disc of stars with great voids of space existing between them. As found today, the Milky Way Galaxy actually indicates a much younger universe. In fact, all observed galaxies are either tightly wound

spiral shapes, as with the Milky Way, or in tightly bunched ball of stars. For a recent example, the Hubble Space Telescope found an extremely detailed spiral shape of stars inside of the central hub of what is known as the "Whirlpool" galaxy, M51. This, and other such discoveries, is in direct conflict to the predictions that are made by old-universe cosmologies.

These scientific findings are a serious problem for "billions of years" beliefs and for Darwinism which has to have "billions of years" of time to have any hope of having taken place. According to secular, old-universe astronomy, the Milky Way is supposed to be more than ten billion years old. This age is about forty times longer than the spiral shaped galaxies should have held to these tightly wound patterns. This situation has been known about since the 1950's and is what Darwinian biased scientists refer to as the "winding up dilemma." This "dilemma" is a problem that applies to all other galaxies as well.

5] One of the primary laws of science is the Law of Biogenesis. This Law of real science is that life can only come from living matter. In other words, non-living matter can not produce living matter, as required to get Darwinian evolution started.

To try and skirt around this scientific Law, which destroys Darwinian style evolution before it even begins, Humanistic textbooks teach that life spontaneously generated itself from non-living chemicals to become a "simple" single celled creature, such as a bacteria cell. Take for example the words from a high school biology book published by Glenco in 1998. On page 24 kids read: "All the many forms of life on Earth today are descended from a common ancestor, found in a primitive population of unicellular organisms. As anyone can read, this is taught as if it were a fact that the evidence has been found. Three sentences later the text admits: "No traces of those events remain..." This is proof that it never took place as opposed to supporting Darwinian philosophy.

So why can't life spontaneously generate itself from non-life? Real science provides us one good reason. The field of Biochemistry has discovered that bacteria cells are run by tiny molecular motors which operate and allow the cell to perform its various functions. These microscopic motors are called Bacterial Flagellum and can even change gears depending on how much weight they are either towing or pushing. The Flagellum is made of about 40 different, and highly complex, proteins and is known to be irreducibly complex. This term means that if any of the proteins were not entirely whole and in the exact order to form this molecular motor at the exact moment for life to begin, life never could have started itself. And to make matters even worse for naturalistic Darwinism, the process of putting the proteins in the correct order to form the Bacterial Flagellum requires other molecular motors which are themselves irreducibly complex. In other words, there is no possibility that life began on its own. The Law of Biogenesis has never been known to have been overcome. This means that Darwinism is dead in the water before getting launched.

3] Darwinists claim that life arose after a Big explosion lead to the formation of a big rock. Then oceans formed on the rock and from these primordial oceans, life arose.

The naturalistic philosophy which is imposed upon scientific researchers today has created many roadblocks to true science. For one example, there is no known way that nature could allow complex, living systems to develop by random chance from nonliving matter. Yet, this is exactly what is required in order for life to have evolved on its own. Due to this dilemma, most Darwinian biased biologists try to separate the origin of life, often referred to as chemical evolution, from discussions of biology. Their religious adherence to naturalistic Darwinism leaves them no other choice.

Experiments such as the Miller-Urey ones from the 1950s, have been able to produce some of the non-living chemical compounds found in living matter but have come nowhere near to creating life in the laboratory. The Miller-Urey experiment required massive amounts of intelligent input from the researchers. Then, during their closely monitored laboratory, using anything but natural conditions, they were able to produce a few of the 20 non-living amino acids that are found in living things. They had to isolate the amino acids so that the conditions which made them would not quickly destroy them.

An even more significant problem for starting life in either a lab or in a natural setting is that of the 20 types of amino acids found in living matter, they can form in either right or left handed forms. Mathematically speaking, any such acids forming in such experiments or in a natural setting would end up with roughly a 50-50 mixture of both right and left handed varieties. Yet to form the proteins found in living systems, the mixture of amino acids must be left-handed only, with all right handed nucleotide sugars. (with only a few rare exceptions). There is not a natural process which is known that can produce just left handed amino acids.

The truth is that the Miller-Urey, and other such experiments, did not come anywhere close to producing life in the lab from non-living matter. The simple fact is that they did not even come up with any of the non-living building blocks of life.

Today, some evolutionary zealots, recognizing the impossibility that life could have spontaneously generated on its own, are suggesting that somehow life started elsewhere in the universe and was dropped off on earth by aliens, meteors or by some other unknown process. This simply shifts the evolutionary problem to where it can not be tested and to where it won't pose as big an embarrassment to secular scientists.

46] Secular Humanists claim that life will be found on other planets and the US government is spending billions of taxpayer dollars searching for life from “outer space”.

Having discovered the complete impossibility of life having begun spontaneously from non-living matter here on earth, and completely closed to the fact that life was created by God, they are simply sending their problem elsewhere and to where no one other than their own institutions can conduct the observations. Thus the world will be subject to their interpretations of whatever they find. Take “life on Mars” as an example.

It is an observed scientific fact that micro-organisms from earth waft up on wind currents. These have been found in the earth’s upper atmosphere and are assumed to get pushed out into space by the solar winds emanating from the sun. These solar winds push things away from the sun and since Mars is further out than the earth the theory is that whenever the microbes get within range of Mars’ gravitational pull, they will be brought down onto the surface of that planet.

This is what NASA’s search for life on Mars is truly all about. The secular Humanist crowd, devoid of any real evidence in support of goo to you Darwinian style evolution on our planet, hope to recover some of these earth-born microbes from the surface of the Red Planet. They will then make the headline acclaiming announcement that “Life Evolved On Mars”. Keep this in mind because if it happens, as I suspect that it will, the “discovery” will be used to mislead billions of people.

Should this event occur, the proof that the microbes came from earth will be that they will be just like the microbes we find here today. Should this deceptive event take place it will be the greatest fraud perpetrated against mankind in the history of the world.

4] Millions of fossilized fish and fossilized amphibians have been found yet never has an intermediate fossil of a finned fish evolving into a legged amphibian been found. Although claims for transitional candidates are often made, never do the claimed evolutionary candidates stand up to true scientific scrutiny. Not a single transitional fossil accompanies the fossils that millions of fossils that have been found.

Charles Darwin realized that the fossil record, as known during his lifetime, did not support the predictions that his theory of evolution made. However, he hoped that, in the future, researchers would begin to find the overwhelming number of “missing links” that should have existed in the fossil record if his thoughts were accurate. Darwin wrote:

“Why is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated

organic chain; and this is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory.” (C.Darwin, Origin of Species, 6th edition, 1872 (London: John Murray, 1902), page 413.)

As one example of the much promoted “missing links, the April, 2006, issue of the scientific journal Nature, reported the discovery of several well preserved specimens of fish in sedimentary layers of siltstone in Canada. Tiktaalik roseae, like the other lobe-finned fish, was declared to be from the late Devonian age, somewhere between 359 and 385 million years old. These fossilized fish specimens were called Tiktaalik roseae and the discoverers claimed that these “represent an intermediate between fish with fins and tetrapods with limbs.” By claiming the fossils to be the long sought “missing link” they were immediately vaulted to world-class status amongst the Darwinian worshipping ranks of scientists.

However, the fact is that Tiktaalik roseae was a 100% fish. In a review article on Tiktaalik roseae which appeared in the same issue of Nature, fish evolution experts admitted that, in many aspects, Tiktaalik roseae “are straightforward fishes: they have small pelvic fins, retain fin rays in their paired appendages and have well-developed gill arches, suggesting that both animals remained mostly aquatic.” In other words, the hailed missing link was just a fish. Due to their evolutionary bias they did weakly try to claim that Tiktaalik’s “skull has a longer snout” feebly suggesting that perhaps “a longer snout suggests a shift from sucking towards snapping up prey...”

The renowned evolutionary Marxist Stephen Jay Gould wrote: “The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution.” (S.J. Gould, in Evolution Now: A Century After Darwin, ed. John Maynard Smith, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1982).

6] Never has an intermediate fossil of a reptile evolving into a bird been found. Millions of fossilized reptiles or birds are found, yet not a single transitional fossil accompanies them.

The overall fossil record is an enemy to Darwinism. All higher kinds of plants and animals appear abruptly in the fossil record with no transitional types linking one group to another. The amount of transitional forms involved in the evolutionary transformation from reptiles to birds, over millions of years, should be total an incredible number. Yet the only ones presented have not held up to even scant scientific scrutiny and have misled billions of people into believing in Darwinian style evolution.

After one embarrassing fraud that was passed off as a reptile to bird missing link was proven to be a fraud put together by a cash-poor farmer in China, 'The 'Missing Link' That Wasn't By Tim Friend appeared in USA TODAY, 2-3-00. In the article Friend wrote: "...this "true missing link... between dinosaurs and birds"...sprouted its...tail not 120 million years ago but only shortly before being smuggled out of China...has children believing in feathered dinosaurs that never existed, prominent scientists calling each other names and two respected science publications under assault..." Unfortunately, the fraudulent claims hit the newsstand about once per year, then quietly disappear.

The primary candidate presented by Darwinists as the missing link between reptile and bird is Archaeopteryx. There is no doubt that Archaeopteryx was an odd bird but there is also no honest doubt that it was a 100% bird. It had well developed feather for flight and feathers are very complex structures. Researchers now know for a fact that reptile DNA does not contain the information to form feathers. The dagger through the heart of Darwinism here is that that real science knows of no way for nature to add appreciable amounts of genetic information to an existing gene pool, much less the millions of pieces of data required to change a reptile into a flying bird.

Another crushing blow to the claim that Archaeopteryx was a missing link between reptiles and birds is that scientists have found several fossils of completely modern birds below the strata layers which contained Archaeopteryx. "...scientists found bird bones... farther down the geologic column than Archaeopteryx..." (Nature 322; 8-21-1986; Science 253; 7-5-1991). Since Darwinists believe those layers of rock formed slowly and that the fossils found in those strata represent our evolutionary paths, finding modern birds in layers below those that contain Archaeopteryx should have removed him from consideration as any sort of transitional kind.

The late paleontologist Dr. Colin Patterson, of the British Museum of Natural History, wrote a book titled, Evolution. In reply to why he had not included any pictures of transitional forms in his publication Dr. Patterson wrote: "I fully agree with your comments about the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them...I will lay it on the line, there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument. (C. Patterson, from a letter to Luther Sunderland, April 10, 1979, as published in Darwin's Enigma (Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 4th ed. 1988, page 89.)

7] Anthropologists, from the 1950's, proved that Neanderthals were 100% human. Yet today, many Darwinists still claim them as "missing links".

Neanderthal man' was the name given to human bones found in 1856 in Germany's Neander Valley. Even today many Darwinists depict Neanderthal Man as a half-witted link between ape and man who lacked language skills and

creative abilities. Others say he was a dead end in human evolution from our supposed ape like ancestors. However, the evidence has been around since the early 1900's which reveal that Neanderthal was a variation of modern humans and he has been reclassified as *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*, a particular kind of modern man.

The renowned pathologist Rudolf Virchow presented evidence that the Neanderthal specimens which showed a hunched over stance and other features were influenced by rickets and arthritis. However, due to the overwhelming Darwinian bias, which has been undermining scientific education and scientific research for the past 100 years, his conclusions were held back from the public for half a century! Another example of Darwinian bias was that it took longer than twenty years for the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago to correct its display of Neanderthals even after their Neanderthal display was proven to be misleading Darwinian propaganda! So much for honest 'science'.

The Darwinian bias still attempts to mislead anyone not on their toes. For instance, although Neanderthal's brain size was slightly larger than modern man's, his brain is said to be of lower quality. However, this is just bias masquerading as science. Evidence reveals that Neanderthal Man lived at the same time as modern man and that they likely interbred with each other. The discovery of a Neanderthal hyoid bone, related to the voice box, which was no different than that of a modern human, has led many scientists to the conclusion that Neanderthal Man had speech abilities just like that of humans today.

Other evidence reveals that Neanderthal conducted religious rituals and were very creative. A Neanderthal toddler was unearthed in Syria with a flint tool resting at about the spot where the infant's heart had once beaten. Tools and jewelry, such as pierced animal teeth and ivory rings were discovered with a Neanderthal fossil in a French cave in 1996. Wooden spears and well designed and crafted stone tools and stone spearheads have also been found. These finds and many others contradict the Darwinian bias that Neanderthals were a less developed 'missing link'.

It has been concluded that Neanderthals lived with other variations of modern humans in the Middle East and hybrids of Neanderthals and other humans are known from a number of areas around the world. The only honest conclusion is that Neanderthal Man was 100% human.

8] Anthropologists proved in 1987 that "Lucy" was just an ape. Yet today, Lucy is still claimed as a "missing link" in textbooks around the world.

'Lucy' is the name given to the much promoted fossilized skeleton that was discovered during 1974 in Ethiopia. Anthropologist Donald Johanson was the discoverer. Lucy has served as the poster child for Darwinism ever since.

It was claimed that Lucy walked upright, like a human walks upright, and that they knew it was a missing link because the knee was “slightly bigger” than a normal ape’s knee (proving that it was evolving into a human) and that its femur had to angle to the knee, just as a human femur angles to the knee.

However, what do the actual facts reveal? Well, according to another one of the world’s best known anthropologists, Richard Leakey, son of Luis Leakey, Lucy’s skull was so incomplete that most of it is ‘imagination made of plaster of paris’. (The Weekend Australian, May 7-8, 1983, Magazine section, page 3). During 1983, Leakey stated that no firm conclusion could be drawn about as to species Lucy belonged to.

Scientifically speaking, Lucy is a member of a family of apes known as australopithecines, specifically *Australopithecus Afarensis*. Pithecus means ‘ape’ and as far back as 1987 scientists knew that Lucy was just an ape and not a missing link between ape and man. During 1987, Dr Charles Oxnard, Professor of Anatomy and Human Biology at the University of Western Australia felt that although australopithecines were unique, he wrote that: Anatomists have concluded these creatures are not a link between ape and man, and did not walk upright in the human manner. (Fossils, Teeth and Sex — New Perspectives on Human Evolution, Charles Oxnard, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London, 1987, page 227.)

Other skeleton finds of *Australopithecus Afarensis* have shown that they had curved toes and fingers for gripping tree limbs.

The facts prove that none of the australopithecines are a transitional link between apes and humans. Lucy and the other australopithecines reveal nothing about supposed human evolution yet still today, Lucy adorns high school and college textbooks, usually reconstructed to have walked upright, just like a human. While failing to hold any proof for Darwinian change, Lucy does reveal the desperation of the Darwinian faithful and how easily it is to be fooled by misleading textbook information.

10] Radiometric dating methods rely on many wild guesses which corrupt the reliability of the radioisotope dating techniques.

The radioisotope dating methods are not a measure of time; they are a method of accounting for the amount of radio active decay that has occurred within a certain type of radio active element. As an example, let us discuss Potassium-Argon dating. It is a scientific fact that Potassium 40 decays into Argon 40. It is also a scientific fact that a scientist that has been trained to work with the radiometric dating techniques can grind up a rock and very accurately measure the amount of potassium 40, and the amount of argon 40, that was contained in the rock sample that they are working with. These are plain and simple scientific facts that can be tested, observed, studied and repeated. It is also a plain and simple

fact that this is where the science comes to an end with regard to the radiometric dating methods..

At this point in time, to derive the age of the rock based on the radioisotope dating methods, several wild guesses, which are referred to as 'assumptions,' must be made. It is these assumptions that completely corrupt the integrity of the radiometric dating methods.

For example number one: a scientist employing the radiometric dating methods in order to ascertain the age of a rock must assume that the rate of decay from Potassium 40 to Argon 40 has always remained the same. Since no one was there to test, study or observe that the rate of decay has always been the same this single wild guess, if incorrect, will cause the supposed age obtained by this particular dating method to be off by millions or billions of years.

For example number two: a scientist using the radiometric dating methods in order to derive the age of a rock must assume that there was not any Argon 40 in the rock when it the rock first formed. Since no one was there to test, study or observe that there was not any Argon 40 in the rock when the rock first formed this single wild guess, if incorrect, will cause the supposed age obtained by this particular dating method to be off by millions or billions of years.

For example number three: a scientist using the radiometric dating methods in order to get an age to assign to a rock must assume that the rock was never contaminated with either Potassium 40 or with Argon 40. In other words, everyone is supposed to believe that this rock laid there for millions or billions of years and was never contaminated by the elements being measured. We are to blindly trust that the rock never lost or gained either of the elements being measured. Since Argon 40 is a gas that can easily pass from one rock to the next this is an incredulous assumption, especially since it is well documented that heat, pressure, earthquakes and moisture can all cause contamination to occur. Since no one was there to test, study or observe that the rock was never contaminated with either Potassium 40 or with Argon 40 this single wild guess, if incorrect, will cause the supposed age obtained by this particular dating method to be off by millions or billions of years.

These three wild guesses alone reveal the corruption involved in the radioisotope dating techniques. These methods are completely unreliable when used to obtain the age of any particular rock.

11] Carbon Dating relies on several wild guesses which corrupt the reliability of the dates that it obtains. Yet while specific dates are not likely to be valid, Carbon Dating does greatly support that the earth's strata layers can only be a few thousand years old and were laid down during a global flood.

In Carbon Dating the amount of Carbon-14 in organic remains is measured. Carbon-14 is produced in the earth's atmosphere and during the process of photosynthesis; plants take in CO₂, which contains trace amounts of Carbon-14. When an animal breathes in air, or eats a plant, they also take in trace amounts of Carbon-14. Once the plant or animal dies it stops ingesting additional amounts of Carbon-14. Since Carbon-14 decays away over time, the less Carbon-14 found in an item the older will be the age assigned to that particular item.

At this point in time, to derive the age of an item based on Carbon Dating, several wild guesses, which are referred to as 'assumptions,' must be made. It is these assumptions that completely corrupt the integrity of the Carbon Dating method.

For one example, a scientist employing the Carbon Dating method in order to ascertain the age of an organic remain must assume that the rate of Carbon-14 decay has always remained the same. Since no one was there to test, study or observe that the rate of decay has always been the same this single wild guess, if incorrect, will cause the supposed age obtained by this particular dating method to be completely in error.

Furthermore, scientists seem to agree that measurable Carbon-14 should decay away in less than 100,000 years. Therefore, Carbon Dating can not age an item older than 100,000 years since there would be no Carbon-14 left to measure if the item is actually that old, or older. This is of particular interest because secular teachings claim that the Cambrian layer, the lowest stratified rock layer with appreciable amounts of fossils in it, is supposed to be up to 580,000,000 years old, which is (5,800) 100 thousand years periods. Yet scientific studies have revealed that all fossil bearing layers, down to the supposedly 580 million year old Cambrian strata layer, still contain Carbon-14. This by itself proves that the earth's strata, from which all old earth beliefs have been derived, can only be a few thousand years old.

Of even more interest is that the range of amounts of Carbon-14 found in all the fossil bearing strata is in the same range from the top layers all the way down to the bottom layers. Since Carbon-14 decays away over time, this proves that all the earth's stratified layers were formed during a single event and only a global flood can viable account for this.

12] Carbon Dating relies on several wild guesses which corrupt the reliability of the dates that it obtains. Although specific dates are not likely to be reliable, Carbon Dating does greatly support that the earth was judged by a global flood in the recent past.

For one example, by comparing the ratio of Carbon-14 to Carbon-12 in the item to that which presently exists in the earth's atmosphere, a scientist using the

Carbon Dating method must assume that the ration of Carbon-14 to Carbon-12 in the atmosphere is in equilibrium. That is, they must assume that the amount of Carbon-14 decaying away equals the amount being manufactured in the atmosphere. This single wild guess, if incorrect, will completely corrupt the age obtained through the Carbon Dating technique and several scientific studies have documented that the amount of Carbon-14 in the earth's atmosphere varies in extreme measures.

Furthermore, scientists generally agree that measurable amounts of Carbon-14 should decay away in less than 100,000 years. Therefore, since there would be no Carbon-14 left to measure if the item had been dead for more than 100,000 years, Carbon Dating can not age an item older than 100,000 years old, or older. This is of particular interest because secular teachings claim that the Carboniferous layer formed about 250,000,000 years ago, which is (2,500) 100 thousand years periods of time. Therefore, Carbon-14 should never be found in this layer, unless the layer is less than 100,000 years old. This is of particular interest because scientific studies on coal recovered from the Carboniferous layer reveal that all the coal still contain amounts of Carbon-14! By itself, this is strong proof that the earth's strata layers, from which all old earth beliefs have been derived can only be a few thousand years old and the only viable explanation as to how the earth's strata layers all formed recently is that the world we live on endured a global flood sometime within the last few thousand years.

13] The Carbon Dating of diamonds from around the world provides strong proof that the earth is only a few thousand years old. Although Carbon Dating relies on several wild guesses which corrupt the integrity of the dates that the dating method obtains, Carbon Dating lends tremendous support that the earth can not be millions, much less billions, of years old.

In Carbon Dating the amount of Carbon-14 remaining within organic remains is measured. Carbon-14 is produced up in the earth's atmosphere. During the process of photosynthesis; plants take in CO₂, which contains trace amounts of Carbon-14. The plants tissue thus contains trace amounts of Carbon-14. When an animal breathes in air, eats a plant, or eats an animal which ate a plant, that animal also takes in trace amounts of Carbon-14 which becomes a part of their tissue. Once a plant or animal dies it stops taking in additional amounts of Carbon-14 and because Carbon-14 decays away over time, the less Carbon-14 found in an organic remain the older will be the age assigned to that particular remain. At this point in time, to derive the age of an item based on Carbon Dating, several wild guesses, which are referred to as 'assumptions,' must be made. It is these assumptions that completely corrupt the integrity of the Carbon Dating method.

For one example, scientists that actually employ the Carbon Dating method in order to ascertain the age of a particular organic remain must assume that the

rate of Carbon-14 decay has always remained the same. Since no one was there to test, study or observe that the rate of decay has always been the same this single wild guess, if incorrect, will cause the supposed age obtained by this particular dating method to be completely in error.

Still, most of these researchers appear to agree that measurable Carbon-14 should decay away in less than 100,000 years. Please realize that this is an assumption, a wild guess, because there was no one around to test, study and observe the decay rate of Carbon-14 has always been the same. This said, therefore, Carbon Dating can not age an item older than 100,000 years since there would be no Carbon-14 left to measure if the item is actually that old, or older. This is of particular interest because secular teachings claim that most diamonds are a billion or more years old, which is at least (10,000) 100 thousand year periods of time. If diamonds, and the earth, are indeed billions of years old, diamonds should never contain Carbon-14.

Again, Carbon-14 Dating is proving to be unfriendly to the old earth claims which are a prerequisite for Darwinism, and the secular worldview which is based upon Darwinian style evolution being true. This is because recent studies, from diamonds obtained from around the world, reveal that the sparklers still contain amounts of Carbon-14. This proves that the diamonds can only be a few thousand years old, not millions, much less billions, of years in age.

14] The 1980 eruption of Mount Saint Helens, in the state of Washington, and several associated events that followed, revealed for the world to see several methods of strata formation. In certain areas several hundred feet of finely stratified strata layers were laid down in a matter of minutes, proving that these layers form can quickly as opposed to slowly over never observed "millions of years" of time.

To begin the layering, air fall depositions formed finely stratified layers in a matter of minutes following the May 18, 1980 eruption of Mt St Helens. These continued to form for several days following the blast as debris continued to settle and come down from the atmosphere. A twenty-five foot thick layer of finely stratified accumulations were produced within a matter of hours at Mt St Helens on June 12, 1980 by flows that rushed from the crater of the volcano at velocities of hurricane wind intensities. This twenty-five foot thick layer was laid down on top of the air fall deposits and is exposed where massive water and mud flows later carved a canyon through the strata layers. This huge water and mud flow, which occurred on March 19, 1982, laid down yet another finely stratified layer on top of the other layers, all of which formed rapidly, not over never-seen "millions of years" of time. In total, Mt St Helens exhibited three different methods that cause the sudden formation of finely stratified layers. These were: volcanic air fall deposits; pyroclastic flow accumulations; and layers which were laid down by water-borne sediment flows.

The fact is that scientific testing proves, as was scientifically observed at Mt St Helens, that whenever mixtures of various sized grains are shifted or moved cataclysmically, whether by volcanic activity or massive water flow, they rapidly segregate by grain size and/or density. In fact, when a mixture of various sized grains are poured in a pile, the larger grains tend to be found at the base of the pile, while the smaller grains generally end up on the top of the formation.

It is the same process that most kids know to use in order to get more raisins in their raisin bran. By shaking the box for five seconds before pouring out your cereal they literally “stratify out” the cereal as the raisins move to the top, a fact that is scientifically tested and repeated in homes around the world for the past several generations.

15] The word “Evolution” has many meanings, but only one is testable, repeatable and observable. In other words, only one of the many definitions of the word ‘evolution’ is a scientific fact. This observable type of evolution is not Darwinian or Neo-Darwinian evolution.

Darwinian or Neo-Darwinian style evolution would be one kind of plant or animal changing into a different kind of plant or animal. This has never been observed to have occurred within living plants or animals. Never.

The fossil record, despite a handful of dubious claims to the contrary, does not support any form of Darwinian evolution either. Darwinian style change would require that nature be able to add massive amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to already existing gene pools. This would be the addition of the types and amounts of new and beneficial genetic data that would cause one kind of being, let us say a dog, to ‘evolve’ into a completely different type of creature, let us say a pig.

The addition of the required new and beneficial genetic data has proven to be yet another major problem for Darwinian style change. If Darwinism had actually taken place scientists should have no trouble showing a million easily identifiable examples of nature adding new and beneficial genetic information to pre-existing gene pools. However, as of this writing, and after literally millions of observed scientific experiments, Darwinists can show no viable example, not even one, of nature adding appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to a plant or animals gene pool. Not even one!

The one meaning for the word ‘evolution’ which is testable, repeatable and observable is Micro-evolution. Since the word evolution is generally thought to mean Darwinian style change, it is best to remove the confusing term and refer to these observable changes as Micro-Adaptations. These are simply changes within the same kind of plant or animal. For example, a brown dog giving birth to a yellow puppy. Micro is a dog birthing a dog or a finch hatching a finch.

Although there can be a wide variation within a particular kind, kinds, like dogs, will only bring forth after their kind. That is, finches will only beget finches.

This is what Darwin observed on the Galapagos Islands, finches bringing forth finches. Micro-Adaptations which are kinds bringing forth after their own kind. This is an observable scientific fact and millions of examples could be shown. It is important for people to understand this because ten times in the book of Genesis we are told that plants and/or animals will bring forth after their kind and this is exactly what real science proves to be true. Everyone needs to clearly understand this so they can choose what to believe.

16] Darwinism can be scientifically refuted in as little as 6.4 seconds with the use of three scientific facts!

Fact number one: The Code Barrier, best referred to as the DNA Code Barrier, is a scientific principle that one kind of plant or animal only has the genetic information in its gene pool to produce its own kind. Take a cow as a simple example. While there may exist the genetic data to produce a wide variety of adaptations within the cow's particular DNA, the simple fact is that cows only possess the genetic ability to produce cattle. Plants and animals can only bring forth after their kind, just as we are told ten times in the book of Genesis. This fact is known as the DNA Code Barrier and is a major problem for Darwinian style evolution. The Darwinist must have a way for cows to produce non-cows and this would only be feasible if there was a method for nature to add massive amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to an existing gene pool. However, as of this writing, real science knows of no way for nature to add appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic data to one kind of a plant or animal's DNA. The DNA Code Barrier, a roadblock for Darwinism.

Fact number two: Gene Depletion is the scientific principle that all adaptations and/or mutations are the result of the sorting or the loss of the parents genetic information. In other words, adaptational variations, as well as mutational changes, are caused by the recombination or loss of the beginning genetic data which was inherited from the parents, not by the gain of new and beneficial genetic data as Neo-Darwinism falsely teaches. This is how ranchers breed cattle to best match their end use goals. Breeders can get meatier cattle or better milk producers, etc. by breeding out traits that they do not wish their cows to have. This is done through the loss of genetic information, not by the gain of new data in the cow's DNA. This is why the loss of genetic data is referred to as the scientific principle of Gene Depletion. Gene Depletion is yet another major roadblock for Darwinism.

Fact number three: Natural Selection is the scientifically observed process whereby in free competition for resources the weaker of a species tends to be eliminated, unable to compete with the stronger of its kind.

So let's put these three scientific principles together to reveal why no one has ever been able to discover any viable evidence of Darwinism having taken place. Start your timer: the DNA Code Barrier plus Gene Depletion plus Natural Selection makes Darwinian style change scientifically impossible. Stop your timer. I get 6.4 seconds. That is how long it takes to scientifically refute Darwinism, the foundation for secular humanism.

17] Human DNA molecules contain enough hereditary data to fill a 500,000 page thick book. This data is translated by enzymes, all of which are encoded to protect against mutational defects. Both the genetic data and the enzymes that decode the information had to be there from the very start. Gradual evolution makes no sense at all.

Still, Darwinists teach that mankind evolved over long periods of time from some sort of an unknown apelike ancestor, often claiming that Human DNA is 98% the same as the DNA found in a chimpanzee. Let's look at the truth and this claim as well as to the viability of this statement.

As far as to the integrity of this claim, it was based on only about 1% of the total genome. The 1% that was compared was the part controlling body design. Since people and apes have two arms and two legs, the fact that this portion of their DNA strands is rather similar was to be expected. To promote the claim that this proves we are 98% the same in our overall DNA as a chimpanzee is plainly dishonest and highly misleading.

So what about the viability of the claim that people evolved from apes? Nature magazine has reported that, as real science gets into the genome, the wider the gap in genetic similarities becomes between man and ape. In fact scientific studies reveal that there is at least a 7.7% difference between ape DNA and human DNA. How big a difference is that? Well, consider that you contain about three billion pieces of genetic information in every single one of your cells that contain DNA throughout your entire body (do you really think that this kind of complex data formed without any intelligence behind it?). Just a 7.7% difference between a human's genetic data and the gene pool found in a chimpanzee would require 231,000,000 beneficial and new genetic information adding mutations to take place in order to change a chimp into a human.

Keep two facts in mind. First, science knows of no way for nature to add appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to an existing gene pool. Second, so many mutations are fatal that there is no mathematical possibility of stringing together 231 million in a row with exterminating the potential evolving individual.

So why don't Darwinists stop promoting misleading information and just bring out the real evidence that we evolved from a single celled creature? Because there is not any real evidence to show.

18] Amino acids are the building blocks for proteins and must be in an exact order for a protein to operate. The scientific facts are that virtually all living things require all left-handed amino acids with all right-handed nucleotide sugars. However, in a natural setting, the mix would be 50% right-handed and 50% left-handed amino acids and sugars. The probability of these coming together naturally is mathematically impossible.

For instance, proteins are the primary components of cells and proteins are usually made from at least 22 different types of all left-handed amino acids. Just like letters of the alphabet that are used to make up a sentence, the proteins must also be in a specific order to have any meaning. The letters, To be or not to be, that is the question, convey meaning. However, the same letters randomly arranged, bTo oi oeh eo cv seno e utrn t,ta qsn, have no meaning at all. The odds of coming up with this line from Shakespeare, using randomly dropped scrabble letters 1 in 2,810 trillion octillion! That is 2,810 with 39 zeros following it which is another mathematical impossibility.

The same goes for amino acids even being able to form proteins on their own in nature. Even the smallest known protein is made up of hundreds of left-handed amino acids. Mathematicians have calculated the odds of just one protein developing on its own in nature to be 10 to the 119th power, that's 10 to the 119th power 22 times to arrive at one "simple" bacteria! Double every molecule in the universe to arrive at that number! Being generous, it has been estimated that to form the 'simplest' protein from primordial oceans, even if we started with the 20 left-handed amino acids and were given 15 billions years to do so, would be 10 to the 60th power. What kind of a number would that be? Well, that number would account for every molecule in the entire universe! And these are the odds of forming one protein when we start with all left handed amino acids! The 'simplest' cell requires 600 specific proteins!

The probability of proteins coming together naturally is mathematically impossible.

19] The complete lack of transitional fossils refutes Darwinian evolution. Had everything evolved from bacteria, the fossil record should contain millions of "missing links". But the links are missing, refuting Darwinism all by itself.

Darwin stated on page 211 of his first book, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*, that "If my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties... must assuredly have existed."

Certainly agree with Darwin's statement. If everything in the world had evolved from that supposed first living cell, then the fossil evidence would be overwhelming. There should be nothing to debate. However, the fossil record

has been a total embarrassment for secular beliefs which are founded on Darwinian style change being true and removing God from the equation.

Back in the 1930's Richard Goldschmidt had the same problem that Darwinians have today. He had no evidence that Darwinian change had ever occurred. Goldschmidt developed the "Hopeful Monster" theory to try and cover the gaping holes in the fossil record where all things are found as completed kinds, not intermediate or transitional types of plants or animals as Darwin expected would be found, if his theory were correct.

The Hopeful Monster theory basically claimed that there was no evidence of Darwinian change in the fossil record because Darwinian change occurred virtually instantaneously. Goldschmidt even suggested that perhaps reptiles laid eggs and birds popped out, leaving no evidence behind!

Well, fifty years later there was still no evidence of Darwinism having occurred so Niles Eldridge and Stephen Gould changed the Hopeful Monster theory just slightly but gave it a much more scientific sounding name. Now the theory which explains why there is no evidence in the fossil record of Darwinian change is referred to as Punctuated Equilibrium. Although this sounds rather daunting, what it basically means is that there is no evidence of Darwinian change in the fossil record because Darwinian style evolution occurred in such short bursts of time that no evidence was captured in the fossil record!

Prior to trying to comply with Darwinism, science had been knowledge derived from the study of the evidence. Darwinism is not science; it is a religious belief which has greatly undermined both scientific research as well as scientific education. The fossil evidence is missing because Darwinism never took place.

20] Neo-Darwinism is taught as if it were a fact in textbooks around the world. However, Neo-Darwinian change is based upon three refutable assumptions. These are that Mutations create new and beneficial genetic data; that Natural Selection causes the mutant to take over the existing population of that particular kind; and that Long ages of time, "millions of years" of time, allow the mutational changes to add up to Darwinian style change.

First is the problem with the assumption that mutations create appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic information which improves the mutant, causing it to take over the population's gene pool. After millions of scientific experiments, almost all having the goal of supporting this first Neo-Darwinian claim, real science knows of no way for nature to be able to add appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to an existing gene pool. In fact, all observed mutations are caused by the mix-up or loss of the parents beginning genetic data and is exactly the opposite of what Neo-Darwinists claim.

Next is the issue with Natural Selection, an observable scientific fact, causing the genetically weakened mutant to take over the gene pool. While it is true that in very rare instances a mutational loss can result in a short term benefit, the fact remains that mutations are caused by the sorting or loss of genetic data and are removed from the population by Natural Selection. They do not take over the gene pool because of Natural Selection.

Thirdly, millions of years of time is a belief, not a scientific fact and more and more evidence is piling up against old-earth beliefs.

Although Neo-Darwinism is taught as if it were science today, in total, Neo-Darwinism is based on demonstrable failures and should have been removed from school textbooks years ago.

21] Adaptations that occur within any particular kind of plant or animal are not examples that support Darwinian, or Neo-Darwinian evolution.

Micro-evolution, best referred to as adaptations, are both a Biblical and a scientific fact. These are simply variations within the same kind of plant or animal, like a brown dog producing a yellow dog. These changes are caused by the sorting or loss of the parents genetic data so they are the opposite of Darwinian-style change. Also, micro changes have limits as to how much variation they can obtain. While one kind of dog may adapt to 120 degree temperatures, another may adapt to live at negative 20. They have done so by losing genetic data, not by the addition of data as Darwinism requires. If their locations were switched, they would both die. They would be unable to adapt because they have lost the genetic information to do so.

Because Darwinists have scant, if any facts to support their claim that everything evolved from a single cell creature, they often times resort to showing examples of adaptations which occur within the same kinds of plants or animals. These micro changes are simply kinds bringing forth after their own kind and are both Biblically and scientifically accurate. However, to use them to support Darwinian style changes, which are not scientifically observed, is simply dishonest. Showing Biblically and scientifically correct adaptations, such as brown butterflies producing yellow butterflies, then switching the discussion to Darwinian evolution, one kind bring forth a different kind, is the old "bait and switch" con game.

The fact is that adaptations that take place within any particular kind of plant or animal are not examples that support Darwinian style change.

22] Darwinists claim that mutations in Homeo Box genes lead to the evolution of new kinds of plants or animals. However the observable facts reveal this as an erroneous conclusion.

Homeo Box genes are known as Hox genes for easy reference. Hox genes are control genes. Just as a traffic cop directs the flow of automobiles to where they need to go, Hox genes direct genetic information to where that particular data is required for the development of a specific portion of a given organism. Take a frog as an easy to imagine example. The frog has four legs and in the frog's gene pool is found the genetic information to form its left front leg, its right front leg, its left rear leg and the frog's right rear appendage. This genetic blueprint is extremely detailed and will produce the appropriate limb which will allow the frog to live its life productively, for a frog. However, how does this coded hereditary information know where to go to form the leg? This is where the Homeo Box gene comes into play.

The Hox gene is the traffic cop for the various genetic information in a given plant or animal. The Hox gene directs the genetic data to form, let's select the frog's left rear leg, to the proper place to form that left rear leg. Without the Hox gene the information to form the left rear leg would not know where to properly form the limb.

A mutation in the Homeo Box gene can cause all sorts of problems and lead to monstrosities which are most often fatal. If not immediately fatal, most Hox gene mutations lead to plants or animals which are the weakest of their specific kind in nature and to their early removal via Natural Selection. Natural Selection is the scientifically observable process by which weaker kinds are removed by the competition for resources in a natural environment.

A Hox gene mutation in the frog we are employing for this example can result in the frog's genetic information to form its left rear leg placing that information in the wrong location. If you have ever seen a picture of a fruit fly, often used in mutation experiments in laboratories, with one of its legs protruding from its forehead, this was most likely the result of a mutation in one of its Homeo Boxes. A similar mutation in our frog's Hox genes may result in the frog's left rear leg coming out from the middle of the poor amphibian's back and there is nothing beneficial about this kind of a mutation.

The leg which has developed in the wrong location will not be functional as it will not have the skeletal muscles or nerve connections necessary to be useful. The improperly placed leg will hang off of the poor frog's back useless, yet burning up the frog's energy and resources to maintain it. This will make the frog the weakest of the frog's and in a natural setting, our frog will be the one most likely removed by Natural Selection.

23] Genetic Duplication errors do occur. However, these copying errors do not produce new genetic information.

Darwinists claim that genetic duplication errors within the genetic information of a particular plant or animal leads to the formation of new and beneficial genetic

data. The contention of the Darwinist is that the duplicated genetic data then leads to the evolution of new and improved kinds of plants and animals.

Gene Duplication is a scientific fact. Although rare, genetic copying errors are scientifically testable and observable. These are random in nature and do not create any new and beneficial genetic information, a requirement for Darwinian style evolutionary change. These copying errors simply duplicate the already existing genetic data which was inherited from the parents of the offspring which has suffered the copying mistake.

As a simple example, take the manufacturing of a book. If, during the production process, a printing press malfunctioned and made two copies of chapter three, would that add any new information to the book? The answer is no, it would not add any new knowledge or information. Duplication errors just make additional copies of the information that was already present; they do not add any new or beneficial information to the book. Nor do these types of mistakes enhance the reading experience for the reader.

Fruit flies are subjected to all sorts of radiation and abuses in order to cause mutations and genetic errors. If you have ever seen a picture of a fruit fly that has four wings, then you have likely seen a fruit fly that suffered a genetic duplication mistake. Although it may have four wings, the second set is useless as it won't duplicate everything that is required to allow the wings to be of use. For example, it won't have all of the skeletal, nerve and other needed pieces that, working together, permit the fly to fly. Because of the genetic error, the fly can't fly...it can only stumble along. In a natural setting, the poor four-winged fruit fly would be the one most likely removed by Natural Selection.

Gene Duplication do not create any new and beneficial genetic information, a requirement for Darwinian style evolutionary change.

24] Darwinists claim that the "open-system argument" overcomes one of the most accepted of all scientific principles, the Law of Entropy.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics is the Law of Entropy. This never refuted law of observable science holds that all things in a natural setting lose usable energy and become disorganized over time. This scientific fact is a huge problem for Darwinists who teach that things evolve better and better over time, in direct conflict to this scientific principle. So how do Darwinists get around the Second Law of Thermodynamics, the Law of Entropy?

Well, to avoid this particular scientific roadblock to their belief that all life forms evolved from that first cell that spontaneously generated (overcoming the scientific Law of Biogenesis), Darwinians employ the "open-system argument." Basically stated, this is the claim that an open system gets massive amounts of new energy added to the system so the Law of Entropy does not hold true in

such a set up. They apply the “open-system” argument to our solar system which receives tremendous amounts of raw energy from our sun. Darwinists then claim that this addition of energy allows their belief to violate the Second Law.

However, there are many problems with this argument and the fact is that the open-system argument does not help Darwinism. For example, if the Law of Entropy does not apply to our solar system, then how did we discover it? Also, the much observed fact is that raw energy tends to speed up both entropy and destruction. Take as a simple example a lawn chair. Let's say we bought a new lawn chair which came with a nice thick padded set. After sitting on your patio for two years, the sunlight will have fairly well destroyed the seat cushion. The sunlight most certainly will not improve the cushion. Hoping that undirected raw energy can lead to better organization is like pouring gas on top of that lawn chair and lighting it on fire in the hope that the raw energy will improve its usefulness.

Dr. John Ross of Harvard stated: “..the second law applies equally to open systems...the notion is that the law...fails for such systems. It is important to make sure that this error does not perpetuate itself.” (J Ross, Chemical and Engineering News, July 27, 1980, page 40).

The important issue is: the information in the system, not the energy available. It is the fact that raw, undirected energy, like sunlight, is incapable of producing the specified complex information found in living cells.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics, the Law of Entropy, is one of the most accepted laws in real science and is another major problem for Darwinism. The “open-system” argument does not overcome this principle of real science.

25] Darwinists claim that insects, such as cockroaches, becoming resistant to poison is evidence that they are evolving better and better in Darwinian fashion. In fact, the Teachers Guidebook which was put out by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) back in 1998, claimed in a section titled, “Teaching About Evolution” on pages 16-17, that continual evolution produces insects that are resistant to poisons. However, observable scientific tests reveal that this has nothing to do with the Darwinian-style evolution of new kinds of insects with new and beneficial genetic information having been created and added to their parents pre-existing gene pools. Real science reveals that this ability to survive in different conditions was already in their parents DNA.

Let us say that we had 1,000 cockroaches on the floor in front of us and we sprayed them with an insecticide. Suppose for the sake of this easy to understand example, that the poison killed 998 of the 1,000 insects, but two survived. Did these two instantaneously evolve and immune system to ward off the quickly falling insecticide? Of course not! The two surviving cockroaches likely already had the gene in their genetic information which allowed them to survive that particular poison. The other 998 bugs did not have this particular genetic

trait activated and were killed by the results of the bug spray. When the two survivors have offspring, the next generation of cockroaches will largely inherit this immune gene and the new population will be resistant to that particular insecticide. They Darwinian evolved nothing! No new, much less beneficial, information was added to their genetic content.

The fact is that various kinds of plants and animals have a wide variety of genetic variability in their DNA is what allows them to adapt and live in various climates and conditions around the world. Since real science knows of no way for nature to add appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic data to anything's DNA., this is strong proof in favor of there being an Intelligent Biblical Designer behind the creation of the earth's many life forms as

26] Darwinists claim that bacteria becoming resistant to anti-biotics, such as penicillin, are evidence that they are evolving better and better in Darwinian fashion. In fact, the Teachers Guidebook which was put out by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) back in 1998, claimed in a section titled, "Teaching About Evolution" on pages 16-17, that continual evolution produces bacteria that are resistant to antibiotics. However, observable scientific facts reveal that this has nothing to do with the Darwinian-style evolution of new kinds of organisms with new and beneficial genetic information having been created and added to their parents pre-existing gene pools.

It is a scientific fact that bacteria can become resistant to antibiotics via a mutation that causes an anti-penicillin enzyme to mass produce. It is also a fact that Darwinists claim that the mutation that causes bacteria to be immune to penicillin is proof for their evolutionary belief. However, observable scientific tests reveal that this has nothing to do with the Darwinian-style evolution of new kinds of organisms with new and beneficial genetic information having been created and added to their parents pre-existing gene pools. Real science reveals that this mutation, like all observed mutations, is caused by the sorting or loss of the parent bacteria's pre-existing DNA, not by the creation of new and beneficial genetic information.

Although this genetic loss has nothing to do with Darwinian change, does it actually convey a benefit to the bacteria? Well, if that mutated bacteria were in a person, and if that person were in a hospital, and if that hospital staff were administering penicillin to that person, then in that one situation, the mutation would provide that bacteria with a benefit. However, everywhere else in the world, that poor little bacteria would be using up much of its energy and resources manufacturing the un-needed anti-penicillin enzyme. This would make it the weakest bacteria around and lead to its removal via Natural Selection.

Bacteria becoming resistant to a particular anti-biotic have nothing to do with the Darwinian-style evolution of new kinds of organisms with new and beneficial genetic information having been created and added to their parents pre-existing

gene pools. These weakened bacteria have nothing to do with Darwinian change.

27] Darwinists show drawings of a human in the embryonic stage and claim that humans have gill slits, or gill pouches, from our past evolutionary stages. However these are not gill slits or gill pouches. These are simply folds in the skin which develop into the organs in our throat and neck area.

This is a take off of Ernst Haeckel fraudulent work from the 1860's. Haeckel had read Darwin's book, "Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life" shortly after the book was published. Haeckel had the same problem that Darwinists are confronted with today, he could not find any real evidence to support the Darwinian belief, so Haeckel became one of the Darwinian pioneers for inventing evidences that never actually existed with the exception of in their fraudulent examples.

Please make a note that Darwinists are experts on making drawings of things that never existed in order to support their theory that never took place. Keep this old saying in mind whenever you encounter the supposed Darwinian "proofs". They are almost always drawings of how they think the evidence would appear if any evidence were ever found. Thumb through your local high school's biology book and you will find this to be the overwhelming case.

Haeckel came up with the "Biogenetic Law", also know as the "Theory of Recapitulation", that "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny". Simply stated, this is the teaching that you go through your past evolutionary stages while in your mother's womb. What he did was to take a human in the embryonic stage and draw copies of the human with slight changes in the drawings. Haeckel then labeled his drawings as human, salamander, fish, and other various critters all looking almost identical. Then he announced his finding as proof for Darwinian evolution.

Embryologist Dr. Michael Richardson stated: "What he (Haeckel) did was to take a human embryo and copy it...these are fakes." [The Times (London) August 11, 1997; page 14].

He was proven to be a fraud in the 1870's yet variations of his 100% false "theory" are still taught in colleges around the world today. The simple fact is that fraud in the nineteenth century is still fraud in the twentieth century.

28] Darwinists claim that viruses or bacteria becoming resistant to anti-biotics are proof that they are evolving better and better in Darwinian-style fashion. In fact, the Teachers Guidebook which was put out by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) back in 1998, claimed in a section titled, "Teaching About Evolution" on pages 16-17, that continual evolution produces bacteria that are resistant to antibiotics.

Darwinists claim that the AIDS virus or the Bird-Flu virus may evolve better and stronger until they become immune to current medical treatments, leading to a worldwide health pandemic. While it is true that one of these could suffer an alteration that could cause it to be uncontrolled by present treatments, observable scientific facts reveal that this has nothing to do with the Darwinian-style evolution of new kinds of organisms with new and beneficial genetic information having been created and added to their parents pre-existing gene pools.

It is a scientific fact that mutations do occur. It is also a scientific fact the mutations are caused by Gene Depletion. This is the observable principle that mutations are caused by the sorting or loss of the parents beginning genetic information, not by the gain of new and beneficial genetic data.

Both bacteria and viruses multiply rapidly, accumulating genetic losses due to mutations. Realize that these are simply micro-changes within the same kind of virus or bacteria, not the evolution of some new and distinct organism. However, anti-bacterial or anti-viral treatments are developed to recognize and attach to a particular protein on the pathogen. It does this by recognizing the protein by the proteins shape. If a mutation, or a micro-adaptational change, caused by the recombination or the loss of the starting genetic information alters the shape of that particular protein that the anti-biotic recognizes and attacks, it can make the vaccine useless! This micro-change can alter a small health risk into a worldwide pandemic.

Such changes in either bacteria or viruses have nothing to do with the Darwinian-style evolution of new kinds of organisms with new and beneficial genetic information having been created and added to their parents pre-existing gene pools.

29] People can breed roses to produce red, yellow or pink flowers. Some roses can be bred that do better in warmer or in colder climates. These are examples of scientifically correct micro-adaptations. Darwinists claim that these are also examples of Darwinian change in action. Real science undermines this false claim.

Through the addition of the breeder's intelligent input, people can obtain these various roses; however, these are caused by breeding out undesired genetic information, never by the breeding in of appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic data to the roses pre-existing gene pools. And these micro-changes can only go so far. Never will a rose produce a non-rose such a pumpkin or a pine tree for instance. Darwinian style change would require that nature be able to add massive amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to cause one kind of being, take a rosebush, to 'evolve' into a completely different type of organism, let us say a pumpkin.

If Darwinism had actually occurred scientists should have no trouble showing many easily identifiable examples of nature adding new and beneficial genetic information to pre-existing gene pools. However, as of this writing, and after literally millions of observed scientific tests, Darwinists can show no viable example of nature adding appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to a plant or animals gene pool.

The Code Barrier, best referred to as the DNA Code Barrier, is a scientific principle that one kind of plant or animal only has the genetic information in its gene pool to produce its own kind. Take a rose as an example. While there may exist the genetic data to produce a wide variety of adaptations within the rose's DNA, the simple fact is that roses only possess the genetic ability to produce roses. Plants can only bring forth after their kind, just as we are told in the book of Genesis. By breeding yellow roses with yellow roses, the genetic data to produce other colors is eventually lost, or red out, and then you have roses that will only produce that particular color. This was deliberately caused by intelligent input and the loss of genetic data, another scientific principle known as Gene Depletion. The DNA Code Barrier and Gene Depletion are two major roadblocks for Darwinism.

People using their God-given intelligence to produce various types of flowers, dogs, cattle, or other variations within a particular kind of living organism through the manipulation of genetic losses is the complete opposite of what Darwinism claims to have taken place by the addition of new and beneficial genetic data by random chance in nature.

30] Neo-Darwinists claim that Natural Selection, acting on the new and beneficial genetic gains which mutations created in plants and/or animals, led from a single celled creature to every life form that has ever existed on earth, either today or in the past.

However, real science, based on millions of observations, reveals that Natural Selection can only work on the already existing genetic traits found in the DNA of any particular organism and exhibited in the living specimen. Natural Selection can not create or add any genetic data to a plant or animal's gene pool. While Neo-Darwinists teach that mutations add new and beneficial genetic data to an existing gene pool, thus improving the organism, which is then propelled to the head of the pack after Natural Selection removes the weaker parent forms, actual science proves that the mutants are the genetically weaker variety and they are the ones most likely removed by Natural Selection, not the genetically stronger parent form of the creature. This is actually exactly opposite of what Darwinists and Neo-Darwinists claim.

Famed Swedish evolutionist, Professor Herbert Nilsson of Lund University said that, with regard to Neo-Darwinism, mutations "...are always...weaker (Gene

Depletion) ...and in...free competition (Nature) they are eliminated..." (by Natural Selection). Again this is exactly the opposite of what Neo-Darwinists claim.

Evolutionist Pierre-Paul Grasse stated in "Evolution of Living Organisms" (1977, page 88) that, "Mutations do not produce any kind of evolution."

It is a fact that secular Humanists own the textbooks, the public educational systems and scientific establishments. This is an observable fact. It is also demonstrable that they teach that mutations plus Natural Selection leads to Neo-Darwinian evolution. However, based on millions of observable and repeatable scientific experiments, another fact is that the DNA Code Barrier plus Gene Depletion plus Natural Selection combine to prevent Neo-Darwinian evolution from being possible. This is the opposite of what Neo-Darwinists claim.

31] Darwinists claim that bacteria can transfer genetic information from one bacterium to another and that this exchange of genetic data leads to the Darwinian-style evolution from one kind of plant or animal to completely different kinds of organisms.

It is a scientifically observed fact that genetic transfers can increase the amount of DNA in an existing organism. It is another scientific fact that genetic transfers have been observed to have taken place among certain types of bacterium. These bacteria can transfer small amounts of genetic information to other bacteria. These exchanges of DNA are known as plasmid transfers.

However, these transfers of small quantities of genetic data have nothing to do with the creation of new and beneficial genetic data as is required by Darwinism. Realize that plasmid transfers are just the transfer of already existing genetic information. The data must have already existed in one bacterium to be transferred to another bacterium. Plasmid transfers have nothing to do with the creation of new and beneficial genetic information, as required by Darwinian evolution.

The creation of complex genetic information is yet another hue roadblock for Darwinian-style change. As of this writing, real science knows of no viable example of nature adding new and beneficial genetic data to an existing gene pool. The simple fact is that if the millions of various kinds of species found alive on earth today had Darwinian evolved from some single-celled being, Darwinists should be able to easily present a million of examples of how nature can add appreciable amounts of new and beneficial DNA to create the changes. Yet they can not show a single viable example.

32] Darwinists claim that the ordered structure found in a tornado, or in hurricane, rock crystal or in a snowflake is proof that complexity and order can occur naturally and lead to Darwinian style evolution. However, the scientific facts

reveal that the order found in these non-living systems have nothing to do with the Darwinian evolution of complex living systems.

It is a scientifically observable fact that tornadoes, hurricanes, rock crystals and snowflakes are all naturally occurring. Let us take snowflakes and rock crystals for easy to envision examples. Both of these exhibit order but neither of these present us with complexity. Their order forms as a result of the orderly arrangement of their properties.

Life requires both order and complexity. Living cells form due to the specified complex genetic information which is found in their DNA. The DNA chromosome is the most complex molecule found in the universe. Mathematician and molecular biologist Howard Morowitz estimated that the odds of just one DNA forming itself in a natural setting would be: 1 in 10 to the 100 billionth power. Well what kind of odds are those? Let us consider that one in ten to the 50th power is mathematically considered to be absolutely zero. 1 in 10 to the 100 billionth power would be about equal to winning the Arizona state lottery every weekend, fifty-two weekends per year, for the next 27,000 years in a row. And that would be the odds of just one DNA arranging itself on its own. Darwinian evolution requires billions of DNA having formed on their own, not just one. Life could not have originated on its own and living things exhibit both order and complexity.

It is true that the order and tremendous power can be seen in a tornado or hurricane. These naturally occurring phenomena can be both lethal and breathe taking. Meanwhile, both snowflakes and rock crystals are beautiful to observe. However, unlike living cells, these naturally occurring phenomena do not ingest specific nutrients which they then turn into energy. Tornadoes, hurricanes, snowflakes, rock crystals and other naturally occurring things do not communicate with each other or form complex biological systems. They certainly can not reproduce themselves either. While they do indeed exhibit order, they do not complexity.

Under the guise: "Science always corrects itself." Secular Humanists continue using unfounded claims to promote their religious philosophy which is based upon the belief that "billions of years of death led to Darwinian-style evolution.

33] Darwinists claim the earth is billions of years old and that life evolved on its own over hundreds of millions of years of time. In fact, George Wald, who was a former Harvard professor and Nobel prize winner, as well as an avid Darwinist, stated that, "Time is in fact the hero of the plot...the impossible becomes possible ...time itself performs the miracles." Time is indeed the magic ingredient for Darwinism to seem possible. However, most of the means of putting an age to our planet provide a rather recent age, not the billions of years that Secular Humanists claim.

Since I have previously refuted the few methods that give the appearance of an old earth, let us take a look at some of the facts that point to a rather young earth (as compared to billions of years philosophies).

The earth's magnetic field has been observed to have weakened by 6% during the past 150 years. This is a scientifically observed fact. Employing the same methods that are used with regard to the radioisotope dating methods that is by extrapolating backwards at the same rate of decay that is observed today, we learn that the earth can not be more than 12,000 years old and that life could not have existed for any time more than a few thousand years. As recently as 12,000 years ago the earth's magnetic field would have had the strength exhibited by magnetic stars.

There are about 1,200 minerals in the earth. Each of these minerals is found in the seas and the amounts of each of these individual minerals are increasing annually. This occurs because they are added to the oceans of the earth by water runoff and leaching from land masses. Then, during the evaporation process of the planet's hydrologic cycle, the minerals are left in the seas while the moisture goes off to either rain or snow down on the land mass and eventually run back into the seas, carrying more of the minerals into the seas.

Researchers can measure both the amount of any particular mineral in the oceans waters and they can determine the current rate at which the mineral is accumulating in the seas. Again, using one the same assumptions employed by the radiometric dating techniques, which is that the presently observed rates are the same as the past rates, scientists can determine that all 1,200 minerals provide proof that the earth's oceans are much too young for the time requirements needed for Darwinian beliefs to be correct.

The old earth beliefs are based on about forty radiometric dating methods and the man-made Geologic Time Scale. Please realize that I have just provided about 1,201 ways to date the earth young. That is 1,201 to 41. And I could add many more to the young-earth side of the equation. Time itself did not perform any miracles for Darwinian beliefs.

34] Darwinists claim that similarities are proof for their belief. Let us take similar biochemistry as an example. Secular scientists claim that the biochemistry found in a human is 98 percent the same as that discovered in the DNA of a chimpanzee. They further publish that this is proof of our close evolutionary relationship with the apes.

What the Darwinists do not tell you is that this 98 percent finding is based on a comparison of only about 1 percent of the DNA found in humans and chimps. They also fail to note that the Darwinian biased researchers took the DNA that is responsible for forming the basic body structures. Well, since the basic body

structures of both humans and apes include a torso, a head, two arms and two legs, the fact that the genetic information found in this portion of the DNA is rather similar was of no surprise to anyone knowledgeable of how DNA operates. This finding is used as misleading propaganda yet provides no viable evidence that we evolved from either apes or from a common ancestor.

Today, honest scientific research has that 98 percent figure down to about 93 percent as science gets deeper and deeper into the genome. Expect this difference in human and ape "similarities" to continue to widen.

However, if similar biochemistry is proof of our supposed evolutionary relationship with other plants and animals, why are Darwinists not claiming that we evolved from mice? People share about 96% of the same biochemistry with that found in a mouse. Similarities do not support Darwinism. For that matter, humans share about 50% of the same biochemistry with that found in a banana. Still, I have not seen any textbooks proclaiming that people evolved from bananas.

Another scientific fact is that if we did not share similar biochemistry with other plants and animals, we would not be able to digest anything except other people. The same goes for each kind of animal. We have to have similar biochemistry and this is strong proof in favor of us having an Intelligent Biblical Designer.

The scientific fact is that similar biochemistry provides no evidence of any evolutionary relationships.

35] The scientific field of Biochemistry is finding that seemingly simple structures are actually made up of many parts. These structures are known to be "Irreducibly Complex". This means if any one part is missing, damaged or not complete and in the correct position from the very start, then the entire system would have failed to have functioned. This in turn means that gradual Darwinian evolution is a scientific impossibility.

Darwinists have been teaching for many years that life spontaneously generated itself from non-living chemicals. I have previously refuted this false knowledge and discussed the scientific Law of Biogenesis so I will not dwell on this here, however; once again real science goes against the false science of Darwinian teachings. Biochemists have found that bacteria cells are actually run by tiny molecular motors called Bacterial Flagellum. These microscopic motors are so small that a billion of them could fit on the head of a pin...with room to spare.

These Bacterial Flagellum are made up of about 40 different specific and complex proteins and these tiny molecular motors are irreducibly complex. In other words, if any one of the proteins were not entirely complete, operational and in the exact position required of them to form the Bacterial Flagellum, then the

entire cellular system would have failed and life would not have spontaneously generated from non-living chemicals.

To make matters even worse for those still clinging to some faint hope that Darwinism actually somehow occurred, the process of putting the specific proteins in the correct order to form the Bacterial Flagellum requires other molecular motors which are themselves irreducibly complex!

The only hope left at this point is to claim that the parts that form the Bacterial Flagellum evolved elsewhere and were later co-opted to form the flagellum. Darwinists have invoked this claim and while scientific research has discovered ten of the forty pieces elsewhere, further studies have proven that these parts were formed as the Bacterial Flagellum first, then co-opted elsewhere. As is always the case, real science refutes the Darwinian claims.

36] Darwinian biased researchers claim that similarities are proof for evolutionism. They claim that the forearm of a human, the flipper of a whale, or the foreleg of a horse, dog or cow all have two bones in them. Then secularists claim that this proves that these various creatures, along with humans, evolved over long periods of time from a common ancestor.

It is a scientific fact that humans do have two bones in our forearm. We have named these bones the ulna and the radius. It is also a demonstrable fact that the animals listed above do have two bones in their flipper or foreleg. This is where the science ends and the bias of the particular scientist who is interpreting the evidence comes into play.

We all have a religious belief. If you are an atheist then that is your religious belief. If you are a Christian then that is your religious belief. Everyone has a religious belief and that belief will bias how you see things. In other words, whatever your worldview is will determine how you interpret things.

Take the similar bone structures. If you believe in Darwinism, you will interpret the bones as having a similar structure due to having evolved from a common ancestor. Since this is the foundational belief for secular Humanism, and since secular Humanists own the textbooks, public school systems and the educational establishments, their religious based interpretations are taught as if they were scientific facts, which they are not. If you look at the same evidence through a Biblical worldview you will see the similar bone structure and assume that the basic structure is similar because they all came from the same Intelligent Biblical Designer.

The creation-evolution debate has never been about the evidence because everyone has the exact same evidence to test, study and observe. The key issue between the teaching of Darwinism or Creationism is a matter of which of

these worldviews is the correct one to use to interpret the evidences that we all share?

With regard to the similar bone structures I like to point out that I drive a Chevrolet pickup truck while my neighbor drives a Chevy van and their dashboards are identical...it is not because they evolved from a moped! It is because they had the same designer.

To teach the secular biased interpretation of the evidence only is simply Humanistic propaganda and indoctrination, not scientific education. Similar bone structures are not proof for Darwinism.

37] Darwinists have been expecting and predicting that the study of the human genome would reveal proof of our evolutionary past. Darwinists have been claiming that researchers would find repressed genes in the human gene pool from our past evolutionary stages.

I have already discussed the scientific principle of the Code Barrier, better called the DNA Code Barrier, and scientific research into the genome has confirmed this scientific principle. Real scientific research has revealed that humans only have human genes. Dogs only have dog genes. Horses only have horse genes, and on and on this goes. One kind of animal, or plant for that matter, only possesses the genetic information to produce its own kind of being.

Repressed genes have been found. Researchers have indeed proven that people do indeed have repressed genes in their gene pool. For instance you might have green eyes even though your DNA may contain the repressed genetic information to produce brown eyes. However, the repressed genetic data was for human eyes, not the DNA to form the eyes of some other kind of creature, like the eye of a horse. That type of genetic information is only found in the genome of a horse.

This is yet one more major problem for the theory of Darwinian evolution.

38] Dinosaurs have been used to fool billions of people into believing that Darwinian-style evolution took place over hundreds of millions of years of time and that dinosaurs are prime examples in support of Darwinian theory. Darwin believed that if his theory were true, numberless intermediate species, transitional links, had to have existed. Yet today, not a single such transitional kind is known that will stand up to honest scientific scrutiny. Not a single one from the fossil record (they claim several, however, these do not stand up to honest evaluation) and none are found from among the millions of living species alive on earth today. Not a single one. They are all missing and this is why they are called the "missing links."

Dinosaurs are a good example of the gaping hole encountered by Darwinists due to the transitional links not existing. Here is the problem that dinosaurs present to Darwin's theory with regard to evolutionary links.

Although most people think that all dinosaurs were giants, and several were, the actual size of the average dinosaur was the size of a large sheep. In fact, several were only about the size of a chicken. The issue that these fabulous creatures present for Darwinism is that they show no evidence in support of Darwin's theory. The huge beasts appear suddenly in the fossil record. There is no evidence that they evolved from anything. We are supposed to believe that Dinosaurs, such as an eighty-ton sauropod, evolved from something but left no traces of what they evolved from. It is certainly reasonable and fair to expect those espousing Darwinism as if it were science to actually provide some scientific proof in support of their claims. Yet dinosaurs, like everything else, fail to provide any evidence in support of Darwinian teachings. None.

Next, during the supposed 190 million year reign of these creatures, they revealed no evidence that they were evolving amongst themselves. They are found fully developed and nothing is found that supports that they were evolving during this supposed 190 million year period. According to secular interpretations of the earth's rock layers, several went extinct before others did (the ages are based on which sedimentary strata layer, which was laid down in water, they are found in – denying that the layers were laid down during the global flood). But going extinct is not evolving and no evidence of dinosaur evolution is found from their time living on earth.

Finally, dinosaurs disappear quite suddenly, revealing nothing of their evolutionary change into anything else. I see a clear pattern here in the theory of evolutionism. They have no evidence to back up their claims. None. There are a thousand theories as to what caused dinosaurs to suddenly disappear. Again, I will point out that we now find their bones buried in sedimentary layers which were laid down by water.

Dinosaurs do not show any traces of having evolved from something else. Dinosaurs reveal no evidence of evolving into anything else. These often-times incredible beasts show no evidence in support of Darwinism. Not a single example. Actually dinosaurs are no different than any other animal in that they provide no evidence in support of the theory of evolutionism. None.

39] Dinosaurs have been used to fool billions of people into believing that the earth is old enough to have provided Darwinian-style evolution with its much needed primary ingredient...time. The secular interpretations of the evidences claim that dinosaurs lived about a quarter of a billion years ago and that they went extinct more than 64 million years ago.

If these teachings were true we should not find any evidence of man having lived at the same time as dinosaurs. If these incredible beasts have been extinct for millions of years we should not find any evidence in support of their existence during the past million years, much less any facts showing that they lived within the past 10,000 years. None. However, human historical records, archaeology and other scientific finds continually run afoul of the Darwinian claims.

Note that the word dinosaur was invented in 1841. Prior to 1841 they were called dragons and/or serpents. Ancient history books are full of thousands of accounts of men and various kinds of dragons. We call these "dragon stories" today. Let's take a quick look at three such accounts that came out of what is now India. 2,300 years ago Alexander The Great wrote that his soldiers were scared by great dragons that lived in caves there. 2,000 years ago Roman historian Pliny the Elder wrote that the "...elephants are constantly at war with the dragons" there. Then, 1,900 years ago Apollonius of Tyana recorded that "the whole of India is girt with enormous dragons...killers of elephants." Well, it takes a pretty big critter to kill and eat an elephant. In fact, Marco Polo wrote of the dragons that were domesticated in China just 750 years ago. There was nothing mythical about dragons, which were dinosaurs, a few hundred years ago.

Paintings and carvings in and on rock walls, etched stones and artwork are found around the globe of various sorts of dinosaurs. We are told that many of these man-made depictions are from 800 to 2,000 years old. Yet we only recognized dinosaur bones in 1821. People had to have seen them in order to replicate them in carvings and paintings 1,800 years before mankind began to find their fossils.

True science continues to make things worse for Darwinism. Over the past twenty years scientists have found several unfossilized dinosaur bones that still contain red blood cells and soft, flexible tissues inside of the bones. Researchers admit that these things could not have lasted for more than 10,000 or so years. They most certainly are not millions of years old.

Darwinism has to have time beyond human comprehension to fool people into believing that they evolved on their own and dinosaurs are one of their cornerstones to getting you to believe in their much needed "millions of years" of time. However, ask yourself this simple question: Who saw dinosaurs go extinct 64 million years ago? Then look at the actual evidences and you will discover that dinosaurs are not a friend to the theory of Darwinism.

40] Darwinists worship time. In fact time is their magical ingredient. Former Harvard professor and Nobel prize winner George Wald stated: "Time is in fact the hero of the plot...the impossible becomes possible...time itself performs the miracles."

Yet the old earth ages required by Darwinists only come from two sources: the geologic time scale and the radiometric dating methods. I have previously refuted the radioisotope dating methods, revealing that they get a wide range of ages from any particular rock. These methods have to select a date that matches the Geologic Time Scale. In other words, the published dates come from this man-made time scale, not from any scientifically valid testing. So let us take a look at the bible for old-earth beliefs, the Geologic Column, or Time Scale.

The Geologic Column was popularized back in the early 1800's. Each of the sedimentary layers of rock, which were laid down by water, were given an ancient age, a name and assigned corresponding index fossils. The scientific problems with these are many. First was the anti-Christian bias that permeated the ages assigned to the layers.

To start, despite that the layers were laid down by water, complete denial of the global flood was invoked and ancient ages were given to the layers with the purpose of undermining the Bible's accounts on world history. And where did these secular scientists derive the ages of the layers? They made them up. Pure and simple.

Then they assigned index fossils to each layer. An index fossil supposedly went extinct while that particular layer was slowly developing. Since that creature supposedly went extinct while that layer was forming, it should never be found above those strata. Remember that secularists believe the layers formed over long periods of time so the deeper layers are older than the layers above it.

The problems with this time scale are numerous, and keep in mind that this is where the old-earth dates are actually derived from. For instance, the index fossils, supposedly extinct for up to hundreds of millions of years, keep showing up alive today. This alone refutes the time scale but the situation gets even worse from a scientific standpoint.

The Geologic Column is comprised of twelve primary strata layers from which old-earth dates are derived. However, these twelve layers, with their corresponding index fossils, has never been found anywhere in the natural world in the order depicted by the Geologic Time Scale. Never. The only places that the column has been found in its entirety are in school textbooks and in museum depictions. Most of the earth averages only three or four of the layers and these are generally in a mixed order with the supposedly older layers laying on top of the supposedly younger layers.

Real science shows that there is no viable reason to believe in an old-earth. The fact is that time itself performs did not perform the miracles required by the theory of Darwinism.

9] The utter failure of scientists to create life from non-life in the laboratory is yet another major problem for the philosophy of Darwinian style evolution. Darwinism teaches that life somehow began on its own in the non-observable past. However, throughout the past fifty-five years, thousands of scientists, building upon years and years of previous scientists research and experimental efforts, have never even come close to creating life from non-living matter.

Despite using computers, sterile lab conditions, and employing massive amounts of intelligent human input to special create conditions most suitable to allow life to begin on its own, researchers have failed miserably in their endeavor to show how life could have started to begin the Darwinian process.

Still, textbooks have tried to persuade unsuspecting students that life has been made in the laboratory. The misleading books will refer to an experiment, such as the Urey-Miller experiment from the 1950's, or to a take off of that original failed experiment, and indicate that it was successful. However, if you look closely at any of the attempts to create life from non-life in the lab, you will find that they came nowhere near to making living matter. Usually the best that these tests have done is to come up with some non-living chemical compounds which are found in living matter.

This would be equal to someone creating some calcium and, since calcium is found inside of the human body, announcing to the world that they had created a human being! No one has ever created living matter from non-living matter. Former Harvard professor and Nobel Laureate George Wald stated why Darwinists continue on. He said "I do not want to believe in God. Therefore, I chose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible: spontaneous generation arising to evolution."

Let us assume that one day, after spending billions of dollars and building upon years and years of research from thousands of other scientists, that someone was able to get non-living matter to produce living matter. Would this prove that life could spontaneously generate without any intelligent being having been involved? Hardly! If scientists are ever able to create life in the lab, all it would prove is that it takes massive amounts of intelligent input to create life. There is no way that life could have started on its own from non-living matter in a natural setting.

41] Darwinists claim that Ambulocetus is the missing link between land mammals and whales. They also claim that the whale evolution series is solid proof of Darwinism in action.

Sadly this is Darwinism in action, but not because it is based on actual scientific evidence of Darwinian-style evolution having taken place. Unfortunately Darwinists are skilled at drawing things that never existed to promote their theory that never took place and the whale evolution series is a fine example of such

“Darwinism in action.” Drawings depicting an extinct land mammal are posed next to Ambulocetus which is followed by a whale. This is a deliberate attempt at creating and leaving a distinct impression in the minds of the book’s readers that this is solid proof of Darwinian style evolution.

The much promoted half-mammal, half-whale Ambulocetus, beautifully drawn in full-color depictions never actually existed. The mythical creature put forth as the long awaited missing link of something evolving from one kind of animal into another kind of being was made up of bones that were found in separate strata layers and in different locations! That is correct: the bones aren’t even from the same animal. In fact, whatever animals the bones are from did not even live at the same time, according to the evolutionary interpretation of the strata layers! Even with these deliberate shenanigans, only about 24% of a skeleton was made up and it contained no pelvic girdle. In other words, they don’t know whether the creature would have swam, walked or crawled yet drawings in modern day schoolbooks show it as the missing link between land mammals and whales.

Darwinists are skilled at drawing things that never existed to promote their theory that never took place and Ambulocetus, the non-existent missing link between land animals and whales, is employed to mislead many people.

42] Darwinists claim that the much promoted drawings and museum displays depicting the horse evolution series is solid proof of Darwinism in action.

Sadly this is Darwinism in action, but not because it is based on actual scientific evidence of Darwinian-style evolution having taken place. Unfortunately Darwinists are skilled at drawing things that never existed to promote their theory that never took place and the horse evolution series is a fine example of such “Darwinism in action.” Textbook drawings and actual bone arrangements in museums depict a supposedly extinct “ancient” horse next to a lightly larger horse next to the modern-day horse. This is a deliberate attempt at creating and leaving a distinct impression in the minds of the book’s readers and museum visitors that this is solid proof of Darwinian-style change.

However, the much promoted horse-fossil evolution series, found beautifully drawn in full-color depictions in various textbooks, or magnificently arranged with actual bones going from the small ancient horse to the large modern horse has never been found in the order that they are presented. In fact the supposed modern day horse has been found in strata layers below the rock layers that contain the supposed ancient horse. Well, according to the evolutionary interpretations of the strata layers, that puts the modern horse on earth prior to the supposed ancient horse that the modern horse was supposed to have evolved from! Furthermore, the order in which the hoses are arranged has never been found anywhere in the world! Nowhere have the fossilized horse bones matched what Darwinists are teaching in the schools and museums. Never.

Another sad but interesting note is that of all the museums displays that I am aware of which depict the horse evolution series showing the small horse next to the larger equine next to the larger Modern horse are all made from the bones of modern horses! That is correct. They have taken the bones from a one-month old horse, the bones from a three-month old horse, a year-old horse and an adult horse and lined them up in order by size then employed them to fool millions of people into believing that Darwinists actually have proof of Darwinism in action.

Again, this sadly is Darwinism in action, but not because it is based on actual scientific evidence of Darwinian-style evolution having taken place. Darwinists are skilled at making up or drawing things that never existed to promote their theory that never took place and the horse evolution series is employed to mislead many people.

43] Grand Canyon, located in northern Arizona, USA, has been used to fool billions of people into believing that the earth is old enough to have provided Darwinian-style evolution with its much needed primary ingredient...time. The secular interpretations of the formation of Grand Canyon claim that the strata layers through which Grand Canyon cuts formed slowly over hundreds of millions of years of time.

However, the actual observable scientific facts do not support the secular interpretations of the evidences. For example, all the strata layers through which Grand Canyon eroded are filled with fossils of marine creatures. These include starfish, jellyfish, nautiloids, clams, small pieces of various corals, brachiopods, crinoids and sponges. This strongly indicates that all the layers at the Canyon were laid down by water.

The time gaps, which should be there had the layers formed over long ages of time, are not readily apparent between the various sedimentary layers, which were laid down by water, to form the Canyon's colorful walls. Had each layer formed with long periods of time between layering events, then the exposed top layer should show extensive erosion from rain and snow runoff. There should be found abundant signs of plants having grown in the upper, exposed portion of each of the strata layers in the Canyons. There should be chemical evidence from acids leaching from the rocks. These would reveal gaps in the time between the strata layers formation. But the time gaps are missing, indicating that the rock layers were laid down quickly, one layer upon the other.

Also, the strata through which Grand Canyon slices were uplifted about 4,000 feet above the surrounding Colorado Plateau, yet the rock layers are not cracked. This indicates that the layers all formed quickly and during a single catastrophic aqueous event that laid down the sedimentary layers and then smashed the earth's plates together during a massive tectonic event, forming the Kaibab Upwarp where the layers were uplifting before they had time to harden

into rock, which would have been shattered during the uplifting event had they already been hardened into solid rock layers.

The observable evidences support that the strata layers through which Grand Canyon cuts formed quickly in water as opposed to slowly over long ages of time.

44] Grand Canyon, located in northern Arizona, USA, is used to fool millions of visitors every year into believing that the earth is old enough to have provided Darwinian-style evolution with its much needed primary ingredient...time. The secular interpretations of the formation of Grand Canyon claim that the chasm formed over millions of years of time.

However the gradual, long-age formation theories have huge problems. In fact, old-earth secularists can not even agree on how Grand Canyon formed. The Antecedent River Theory, also known as the Ancient River Theory, claims that the Colorado River carved out the Canyon over millions of years of time. The Stream Capture Theory, also called the Precocious Gully Theory, and its take-offs claim that one or more gullies managed to carve out massive amount of sediments which eventually captured other streams to form the Canyon. In other words, secularists have no idea how the Canyon formed, they only agree on one thing: Grand Canyon did not form as a result of the global flood as this would eliminate one of the icons for old-earth beliefs which are the foundations on which Darwinism is built.

There are 900 plus cubic miles of missing sediments from Grand Canyon. Had the chasm formed gradually then the missing sediments should be along the edge of the Colorado River, or down in the Gulf. But the missing sediments are not found in either of these locations. It is quite apparent that Grand Canyon formed quickly.

Back in the 1920's secular geology was teaching that the Scablands in Eastern Washington state formed slowly over millions of years of time. Then one brave and honest geologist named Richard Bretz announced his findings that the Scablands formed in a matter of a few days as the result of a glacier dam that we breached. He revealed how the massive water and mud flows formed the canyons and landscape of that area very quickly and for his excellent scientific work and diligence the secular dominated world of geology black-balled him and ruined his career. Finally in the mid 1960's it was finally admitted the Bretz was correct and that the Scablands formed quickly as a result of a massive dam breach. Grand Canyon is the result of a similar dam breach.

The Kaibab Upwarp served as a huge earthen dam until the trapped lakes behind the dam breached the Upwarp. Cascading water, mud and boulders carved out the Canyon in a matter of days, dispersing the 900 plus miles of sediments widely so they are difficult to identify today.

Observable evidences at Grand Canyon and canyons that have been seen to have formed quickly due to natural dam breaches have shed light on how Grand Canyon formed quickly, not over vast eons of time.

45] Modern textbooks claim two new hominid discoveries (hominids are claimed to be the closet evolutionary link between ape and man). Kenyanthropus platyops, also known as Flat-faced Man, is one while the other is Sahelanthropus which is also called Tomei man.

The 2006 high school biology book titled "Biology" by KR Miller and J Levine, and published by Prentice Hall discusses these two Darwinian wonders on page 838. They state about Tomei Man "...is nearly 7 million years old...older than any hominid previously known.." Wow. That is quite an evolutionary find...or is it? Tomei Man was first discovered in 2002. Later that same year Science News reported in its Oct. 2002 Volume 162 # 16 page, 253 that: "The specimen's teeth resemble" those of the ape lineages and that "it" "didn't walk on two legs..." In fact, Nature magazine reported in October of 2002 that Tomei Man "...represents an ancient ape." In other words, honest scientists knew when Tomei Man was discovered that it was just an ape.

A fair question is why are they teaching kids today that Tomei Man is proof for Darwinism? The answer is that there is no viable proof to support Darwinian evolutionism so they have to either admit that we were created to support their belief with known "mistakes". That brings us to "Flat-Faced Man."

All that was found of Flat-Faced Man was a small skull that was crushed into about 50 pieces. After "reconstructing" the pieces together, it was announced that the face was "slightly" flatter than a normal apes face and this was hailed as proof that it was becoming a human being. This was all that was required to get Flat-Faced Man into public school and college textbooks. What I have not seen printed in any of the schoolbooks is the interesting scientific fact that Flat-Faced Man would have stood two-feet tall! That is right, our supposed closest relative on our ape to human tree was about knee-high to most adults (adult humans that is).

As you can see, it does not take much to qualify as evidence in support of Darwinian claims. Again, this is because there is no viable proof to support Darwinian evolutionism so they have to either admit that we were created to support their belief with whatever they can get people to buy into.

47] Modern day public schools and colleges teach that Darwinism is science. Darwinian evolution provides the foundation for Naturalism. In other words, Darwinism is the foundation for secular Humanism and it is important for everyone to understand this so they will not be fooled into thinking that Darwinism is "science". Real science is knowledge which has been derived from the study of testable and repeatable events. A true scientific hypothesis must be:

A] predictable; and B] refutable. Let's take a look at the predictions and refutability of Naturalistic Darwinism.

Prediction 1: Darwinism predicts that Biology will find organisms adding new and beneficial genetic information to existing gene pools. This would be reliable, empirical criteria of Darwinism. So what does observable science find?

Well, real science has never discovered a single method by which nature can add appreciable amounts of new and beneficial genetic information to a plant or animals gene pool. Increasing genetic information has proven to be another major hurdle for evolutionism. Although secularists have been teaching Neo-Darwinism, that mutations are what add the needed new and beneficial genetic information which then leads to Darwinian-style change, millions of scientific tests prove conclusively that mutations do not add new and beneficial genetic data to their inherited gene pool and are usually genetically weaker than their parent form. Because of this, in natural environment mutations tend to be eliminated by natural selection. With regard to the first prediction, Darwinism fails this key criterion.

Prediction 2: Darwinism predicts that Geology will find the fossil record to be filled with millions of transitional kinds of both plants and animals. This would be reliable, empirical criteria of Darwinism. So what does observable science find? The overall fossil record is an embarrassment to Darwinism. All higher kinds of plants and animals appear abruptly in the fossil record with zero transitional types linking one group to another. The amount of transitional forms involved in the evolutionary transformation from a single-celled creature to every life form found on earth today, or extinct forms found only in the fossil record, should total an incredible number. Yet the only ones presented have not held up to even scant scientific scrutiny and have misled billions of people into believing in Darwinian style evolution. With regard to the second prediction, Darwinism fails this key criterion.

So what about the refutability of naturalistic evolutionism? Humanists own the educational and the scientific establishments so we must look past what they say and study the actual facts. Humanists argue that unless every conceivable possibility to support materialism can be proven impossible, no matter how improbable (such as aliens may have dropped us off) that only their philosophy can be considered as a possible reason for the origins of life.

Materialistic, naturalistic evolutionists force all opposing views to prove a negative, which is impossible. This makes naturalistic Darwinism a non-refutable religious dogma, not science. With regard to its refutability, Darwinism is non-refutable.

Darwinian Evolution is a religious-based belief which fails its own critical criteria and is non-refutable. However the failed predictions of Darwinism refute Naturalism which refutes secular Humanism as being a viable religious belief.

48] Modern day public schools and colleges teach that Biblical creation is a religious belief, which it is, just as is Darwinian evolution. Both are philosophies on how life originated and came to where we are today. Biblical creation provides the foundation for the Gospel of Jesus Christ. So how does Biblical creation stand up to scientific facts?

Real science is knowledge which has been derived from the study of testable and repeatable events. A true scientific hypothesis must be: A] predictable; and B] refutable. Let's take a look at the predictions and refutability of Biblical creation.

Ten times in the book of Genesis God's Word predicts that plants and/or animal will "bring forth after their kind." Also in Genesis, and throughout the Bible, as in 2 Peter 3:6, we are told that "Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:" Scripture claims that the world endured a global flood where everything living on the earth died and the highest hills were covered by the waters. Thus Biblical Creationism predicts that Biology will find that Plants and animals will only reproduce their own kind with variations occurring within their kind; and that Geology will find that the earth has endured a worldwide, catastrophic, aqueous event. These would be reliable, empirical criteria of Biblical Creation. Let's take a look at these two key predictions of Biblical creation.

Prediction 1: Biblical Creationism predicts that Biology will find that plant and animals will only reproduce their own kind of plant or animal with minor adaptational changes occurring within that particular kind of being.

Micro-evolution, better referred to as micro-adaptations because most people associate the word "evolution" with the Darwinian-style change of one kind of being into a different kind of creature, is a scientific fact. Millions of examples could be shown. Micro-adaptations are simply kinds bringing forth after their kind. A short-haired dog begetting a long-haired dog would be an example. Dogs producing dogs with genetic variations which were the result of their inherited genetic traits are simple kinds bringing forth after their own kind and are both a Biblical and a scientific fact. Biblical Creation meets this key criterion.

Prediction 2: Biblical Creationism predicts that Geology will find evidences of a global, catastrophic, aqueous event.

Science finds that the outer crust of the earth is primarily made of sedimentary layers of rock which were laid down by water. These layers are full of fossils which had to be buried quickly, before they could rot away or get eaten by scavengers and polystrata fossils which traverse multiple strata layers attest to the rapid accumulation of the earth's rock layers. Carbon-14, which should decay away in less than 70,000 years, is found in all fossil-bearing strata (evolutionists claim these layers are 580 million years old)! And the C-14 found throughout the layers is in the same range of amounts. These findings prove that the earth's strata layers formed recently and during the same event. Only a global flood viably explains these evidences. Biblical Creation meets this key criterion.

So what about the refutability of Biblical creation? Though the Bible is not a science book, Scriptural claims that plants and animals will bring forth after their kind, and that there was a global flood. If the observable evidences do not support these claims, Biblical creation would be scientifically refuted.

Biblical Creationism is a religious based theory which is scientifically sound as it meets its own key predictions and is scientifically refutable, although Biblical creation has never been refuted by true scientific research.

49] Darwinists claim that the science of Embryology reveals that humans and other creatures, while developing during in their embryonic stages in our mother's wombs, provide proof of our close evolutionary relationship.

However, this is yet another take off on Ernst Haeckel's Theory of Recapitulation which has been scientifically refuted time and time again since the 1870's yet continues to be resurrected by those with a Darwinian mindset. Also, scientific observation fails to support that embryonic development supports that everything has a common ancestor.

In the initial stages of development vertebrate embryos are radically different from different kinds of beings. Animal embryos first undergo cleavage, where the fertilized egg divides into thousands of cells and acquires its major body axes (e.g., anterior-posterior, or head-to-tail, and dorsal-ventral, or back-to-front). During this phase of development each major group of animals (mammals, birds, fishes, and reptiles) follows a very different and distinctive cleavage pattern. This is opposite of the Darwinian claim that the embryonic stages provide proof of our close evolutionary relationship.

Next, animal embryos enter into the gastrulation stage. This is where their cells rearrange themselves to generate their basic tissue types and establish the general layout of the animal's body. Once again, during this phase of embryonic development each major group of animals follows a very different and distinctive gastrulation pattern.

Only after the gastrulation phase, during the pharyngula stage, do the embryos of mammals, birds, fishes, and reptiles briefly resemble each other before developing into the creatures that they were designed to be. Realize that if Darwinian claims were true the different creatures should have developed through a similar embryonic process, as Darwinists claim they did. However, real science reveals that they develop quite differently from one another and this alone is a major problem for Darwinism.

50] The study of human origins has never been about the evidence because everyone has the exact same evidence to test, study and observe. The study of human origins is about the philosophical framework, the worldview, through which the evidences are interpreted.

Those with a secular or Humanistic worldview will look at an ancient ape skull and see proof for Darwinian change in that fossil. A person who holds to a Biblical worldview will observe the exact same skull and see that apes have always been apes. It has never been about the evidences, it has always been about which worldview the facts are interpreted through. Because the secular worldview has been taught as if it were science for the past fifty years, we now live in an evolutionary based society and world. But this worldview is not supported by the best scientifically backed interpretation of the evidences.

Dr. David Pilbeam, former Yale Professor and Co-Author of the "Cambridge Encyclopedia of Human Evolution" stated that theories on human evolution: "...reveal more about how humans view themselves than it does about how humans came about." In other words, if you choose to believe that you evolved for a rock, or pond scum, from an ape-like ancestor, or that aliens dropped off life forms and we evolved from there, then that is certainly your choice to make. However, do not make such an important decision, a decision that will greatly influence the way you view the world, based on the mistaken notion that there is any true scientific evidence that backs up Darwinian-style evolutionism because there is no such evidence available.

During 2006 former Nobel Prize winning physicist Steven Weinberg stated that, "...anything that we scientists can do to weaken the hold of religion should be done..." (A Free-for-All on Science and Religion; New York Times; November 26, 2006). Yes, he meant anything as you have seen from the previous 49 facts we have sent to you.

Philosopher Malcolm Muggeridge stated in the Pascal Lectures, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, that "...the theory of evolution...will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted..."

Perhaps you can now understand why I often say that the teaching of Darwinism is simply Humanistic indoctrination which has undermined both scientific education as well as scientific research.