

SCIENCE PROVES EVOLUTION WRONG

Nine Scientific Facts Prove the "Theory of Evolution" is False

This article will prove that the Theory of Evolution fails many challenges, not simply one.

The Theory of Evolution will never become a law of science because it is wrought with errors. This is why it is still called a theory, instead of a law. The process of natural selection is not an evolutionary process.

The DNA in plants and animals allows selective breeding to achieve desired results. Dogs are a good example of selective breeding. The DNA in all dogs has many recessive traits.

A desired trait can be produced in dogs by selecting dogs with a particular trait to produce offspring with that trait. This specialized selective breeding can continue for generation after generation until a breed of dog is developed. This is the same as the "survival of the fittest" theory of the evolutionists.

Many different types of dogs can be developed this way, but they can never develop a cat by selectively breeding dogs. Natural selection can never extend outside of the DNA limit. DNA cannot be changed into a new species by natural selection. The same process of selective breeding is done with flowers, fruits, and vegetables.

New variations of the species are possible, but a new species has never been developed by science. In fact, the most modern laboratories are unable to produce a left-hand protein as found in humans and animals. Evolutionist fail to admit that no species has ever been proven to have evolved in any way. Evolution is simply pie-in-the-sky conjecture without scientific proof.

If natural selection were true, Eskimos would have fur to keep warm, but they don't. They are just as hairless as everyone else. If natural selection were true, humans in the tropics would have silver, reflective skin to help them keep cool, but they don't. They have black skin, just the opposite of what the theory of natural selection would predict.

If natural selection were true humans at northern latitudes would have black skin, but they have white skin instead, except the Eskimos who have skin that is halfway between white and black. The people from Russia and the Nordic countries have white skin, blond hair and blue eyes. This is the opposite of what one would predict if natural selection controlled skin color.

Many evolutionists argue that melanin is a natural sunscreen that evolved in a greater amount to protect dark-skinned people who live near the Equator. They simply ignore the fact that dark-skinned Eskimos live north of the Arctic Circle.

Melanin in the skin is not a sound argument in favor of evolution. Dark-skinned people have always lived near the Equator, not white-skinned people, even though the dark skin is more uncomfortable in the hot, sunny climate.

Black skin absorbs the heat from the sun's rays more than white skin. Humans show no sign of natural selection based on the environment. The theory of natural selection is wrong because it cannot create something in the DNA that wasn't there in the beginning.

Animals like bears, tigers, lions, and zebras living near the equator have heavy fur while humans living north of the Arctic Circle have bare skin. A leopard from the jungle near the equator has fur like the snow leopard of the Himalayas.

The snow leopard grows thicker hair but the jungle leopard would also if moved to a cold climate. Horses and dogs grow a heavy winter coat in colder climates. Natural selection isn't working as falsely claimed by Charles Darwin.

The cheetah in Africa is an example of an animal in the cat family with very limited variety in the DNA. Each cheetah looks like an identical twin. The cheetah DNA is so identical that the skin from one cheetah can be grafted into another cheetah without any rejection by the body.

Evolution is Scientifically Impossible

Evolution is a theory developed one hundred and forty years ago by Charles Darwin (N/A actually, by his grandfather in 1794 - before Charles was even born), before science had the evidence available to prove the theory false.

His famous book, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, has a title that is now known to be scientifically false. New species cannot evolve by natural selection. Modern scientific discoveries are proving evolution to be impossible. No new scientific discoveries have been found to support the Theory of Evolution.

Life did not start with a bolt of lightning striking a pond of water as claimed by the main stream scientists.

Kids are taught that life can evolve given enough time. This is a false statement without any scientific support.

They are taught that if given enough time, a monkey at a typewriter could punch keys at random and eventually type President's Abraham Lincoln Gettysburg Address. This is nonsense.

Time does not make impossible things possible. As an example, a computer was programmed in an attempt to arrive at the simple 26-letter alphabet. After 35,000,000,000,000 (35 trillion) attempts it has only arrived at 14 letters correctly.

What are the odds that a simple single cell organism could evolve given the complexity of more than 60,000 proteins of 100 different configurations all in the correct places? Never in eternity! Time does not make impossible things possible. (...)

The Indoctrination System Called "Education"

The educational system teaches children not to think. Any student who uses logic and solid scientific evidence to question the Theory of Evolution is ridiculed and insulted into submission. The students who submit become non-thinking robots who dare not question the dogma presented.

A forth-grade elementary school class was observed at the park playing a three-legged race game, where adjacent legs of the two kids were placed into a bag. The kids must cooperate with each step in order to run. The kids thought it was great fun. The teacher told them they were being trained to cooperate.

Actually, it was brainwashing kids into conforming to a system in which they are not allowed to have individual thoughts or opinions. They must become a "team player" and submit to peer pressure. Communist countries have used this same brainwashing technique for decades.

The brainwashing of school children continues by teaching them there is no absolute right or wrong, and the teacher is absolutely positive about it.

Whatever the children think is right for them is OK. That is of course until they question evolution. They are then told they are wrong. This brainwashing results in children who are unable to think logically, scientifically, and accurately. (...)

[Darwinian Evolution cannot be observed and replicated in order to be scientifically validated and also there is not one single known case of a change of kinds]:

Scientific Fact No. 1 - Birds Prove Natural Selection is Naturally Wrong

The body and soul of Darwin's Theory of Evolution was the idea that evolution was made possible through natural selection. This concept is based on the suggestion that those members of a species that are a little stronger, a little larger, or run a little faster will live longer to procreate offspring with these superior adaptations.

Darwin's theory suggests that millions of generations later the changes will result in new species. These adaptations are called links or intermediates between the old species and the new.

The idea of natural selection sounds great when considering deer. The deer that can sense danger the quickest and run the fastest are able to escape the predator on a more consistent basis. However, other examples on the "evolutionary tree" have many flaws.

One of the best examples of evolution nonsense is the thought that a wingless bird began to evolve a wing. Why this would occur is not answered by evolutionists. The wing stub did not make the bird more adaptable to his environment. The first wing stubs would be much too small for the bird to fly.

Why would a bird evolve wing stubs that are useless? This is backwards from the evolutionary theory of natural selection, which states that birds adapt and change in order to survive better in their environment. The bird with a half-size wing is placed at a disadvantage in its environment.

Why would the bird continue for millions of generations to improve a wing stub that is useless? The Theory of Evolution is based on natural selection of the most adaptable member of a species, not the weakest. A bird with a useless wing is at a severe disadvantage. This is the opposite of natural selection.

According to natural selection, the members of the bird species with the smallest useless wing would be the most adaptable and most likely to survive in the largest numbers. According to the theory of natural selection birds could never evolve to fly.

We are then led to believe that some birds got tired of carrying around a worthless half-size wing, so they grew fingers on the end to help climb trees. The wings became arms and a new species was developed.

Evolutionists say birds grew hollow bones for less weight in order to fly. How would a bird pass this long-term plan to the millions of generations in order to keep the lighter bone plan progressing? The evolutionary concept of growing a wing over millions of generations violates the very foundation of evolution: the natural selection.

Birds aren't the only species that proves the theory of natural selection to be wrong. The problem can be found in all species in one way or another. Take fish for example.

We are told by evolutionists that a fish wiggled out of the sea onto dry land and became a land creature. So let's examine this idea. OK, a fish wiggles out of the sea and onto the land, but he can't breathe air. This could happen. Fish do stupid things at times.

Whales keep swimming up onto the beach where they die. Do you think the whales are trying to expedite a multi-million generation plan to grow legs? That concept is stupid, but let's get back to the fish story.

The gills of the fish are made for extracting oxygen from water, not from air. He chokes and gasps before flipping back into the safety of the water. Why would he do such a stupid thing? This wiggling and choking continues for millions of generation until the fish chokes less and less. His gills evolve into lungs so he can breathe air on dry land, but now he is at risk of drowning in the water.

One day he simply stays out on the land and never goes back into the water. Now he is a lizard.

Giant dinosaurs literally exploded onto the scene during the Triassic period. The fossil record (petrified bones found in the ground as at the Dinosaur National Park in Jensen, Utah, USA) shows no intermediate or transitional species. Where are the millions of years of fossils showing the transitional forms for dinosaurs? They do not exist, because the dinosaurs did not evolve.

Books published by evolutionists have shown the giant Cetiosaurus dinosaur with the long neck extending upright eating from the treetops. They claimed natural selection was the reason Cetiosaurus had a long neck. This gave them an advantage in reaching fodder that other species could not reach.

One day during the assembly of a skeleton for a museum display someone noticed the neck vertebrae were such that the neck could not be lifted higher than stretched horizontally in front of them. The natural selection theory was proven to be a big lie.

The Cetiosaurus dinosaur was an undergrowth eater. The long neck actually placed the Cetiosaurus at a disadvantage in his environment, just the opposite from the natural Theory of Natural Selection.

Evolutionists will now claim the animal evolved a long neck because he had the advantage of eating from bushes on the other side of the river. This is typical logic of an evolutionist.

Scientific Fact No. 2 - Species Without a Link Prove Evolution Theory is Wrong

The evolutionist will claim that the presence of many individual species proves evolution. This shallow statement is devoid of reason, logic, and scientific proof.

Evolutionists line up pictures of similar-looking species and claim they evolved one from another. The human "family tree" is an example of this flawed theory. Petrified skulls and bones exist from hundreds of species of extinct monkeys and apes.

Evolutionists line up the most promising choices to present a gradual progression from monkey to modern man. They simply fill in the big gaps with make-believe creatures to fit the picture.

This procedure can be done with humans only because there are many extinct monkey and ape species. They never do this with giraffes, elephants or the Platypus. (...)

The pictures are simply a grouping of individual species that does not prove evolution.

Close to the Missing Link -- Oldest Human Ancestor Discovered

Why do they claim the above discovery is "close to the missing link"? The answer is simple. Look at the picture: It is a monkey.

A monkey species that has become extinct. Lots of species have become extinct. Millions of species have become extinct.

It is obviously not similar to a human. Look at the feet with the big toe spread away from the smaller toes exactly like a modern chimpanzee, not like people.

A newly discovered extinct species does not prove a "missing link" has been found.

Charles Darwin admitted that fossils of the transitional links between species would have to be found in order to prove his "Theory of Evolution." Well, these transitional links have never been found. We only find individual species.

Evolutionists try to form these individual species into a link according to similar major features such as wings or four legs, but this simply proves the Theory of Evolution to be a fraud. Darwin was hopeful that future fossils would prove his theory correct, but instead, the lack of transitional links has proven his theory to be wrong.

The presence of individual species actually proves they were not developed by an evolutionary process. If evolution were true, all plants, animals, and insects would be in a continual state of change. No two creatures would be identical, because they would not be separate species.

All life forms would be a continual blend of characteristics without a clear definition among the species. Everything would be changing, and every animal, insect, and plant would be different.

The cheetah above proves evolution does not exist. All species are locked solidly within their DNA code.

Evolutionists are going ape over "Ape-Girl"

The fossilized bones of a new animal have been found in Ethiopia near the site where "Lucy" was discovered many years ago.

By the way, Lucy was a monkey, not an early humanoid. The number of bones of the Ape-girl skeleton are unique because Lucy had only a few head fragments.

This find gives us a lot of information about the animal because major parts of the skeleton were unearthed (assuming these are all from the same animal).

It has teeth in the jaw and is said to also have unerupted teeth still within the jaw. The evolutionists call the animal a "human-like" female child about three years of age and an "individual." This is not a "human-like" fossil. It is an "ape-like" fossil because it was an ape.

The evolutionists call the animal a "transitional species" and a human ancestor even though it has a head exactly like a modern-day ape. The jaw is thrust forward and the forehead pushed back and slanted. The true appearance is more easily seen from side picture below.

Ape-girl also has arms "that dangled down to just above the knees. It also had gorilla-like shoulder blades which suggest it could have been skilled at swinging through trees."

So, it looks like an ape, it has a head like an ape, it has arms like an ape, it has shoulder blades like an ape - it is obviously an ape, not a human, pre-human or humanoid. This animal is simply a young ape. Its size is as would be expected for a young modern-day ape.

The age of this fossilised animal is also very much in doubt. Scientists many years ago claimed a tooth found was Nebraska Man, a pre-human fossil millions of years old. They determined the age of the tooth. The scientists had sculptured an entire ape-like skeleton from information they found in one tooth. These lies were exposed when real scientists found the tooth to be from a peccary, an animal similar to (and closely related to) pigs.

'Lucy's baby' found in Ethiopia - BBC News - September 21, 2006

"The 3.3-million-year-old fossilised remains of a human-like child have been unearthed in Ethiopia's Dikika region. The find consists of the whole skull, the entire torso, and important parts of the upper and lower limbs. CT scans reveal unerupted teeth still in the jaw, a detail that makes scientists think the individual may have been about three years old when she died."

Remarkably, some quite delicate bones not normally preserved in the fossilisation process are also present, such as the hyoid, or tongue, bone. The hyoid bone reflects how the voice box is built and perhaps what sounds a species can produce.

Judging by how well it was preserved, the skeleton may have come from a body that was quickly buried by sediment in a flood, the researchers said.

"In my opinion, afarensis is a very good transitional species for what was before four million years ago and what came after three million years," Dr Alemseged told BBC science correspondent Pallab Ghosh. [The species had] a mixture of ape-like and human-like features. This puts afarensis in a special position to play a pivotal role in the story of what we are and where we come from."

Climbing Ability

"This early ancestor possessed primitive teeth and a small brain but it stood upright and walked on two feet. There is considerable argument about whether the Dikika girl could also climb trees like an ape.

This climbing ability would require anatomical equipment like long arms, and the 'Lucy' species had arms that dangled down to just above the knees. It also had gorilla-like shoulder blades which suggest it could have been skilled at swinging through trees. But the question is whether such features indicate climbing ability or are just 'evolutionary baggage'."

Evolution is in trouble. The growth of biological knowledge is producing scientific facts that contradict the evolutionary theory, not confirm it, a fact that famous Prof. Steven Jay Gould of Harvard has described as "the trade secret of paleontology."

The fossil record simply does not support the evolutionary theory, which claims there once existed a series of successive forms leading to the present-day organism. The theory states that infinitesimal changes within each generation evolve into a new species, but the scientific fact remains. They don't.

Fossils prove the sudden emergence of a new species out of nowhere, complete with characteristics unknown in any other species. The fossil record has no intermediate or transitional forms. This is

popularly known as the "missing link" problem, and it exists in all species. The missing link problem is getting worse, not better, with the discovery of more fossils.

The missing links are not being discovered, which proves they never existed. Darwin assumed transitional forms would be discovered in the fossil record over time, but that has not been the case. The fossil record, or lack thereof, is a major embarrassment to evolutionists.

The fossil record is a serious rebuke of the Theory of Evolution. New species explode onto the scene out of nowhere. New fossil discoveries continue to prove evolution to be wrong.

Evolution: A Theory in Crisis by Michael Denton

Michael Denton says,

"Despite the tremendous increase in geological activity in every corner of the globe and despite the discovery of many strange and hitherto unknown forms, the infinitude of connecting links has still not been discovered and the fossil record is about as discontinuous as it was when Darwin was writing the Origin."

A reader of the Michael Denton's book says,

"Denton a Molecular Biologist removes all of the supports (if there ever were any) from Darwin's theory of macro-evolution (continuity of life). Denton blasts all of the previous arguments made by the pro-evolutionists showing that there is essentially no support of macro-evolution in the fossil record. He also, clearly demonstrates that there is no support coming from his specialty molecular biology. In the end the only sound explanation he can make is that life is profoundly discontinuous."

Harvard Professor Gould claims that evolution occurs in spurts, not gradually. This theory attempts to explain the lack of continuity in the fossil record. However, this theory is more troublesome than the gradual change theory. Large jumps or spurts in the fossil record don't prove evolution at all. In fact, they disprove evolution.

The theory that evolution can occur in spurts, because the fossil record shows it did not occur gradually, is a wild stretch of the imagination. Species have some characteristics similar to other species, but similarity doesn't prove any evolutionary link whatsoever. There are more than missing links in biology. There are entire missing chains in 100% of the branches of the evolutionary tree.

Many species are dependant upon another species for their coexistence. Hummingbirds and flowers are a good example. The flower would not be pollinated and would become extinct without the bird. They are said to have coevolved together. That is a stretch of the imagination without any basis in science. There are hundreds of these examples that cannot be explained.

Charles Darwin had concern about his theory of natural selection. He knew that a failure to find the missing transitional links would seriously cripple his theory of evolution, but he was hopeful the missing links would be found some day.

Well, guess what? He died not finding them. Evolutionists have never found the missing links. Each time they announce finding one, it is later proven to be false.

The "Living Fossil" Fish Proves Evolution is Wrong

The Coelacanth fish was touted to be a transitional form with half-formed legs and primitive lungs, ready to transition onto land. This myth was exploded in December, 1938 when a live Coelacanth was caught in a fisherman's net off the eastern coast of South Africa. It is now known that the natives of the Comoro Islands had been catching and eating the fish for years.

It did not have half-formed legs or primitive lungs. It was simply a regular fish that people thought was extinct. Evolutionist claimed the 350 million-year-old Coelacanth evolved into animals with legs, feet, and lungs.

This not the case. We now see that the fish recently caught is exactly like the 350 million-year-old fossil. It did not evolve at all.

The Coelacanth is a star witness against the false theory of evolution. After 350 million years, the fish still doesn't have a leg to stand on.

Fisherman catches 'living fossil' - BBC News - August 1, 2007;

"The 1.3m-long (4.3ft), 50kg (110lb) coelacanth is only the second ever to have been captured in Asia and has been described as a "significant find". An autopsy and genetic tests are now being carried out to determine more about the specimen. Coelacanths provide researchers with a window into the past; their fossil record dates back 350 million years."

The Archaeopteryx fossil was herald by evolutionists as a significant transitional missing link. The fossil was discovered in a limestone quarry in southern Germany in 1861 and has been debated ever since.

The dinosaur creature appears to be a reptile with bird characteristics of wings and feathers. It had the skeleton of a small dinosaur with a tail, fingers with claws on the leading edge of the wing, and teeth in the jaws.

The owners of the property discovered six fossils of which only two had feathers. This inconsistency smells of fraud from the beginning. Upon close examination the feathers appear to be identical to modern chicken feathers. Click the picture to see an enlargement.

The Archaeopteryx fossils with feathers have now been declared forgeries by scientists. "Allegedly, thin layers of cement were spread on two fossils of a chicken-size dinosaur, called Compsognathus. Bird feathers were then imprinted into the wet cement" according to Dr. Walt Brown.

This example would not have proven evolution even if the feathers had not been forgeries. Finding a few species with characteristics similar to two other species does not prove a link. There should be millions or billions of transitional links if evolution were true, not simply a few.

The Platypus (*Ornithorhynchus anatinus*), with its duck bill and webbed feet, is a unique Australian animal. It and the two species of echidna are the only monotremes or egg-laying mammals to be found on earth.

The marsupials (mammals with pouches, e.g. kangaroos) and eutherians (placental mammals that give birth to well-developed young, e.g. humans) both give birth to live young.

The monotremes have lower body temperatures than other mammals and have legs which extend out, then vertically below them. These features, together with their egg-laying ability, are more like that of a lizard than a mammal. Platypus are readily identified by their streamlined body, webbed feet, broad tail, and characteristic muzzle or bill which is soft and pliable.

The Platypus males have spurs on their hind feet that deliver a poisonous venom like a snake. A Platypus sting is powerful enough to make people sick and kill a dog.

The Platypus of Australia has characteristics of many species but certainly is not the missing link to all of them. In fact, it is not a link to any of them. The Platypus has made a joke of Charles Darwin's theory of evolution and his unproven theory of natural selection.

April 6, 2006 - Tiktaalik is the latest fossil gap evolutionary fraud;

Scientists fraudulently claim a newly-discovered fish is the second bridge fossil gap between sea and land creatures. The scientists have apparently forgotten that the first fossil gap, Archaeopteryx, shown above was also a fraud. Tiktaalik therefore becomes fossil gap fraud number 2.

"Called 'Tiktaalik' by scientists, the fish lived in shallow, swampy waters. Most remarkably, the creature, which was less than 3 feet long, had the body of a fish but the jaws, ribs, and limb-like fins seen in the earliest land mammals."

Tiktaalik fossil

The claim that the stubby little fossil fins are "limb-like" is a real hoot. The fish doesn't even have fins as large as expected for its size.

The scientists are claiming the fish walked around on the ground out of water and breathed air. This is pure make-believe speculation. No evidence exists that the fish is anything more than just another species.

The excitement about the Tiktaalik fossil is puzzling. Modern-day seals have fins and waddle around on the ground. Modern-day catfish have fins and walk around on the ground. Catfish can live out of water for a long time. Tiktaalik does not provide any support for evolution.

Evolutionists are now claiming that a dolphin captured with two little extra fins near the tail is proof that dolphins evolved from four-footed animals related to the dog.

"Experts believe that the dolphin's ancestor was a dog-like creature which roamed the earth many millions of years ago. And now the extraordinary discovery of a bottlenosed dolphin with an extra set of flippers has provided living proof of the theory. At first glance it looks like any other of its kind. But closer inspection reveals a rogue set of rear fins. Each the size of a human hand, the fins are thought to be the remains of a pair of hind legs, adding to evidence that dolphins once walked on all fours."

This is utter nonsense!

Scientific Fact No. 3 - Missing Inferior Evolutionary Branches

The Theory of Evolution states that minute improvements in an individual within a species increases the likelihood of survival of the offspring. These small steps of improvements continue for countless years until the individuals are changed to such a large extent that a new species has appeared.

This progression is an uninterrupted branch of the "evolutionary tree." These lines of progression can be seen in any biology text book for many species, including mankind. They almost look believable...

The siblings of an individual on the uninterrupted branch may fail to develop the minute improvement and may even suffer from an inferior evolutionary change. Each of these individuals represents a new branch on the tree that is moving away from the uninterrupted branch.

Let us say we have 100,000 coexisting individuals in a species such as a horse. Only a few of these individuals will begin new branches that will eventually become a new species such as a Zebra.

The other 99,999 individuals may each begin a neutral or inferior branch that may continue for millions of years but will eventually stop, because the last individual on the branch fails to produce an offspring.

The odds that the branch will stop producing offspring is increased when the minute evolutionary changes are inferior. The theory of survival of the fittest or natural selection also works in reverse to produce death to the branch where the changes are inferior. The branch stops. This part of the tree is dead.

We see in Scientific Fact No. 2 above that the missing intermediary individuals in the branch of the evolutionary tree present a serious problem for the Theory of Evolution. One superior individual of the 100,000 is missing, but now we have an even more serious defect in the theory. Where are the 99,999 inferior branches? How could 99,999 branches go missing?

Actually, the fossil record shows that everything is missing. No individuals of the species existed. None. Most layers of the earth's crust are completely devoid of all life, but then a layer will appear that is teeming with an absolute abundance of separate species, each containing millions of individuals.

This hypothesis of the "missing inferior evolutionary branches" was developed and posted here by the author, Kent R. Rieske, on March 21, 2008.

Thousands of biology professors at universities around the world, including Darwin, have completely missed this serious deficiency in the fossil record, because they have only been searching for the superior evolutionary branches, not the inferior branches.

Where are the fossils of horses with weak bones that fractured early in life and thereby prevented an offspring from continuing the branch? They don't exist, but they should if the Theory of Evolution was true. In fact, the fossil record should be full of dead branches, which is not. The fossil record simply shows individual species that have become extinct.

Scientific Fact No. 4 - Single Cell Complexity Proves Evolution is Wrong

Scientists a century ago believed the smallest single living cell was a simple life form. The theory developed that perhaps lightning struck a pond of water, causing several molecules to combine in a random way, which by chance resulted in a living cell. The cell then divided and evolved into higher life forms.

This view is now proven to be immature to the degree of being ridiculous. The most modern laboratory is unable to create a living cell. In fact, scientists have been unable to create a single left-hand protein molecule as found in all animals.

The Theory of Evolution claims that organic life was created from inorganic matter. That is impossible. The top scientists in the world with unlimited laboratory resources cannot change inorganic matter into a single organic living cell.

The smallest living cell has the complexity of a Boeing 747 jumbo jet airplane. The components of the smallest living cell have the obvious arrangement showing intelligent design, just as the Boeing 747 did not appear from random parts stacked near each other in a junk yard. The minimal cell contains more than 60,000 proteins of 100 different configurations.

The smallest single-cell creature has millions of atoms forming millions of molecules that must each be arranged in an exact pattern to provide the required functions.

The cell has an energy-producing system, a protective housing, a security system to let molecules into and out of the housing, a reproductive system, and a central control system. This complexity required an intelligent design. It is much too complex to happen by chance.

Evolution: A Theory in Crisis by Michael Denton page 263;

The odds that the correct proteins could somehow come together in a functional configuration to make a living cell are so high that it will never happen. The concept that anything can be accomplished by chance given enough time is false. (...)

Darwin's "Tree of Life"

Charles Darwin made a sketch in his notebook in about July 1837 that has come to be known as the Tree of Life. Darwin developed the Tree of Life theory, claiming that some species were lower in the branches of the tree and evolved into the upper branches. He selected species that looked similar to each other and placed them together, like placing the zebra below the horse.

Charles Darwin knew nothing about DNA, the true scientific key to life. He had no concept whatsoever regarding the complexity of DNA. Life did not originate by the accidental sticking together of a few molecules as Darwin taught.

Darwin did not know that the key to a person's identity (DNA) is locked solid in every cell of the body. The DNA does not change because of external adaptation to the environment as taught by Darwin and still falsely taught in universities by biology professors.

The DNA changes only when an egg and sperm are joined to form a new DNA with chromosomes coming from the male and female donors.

The DNA of the baby is strictly controlled by the parents' chromosomes. It cannot be changed by external environmental influences either. The DNA of all life forms, including plants and trees, absolutely destroys Darwin's Theory of Evolution by Natural Selection. Environmental influence does not change the DNA in plants, animals or humans.

Scientists have now solidly proven that 80% of the life forms in Darwin's Tree of Life have DNA much different from the adjacent lower DNA and could not have evolved from the predecessor.

Some animals have DNA sequences that are identical to sequences in plant DNA, but they obviously could not be related according to the Theory of Evolution.

Intelligent Design can be Seen in the Smallest Bacteria and the Largest Galaxy

The scientific study of complex biological structures has made enormous strides in revealing Intelligent design in nature.

One example is the motor and propeller propulsion system, called a bacterial flagellum, found in many bacteria, including the common E. coli. The propulsion system of the bacteria has 40 moving parts made from protein molecules, including a motor, rotor, stator, drive shaft, bushings, universal joint, and flexible propeller.

The motor is powered by ions and can rotate at up to 100,000 rpm. It can reverse direction in only 1/4 of a revolution and has an automatic feedback control mechanism.

The size is 1/100,000 of an inch (1/4,000 mm) in width, much too small to see with the human eye. One cannot deny the obvious conclusion that this system has an Intelligent Designer.

Molecular Motors in Bacterium - University of Michigan;

"The ATP Synthase motor has the classic stator and rotor structure familiar in man-made motors. It spans a cellular membrane which admits protons (H⁺) one at a time. For each proton, the motor turns once, adding a phosphate to adenosine di-phosphate and converting it to adenosine tri-phosphate, the universal fuel source of cells."

Molecular Motor in Algae Cells Work Together - Science Daily - February 25, 2009;

Scientific Fact No. 5 - Human Egg and Sperm Prove Evolution is Wrong

The evolutionist ignores the problem surrounding the human female egg and the male sperm in the evolutionary theory. The human female like other mammals has XX sex chromosomes, and the male has XY sex chromosomes.

The female egg contains the X-chromosome, and the male sperm contains either an X-chromosome for the reproduction of a female or a Y-chromosome for the reproduction of a male.

The female eggs all develop within the ovaries while she is a baby (fetus) within her mother's womb. Evolutionists claim environmental factors cause small changes in the offspring in the evolutionary chain.

However, the environmental experience of the female cannot change the chromosomes within her eggs and cannot have any effect upon her offspring. Her body cannot go into the eggs contained within her ovaries at her birth to make an intelligent genetic change.

Females cannot be a part of the evolutionary theory for these reasons.

The male sperm are created very differently from the female egg. The sperm are created in the testes of a male on a daily basis. This short time period between the creation of the sperm and conception within the female precludes any possibility that the male can be a part of the evolutionary process.

A harsh winter, or some other environmental condition does not affect the testes in any way that would alter the chromosomes in the sperm. Therefore, the male could not possibly contribute to evolutionary change caused by the environment. This fact applies to humans as well as all other mammals.

There are no ways possible whereby environmental adaptation could occur through the male part of the chromosome. Neither is there any scientific evidence that environmental experiences change the genetic code within the sperm.

Males cannot be a part of the evolutionary process for these reasons. These scientific facts prove evolution of the human species caused by environmental adaptation or any other reason is impossible.

Alexander: In my opinion, there is not enough evidence to support the author's conclusion regarding "Scientific Fact No. 5." Based on my knowledge, the DNA, which is the software of all living things, can bring improvements to a species, though I agree that it cannot change it into an entirely different kind. The DNA is also responsible for our appearance, otherwise we would all look the same.

The fact that the DNA works as a software, making humans — for example — better adapted to the environment, can be easily proven.

Those who walk bare foot develop extra layers of skin on their soles, or those who work the land with their hands, develop extra layers of skin on their palms. Increased resistance to cold can be observed in the descendants of the nomadic tribes, such as gypsies, even though they are no longer living in harsh conditions.

In conclusion, based on my knowledge, improvements are to be expected, but never radical mutations which would result into an entirely different kind.

Scientific Fact No. 6 - DNA Error Checking Proves Evolution is Wrong

The scientific fact that DNA replication, including a built-in error checking method and a DNA repair process, proves the evolutionary theory is wrong. The fact is, any attempt by the DNA to change is stopped and reversed.

Chromosomes, Chromatin, DNA Replication and Repair;

Replication also contains built-in error checking. The frequency of errors is about 1 per 100 million bonds (1×10^{-8}). Over the entire human genome, that works out to roughly 30 errors every single time the genome replicates.”

BUT! There are really only around three errors per replication because of DNA repair. If a repair enzyme finds a mistake, it can fix it, and it can tell which strand is wrong because it can tell which strand is the newly synthesized strand by at the extent of cytosine methylation.

As DNAs exist in cells, many of the cytosines have a methyl group added to them by enzymes called methylases. A new DNA will have relatively few methylated cytosines because it has not been around long enough to have picked up that many methyl groups.

Without DNA repair there can be some major problems. Xeroderma pigmentosum is a serious ailment caused by mutations in the gene for DNA repair. People with xp develop many skin tumors and other problems because of the number of errors in their DNA.

Mutation, Mutagens, and DNA Repair Outline.

Mutations (DNA replication errors) are the result of DNA that is replicated with damage that passes on to the offspring. Mutations are very rare because of DNA checking and repair. However, one in every ten million duplications of a DNA molecule can result in a mutation (error).

The mutation changes are random, unpredictable errors that cause crippling diseases, loss of function and the destruction of the host person or animal. Mutations destroy the species. They do not improve the species. Mutations never lead to a new species as falsely claimed by evolutionists.

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences;

Evolutionists believe in the "mutation theory" for the origin of the many species. (...) They believe that the "time god" makes mistake after mistake after mistake until VOILA -- we have a hummingbird that can fly backwards.

They claim that multiple mutation mistakes eventually led to humans with color vision that can focus at different lengths and two eyes that are coordinated by the brain in order to judge distances.

Scientific Fact No. 7 - Chaos From Organization Proves Evolution is Wrong

The second law of thermodynamics proves that organization cannot flow from chaos. Complex live organisms cannot rearrange themselves into an organism of a higher form as claimed by evolutionists. This is scientifically backwards according to the second law of thermodynamics, which has never been proven wrong.

The universe is slowing down to a lower state, not higher. The genes of plants, insects, animals, and humans are continually becoming defective, not improving. Species are becoming extinct, not evolving. Order will always move naturally towards disorder or chaos.

Quoting from the book, Evolution and Human Destiny, by Kohler,

"One of the most fundamental maxims of the physical sciences is the trend toward greater randomness - the fact that, on the average, things will get into disorder rather than into order if left to themselves. This is essentially the statement that is embodied in the Second Law of Thermodynamics."

This scientific law actually refutes and contradicts the Theory of Evolution in its entirety.

Scientific Fact No. 8 - Chromosome Count Proves Evolution is Wrong

There is no scientific evidence that a species can change the number of chromosomes within the DNA. The chromosome count within each species is fixed. This is the reason a male from one species cannot mate successfully with a female of another species. Man could not evolve from a monkey.

Each species is locked into its chromosome count that cannot be changed. If an animal developed an extra chromosome or lost a chromosome because of some deformity, it could not successfully mate. The defect could not be passed along to the next generation.

Evolving a new species is scientifically impossible.

(For example) a dog has only 22 chromosomes, whereas a monkey has 54 and a cat has 38. Half of the total number of chromosomes are contained in the female reproductive cells and half are contained in the male, so the exact total number is brought together in the offspring.

Humans have 46 chromosomes. This chromosome count is a steady factor. This determines what is called the "fixity of species" because the chromosome count doesn't vary. People always give birth

to people. Dogs always give birth to dogs, etc. The genes can produce variety within the species but cannot result in a different species. (Alexander: Exactly my point below "Fact No. 5").

Genes allow for people to be short, tall, fat, thin, blond, brunette, etc., but they are still all human beings. The chromosomes make crossing of the species an un-crossable barrier. This certainly would hinder any evolution. Dogs cannot breed with cats. This fact stops evolution dead in its tracks.

Sometimes two species are close enough to crossbreed, but the offspring are usually sterile. This is the case when horses and donkeys crossbreed. A male donkey (jackass) and a female horse (mare) will produce a mule. Farmers often preferred mules as work animals prior to the development of the farm tractor.

A hinny is the offspring of a female donkey (jenny) and a male horse (stallion). The hinny and mule usually cannot produce offspring. These animals show that evolution is not possible.

Scientific Fact No. 9 - Origin of Matter and Stars Proves Evolution is Wrong

Evolutionists just throw up their hands at the question of the origin of matter because they know something cannot evolve from nothing. They stick their heads in the sand and ignore the problem.

The fact that matter exists in outrageously large quantities simply proves evolution is wrong. The "Big Bang Theory" doesn't solve the problem either. Matter and energy have to come from somewhere.

What does the theory of evolution need to explain?

If biologists propose the evolution of life (by natural processes and mutations) then the scientific community (scientists who study cosmology and abiogenesis) need to be able to explain how the raw materials (the earth, the sun and the first cell) essential for the evolution of life came into being. If you have no sun, earth or first cell we can have no evolution of life.

In the evolutionist framework, the sun, the earth and the first cell came about by random, mindless, blind and unguided processes. Random, mindless, blind and unguided processes never achieve anything.

In natural selection, the environment affects the gene frequency in a population. Even so, natural selection is a mindless and blind process acting on mutations which are random, mindless and blind.

Evolution (which is mindless and blind) will never achieve anything.

Read our answer to the question: "Does evolution of life in reality have anything more than just 'sheer higgledy-piggledy luck'?"

EVIDENCE 1: The universe could NOT have created itself nor has it always existed

a. The universe could NOT have created itself

In his latest book, misleadingly entitled *The Grand Design*, Steven Hawking makes the adventurous claim that "because there is a law such as gravity, the universe can and will create itself from nothing." Think about that.

Dr. John Lennox (Professor in Mathematics at Oxford University) acknowledges that Hawking is a brilliant theoretical physicist but responds to Hawking's assertion that "the universe can and will create itself from nothing" with; "That sounds to me like something out of Alice in Wonderland ... it's not science!"

Lennox explains by saying; "If I say "X creates X," I presuppose the existence of X in order to account for the existence of X. To presuppose the existence of the universe to account for its existence is logically incoherent." Or put simply; "From nothing, nothing comes!" or "No-thing cannot do anything!"

In relation to Hawking's latest idea Dr. Lennox rightly concludes; "What this all goes to show is that nonsense remains nonsense, even when talked by world-famous scientists".

The universe cannot have created itself!

Ravi Zacharias and John Lennox discuss Stephen's Hawking's ideas in his latest book entitled The Grand Design

b. The universe could NOT have always existed

The idea that the universe has always been in existence has been thoroughly rejected on scientific grounds. The Laws of Thermodynamics show the universe must have had a beginning.

The First Law of Thermodynamics says that there is only a finite amount of energy and the Second Law says that the amount of available energy is continually decreasing. If the universe had existed forever, all the available existing energy would have already been used up.

THE ONLY LOGICAL CONCLUSION

The only logical / scientific explanation for the existence of the universe is that it was created by an outside intelligence.

EVIDENCE 2: The Second Law of Thermodynamics says no!

The Second Law of Thermodynamics tells us that a system will always go from order to disorder unless there is a plan or outside intelligence to organize it.

World-renowned evolutionist Isaac Asimov when discussing the Second Law of Thermodynamics said:

"Another way of stating the second law then is: 'The universe is constantly getting more disorderly!'" Viewed that way we can see the second law all about us. We have to work hard to straighten a room, but left to itself it becomes a mess again very quickly and very easily. Even if we never enter it, it becomes dusty and musty. How difficult to maintain houses, and machinery, and our own bodies in perfect working order: how easy to let them deteriorate. In fact, all we have to do is nothing, and everything deteriorates, collapses, breaks down, wears out, all by itself - and that is what the second law is all about."

As Isaac Asimov says, everything becomes 'a mess ... deteriorates, collapses, breaks down, wears out, all by itself'. Now in complete opposition to one of most firmly established laws in science (the Second Law of Thermodynamics), people who support the theory of Evolution would have us believe that things become more organised and complex when left to themselves!

Some people argue that the earth is an open system and therefore the Second Law of Thermodynamics does not apply. Simply pouring in energy (sunlight) into the earth does not override the Second Law of Thermodynamics. As shown in Isaac Asimov's quote above, the Second Law still applies on earth. Pouring energy into a system makes things more disordered!

The brilliant scientist Lord Kelvin who actually formulated the Second Law of Thermodynamics says for very good scientific reasons; "Overwhelming strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie around us ... the atheistic idea is so non-sensical that I cannot put it into words."

As Dr John Ross of Harvard University rightly states:"... there are no known violations of the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Ordinarily the second law is stated for isolated systems, but the second law applies equally well to open systems. ..."

Evolution has no plan or outside intelligence and, according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, can never take place.

Second Law of Thermodynamics - Does this basic law of nature prevent Evolution?

EVIDENCE 3. Living Things Never Arise from Non-living Things

To produce a living thing you must start with a living thing.

Evolution requires non-living matter to turn into a living organism and this has never been observed.

A Biology textbook puts it like this: "As we have seen, the life of every organism comes from its parents or parent. Does life ever spring from nonliving matter? We can find no evidence of this happening. So far as we can tell, life comes only from life. Biologists call this the principal of biogenesis."

So when it comes to real science (i.e. things we can actually establish by observation and experiment) life always comes from life! Evolutionists insist life came from nonliving matter but they have no way of proving this. Just saying something repeatedly doesn't make it true!

Why Is Abiogenesis Impossible?

EVIDENCE 4: Complex Systems do not evolve 'bit by bit'

In the following quote, Darwin himself acknowledges the logical absurdity of a complex organ like the eye being formed using the natural processes he was suggesting in his theory. Darwin's own deductive reasoning should have caused him to reject his own theory but sadly it did not and Darwin continued to promote his theory of trying to explain the complexity of life using natural processes only.

We are NOT saying that the following quote was Darwin's conclusion but that it should have been Darwin's conclusion.

Darwin said: "To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree."

No mechanism has been put forward that even begins to explain how something like the human eye could have been produced by time, chance, natural selection and mutation.

A baby needs a number of very complex, interdependent systems to live and survive. These systems include the nervous, digestive, excretory, circulatory, skeletal, muscular and an immune system. For the baby to survive and live each system requires all the other systems to be functioning. Therefore all these systems must be in operation at the same time and could not have evolved slowly over millions of years. Think of the amazing intricacy of the male reproductive system coming about by time, chance and random mutation. It would need to be fully functional all along the evolutionary timeline so that reproduction could continue. And remember this highly unlikely progression would be pointless unless the female reproductive system had randomly evolved in perfect sync to compliment the developing male system so they both worked in harmony over the millions of years of evolutionary refinement! Of course, this logic applies to all the other species on earth as well.

There is no evidence anywhere of the evolution of such systems. More than that, not even any hypothetical process can be thought of to explain how something like the brain and the digestive system could have evolved bit by bit over time!

Can evolution be the source of life in all its complexity?

EVIDENCE 5: The Missing Links are Still Missing

If evolution was true, there should be large numbers of intermediate fossil organisms present in the fossil record. Despite over a hundred years of intensive world wide research into the fossil record, the 'missing links' are still well and truly 'missing'.

Evolutionists such as Stephen Jay Gould reluctantly concede this when they say, "The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not based on the evidence of fossils."

What does the fossil record teach us about evolution?

Who's who & what's what in the world of "missing" links?

Is there fossil evidence of 'missing links' between humans and apes?

Did ancient humans live millions of years ago?

EVIDENCE 6: Mutations are contrary to Evolution

Natural selection (better adapted organisms surviving to pass on genetic material) cannot produce evolution because it produces no NEW genetic material. Mutations are random changes in the genetic makeup of organisms. Evolutionists say that mutations supply the new genes needed for evolution to proceed.

For over 1500 generations, fruit flies have been subjected to radiation and chemicals.⁴ This caused mutations in the flies. If you take a human generation to be 25 years, this is equal to around 37 500 years (1500 x 25) in human terms. What happened to these mutated flies over this time? Firstly, they were still flies and had not evolved into anything else! Secondly the flies as a population were worse off with many dying, having curly wings or stubby wings.

Mutations are an example of the Second Law of Thermodynamics (when things are left to themselves they become more disordered over time). It is amazing that evolutionists would put forward mutations as the mechanism by which evolution could somehow take place!

A person with one sickle-cell anaemia gene (a mutation) and malaria has more chance of surviving malaria than a person without the mutated gene. Evolutionists point to this as evolution in action. Read more on malaria / sickle-cell anaemia

Evolution (things becoming more ordered) and mutations (things becoming more disordered) are processes going in opposite directions!

Mutations are not a friend of evolution but an enemy that ultimately cuts the theory down and destroys it!

Can genetic mutations produce positive changes in living creatures?

EVIDENCE 7: Probability Facts are also contrary to Evolution

Evolutionists such as Sir Fred Hoyle concede this when they say "The chance that higher life forms might have emerged in this way (time and chance) is comparable with the chance that 'a tornado sweeping through a junk-yard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein.'"

In a desperate attempt to override the very powerful argument that life could never arise by chance, Richard Dawkins conjectures that "If the odds of life originating spontaneously on a planet were a billion to one against ..."

A billion to one is only 1 in 10 to the 9th power. BUT the probability of even one single protein molecule consisting of 200 amino acids arising spontaneously by chance is 1 in 10 raised to power of 260. This is calculated by raising 20 (the number of different types amino acids available) to the power of 200 (the number of amino acids in the protein chain). Even if the whole universe was packed with amino acids combining frantically for billions of years, it would not produce even one such protein molecule let alone produce a living cell.

Read our answer to the question: "Does evolution of life in reality have anything more than just 'sheer higgledy-piggledy luck'?"

Let's now put this in its larger context. Proteins are 'made' by genes in the cell.

- The average human gene consists of 3000 bases, but sizes vary greatly, with the largest known human gene being dystrophin at 2.4 million bases.
- The total number of human genes is estimated at 30,000.
- * The human genome has some 3 billion DNA base pairs. Except for mature red blood cells, all human cells contain a complete genome!
- The constellation of all proteins in a cell is called its proteome. Unlike the relatively unchanging genome, the dynamic proteome changes from minute to minute in response to tens of thousands of intra- and extracellular environmental signals. A protein's chemistry and behavior are specified by the gene sequence and by the number and identities of other proteins made in the same cell at the same time and with which it associates and reacts.

- Finally, It is estimated that the human body may contain over two million different proteins, each with a unique function.

There is no chance that the human body could have come about by chance!

Probability Arguments in Why Is Abiogenesis Impossible?

Great scientists from the past and present talk on Evolution and God

How Antony Flew (an outspoken atheist for 60 years) came to believe there is a God

Four Things That Two Ex Sceptics Got Wrong

GREAT SCIENTISTS FROM THE PAST

C.S. Lewis showed the very strong connection between the development of modern scientific thought and the belief the scientists held in a Creator (Lawgiver). "Men became scientific because they expected law in nature and they expected law in nature because they believed in a lawgiver."

"Overwhelming strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie around us ... the atheistic idea is so non-sensical that I cannot put it into words." (Lord Kelvin)

"I am a Christian ... I believe only and alone ... in the service of Jesus Christ ... In Him is all refuge, all solace." (Johannes Kepler)

"The more I study nature, the more I stand amazed at the work of the Creator. Science brings men nearer to God." (Louis Pasteur). Pasteur strongly opposed Darwin's theory of evolution because he felt it did not conform to the scientific evidence.

Robert Boyle believed in Jesus Christ's "Passion, His death, His resurrection and ascension, and all of those wonderful works which He did during His stay upon earth, in order to confirm the belief of His being God as well as man."

"Order is manifestly maintained in the universe ... the whole being governed by the sovereign will of God." (James Prescott Joule)

"There are those who argue that the universe evolved out a random process, but what random process could produce the brain of man or the system of the human eye?" (Wernher Von Braun)

"Almighty Creator and Preserver of all things, praised be all Thou has created." (Carl Linnaeus)

"I am a believer in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity." (Sir Joseph Lister)

"Atheism is so senseless. When I look at the solar system, I see the earth at the right distance from the sun to receive the proper amounts of heat and light. This did not happen by chance." "The true God is a living, intelligent and powerful being." (Sir Isaac Newton)

Michael Faraday was careful to "Thank God, first, for all His gifts."

Taken from the book 21 Great Scientists Who Believed the Bible by Ann Lamont published by Answers in Genesis, P.O. Box 6302, Acacia Ridge D.C., Queensland, 4110, Australia, 1995.

PRESENT DAY PhD SCIENTISTS

"The evidence points to an intelligent designer of the vast array of life, both living and extinct, rather than to unguided mindless evolution." (Nancy M Darrall, Speech Therapist at the Bolton Community Health Care Trust in the UK. She holds a PhD in Botany from the University of Wales.)

"Evolutionary theories of the universe cannot counteract the above arguments for the existence of God." (John M Cimbala, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Pennsylvania State University. John holds a PhD in Aeronautics.)

"The correspondence between the global catastrophe in the geological record and the Flood described in Genesis is much too obvious for me to conclude that these events must be one and the same." (John R Baumgardner, Technical Staff Member in the Theoretical Division of Los Alamos National Laboratory. John holds a PhD in Geophysics and Space Physics from UCLU.)

"We have already seen that no such system could possibly appear by chance. Life in its totality must have been created in the beginning, just as God told us." (John P Marcus, Research Officer at the Cooperative Research Centre for Tropical Plant Pathology, University of Queensland, Australia. John holds a PhD in Biological Chemistry from the University of Michigan.)

"The fossil record is considered to be the primary evidence for evolution, yet it does not demonstrate a complete chain of life from simple forms to complex." (Larry Vardiman, Professor from the Department of Astro-Geophysics for Creation Research, USA. Larry holds a PhD in Atmospheric Science from Colorado State University.)

"I ... have no hesitation in rejecting the evolutionary hypothesis of origins and affirming the biblical alternative that 'in six days the Lord God created the heavens and earth and all that in them is'. (Dr Taylor is senior lecturer in Electrical Engineering at the University of Liverpool. Dr Taylor has a PhD in Electrical Engineering and has authored over 80 scientific articles.)

"I believe God provides evidence of His creative power for all to experience personally in our lives. To know the Creator does not require an advanced degree in science or theology." (Timothy G Standish is an Associate Professor of Biology at Andrews University in the USA. Dr Standish holds a PhD in Biology and Public Policy from George Mason University, USA.)

"At the same time I found I could reject evolution and not commit intellectual suicide, I began to realise I could also accept a literal creation and still not commit intellectual suicide." (AJ Monty White, Student Advisor, Dean of Students Office, at the University of Cardiff, UK. Dr White holds a PhD in the field of Gas Kinetics.)

"So life did not arise by natural processes, nor could the grand diversity of life have arisen through no-intelligent natural processes (evolution). Living things were created by God, as the Bible says." (Don Batten, a research scientist for Answer in Genesis in Australia. Dr Batten holds a PhD in Plant Physiology from the University of Sydney and worked for 18 years as a research scientist with the New South Wales Department of Agriculture.)

"In the words of the well-known scientist, Robert Jastrow, 'for the scientist who has lived by faith in the power of reason, the story [of the quest for the answers about the origin of life and the universe] ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries.'" (Jerry R Bergman, Instructor of Science at Northwest State College,

Archbold, Ohio. He holds a PhD in Evaluation and Research from Wayne State University and a PhD in Human Biology from Columbia Pacific University.)

Taken from the book *In Six Days* (why 50 scientists choose to believe in creation) edited by John F Ashton PhD, New Holland Publishers, 1999.

(10,754)