

Why Organic Evolution is not Scientific

- I. "Proofs" for Evolution
 - A. Natural Selection and Genetic Drift
 - B. Mutations
- II. Things Evolution Can't Explain
 - A. Origin of the first life
 - B. Bent Sedimentary Rock layers
 - C. Marsupial Animals
 - D. Fossils
 - E. Salt and Mud
 - F. Non-incremental changes
 - G. Missing Links
 - 1. Nebraska Man
 - 2. Java Man
 - 3. Piltdown Man
 - 4. Zinjanthropus
 - H. Ancient art
 - I. Migration
 - 1. Birds
 - 2. Monarchs

Why Organic Evolution is not Scientific

Today many people believe in organic evolution. Charles Darwin is called the father of evolution. He came up with the theory of natural selection in 1837 after his trip to the Galapagos islands. In 1859 he wrote the book, *The Origin of Species*, which popularized the theory of organic evolution. Organic Evolution is the belief that all life on earth came from a single-celled organism that came to be from a primordial soup. Through billions of years this organism has evolved into all the animals and plants that we see today. This goes against the Bible and science. In this paper we will focus on the scientific problems of organic evolution.

The first thing we need to look at are the things that scientists use to "prove" evolution. Some of the things they say prove evolution are natural selection, genetic drift, and mutations.

Natural Selection is the process by which natural forces cause living organisms over a period of many generations to lose un-beneficial features while retaining beneficial ones. Natural Selection does occur. Scientists can show how natural selection causes change within a kind. The problem is that natural selection has never been shown to cause one kind to change into another kind. Natural selection chooses between already existing genetic codes, it also assumes the existence of a living reproducing cell. Genetic drift is also used by scientists to explain organic evolution, but this has the same problem as natural selection. Genetic drift can only work with the genes that are already present.

In order to explain the origin of new genetic code, scientists look to mutations. Mutations are caused by mistakes in DNA duplication. So far no one has discovered a single mutation that has been totally beneficial. For this to be a proof for evolution there would have to be real examples of beneficial mutations, not just theoretical ones. Even if a completely

beneficial mutation was found, it would still be hard to imagine millions and trillions of totally beneficial mutations.

Not only do these "proofs" for evolution not prove evolution, but there are also many scientific facts that go against the theory of organic evolution. For example, evolution doesn't have an even slightly reasonable explanation for the origin of the first life. How can you make life from stuff that has never had life in the first place? According to most evolutionists all life came from an amoeba or bacteria. But where did that amoeba get its life from? Some say lightning hit a chemical pond and that made life. But doesn't that sound a bit far fetched? Even an amoeba is a super complicated organism. The probability of an amoeba forming completely by accident is microscopic. Even with all the knowledge scientists have about such things, they can not make an amoeba. How can we think something that scientists are not able to form, could be formed completely by accident? Natural selection can't explain the first living organism because the process of natural selection depends on reproduction. Proteins that can not reproduce themselves can not survive to make themselves more complex. Everything in nature gets old and falls apart.

Another thing organic evolution doesn't explain is the bent rock layers. Evolution says that the rock layers were formed through millions of years. That would mean lower layers would already be hard long before the upper layers were deposited. But scientists have found sedimentary rock layers many strata thick that are bent into hairpin turns, with no cracks or breaks. If they were already hard, they wouldn't just bend. They would crack and break. So in order to bend the layers would have had to be still soft, when the bending took place. A massive flood would create many strata over a short period of time, and allow the strata to bend without breaking or cracking. However, the idea that strata were formed over millions of years is a foundational doctrine of evolution. So evolution doesn't have a reasonable answer for these bent rock layers, but the biblical flood could explain this very easily.

Fossils are often used by scientists to prove their theory. Fossils are also something that shows that evolution is false. Scientists have found prints of humans and dinosaurs together, in the same rock. Places like Dinosaur Valley try to hide the evidence and explain it away. They say things

like "the human footprints are fake or smudged dinosaur prints." There are also human footprints in the Cretaceous strata, 135,000,000 B.C. There are human-like sandal prints in Cambrian strata, 600,000,000 BC. If you stepped in wet clay the clay would compress and displace. Scientists cut the footprints to see if they were real, and the clay beneath the heel was more compact than the clay around the outside of the footprint. This shows that these footprints are real and not fake. These can't be dinosaur footprints because you can see that underneath the footprint is the same shape as the footprint even with individual toe prints. Some people still try to explain this away by saying the footprints doesn't look exactly like a human foot. But some test about human footprints show that people running and walking make the same shape footprint as the fossilized footprints that have been found.

The strata has 'mistakes' some animal fossils are in strata that does not match the evolutionary theory. But there is a good explanation for these problems, the Flood. The animals at the bottom of the strata layers were primarily slow water animals. Then came fast water animals then slow land animals, and after that the fast land animals. Birds and flying creatures would also be early in the strata because the rain would knock them down.

The amount of mud on the ocean floor also contradicts evolution. There is not nearly enough mud on the ocean floor if the world was billions of years old. Every year 25 billion tons of dust and mud are dumped in the ocean by water and wind. But the average depth is less than 400 meters of mud on the ocean floor. The main way known to remove a lot of mud from the ocean floor is tectonic subduction. But this only removes 1 billion tons of mud per year, but this leaves 24 billion tons per year. If this rate continued for 3 billion years then there would be dozens of kilometers of mud on the ocean floor.

There is also far too little salt in the ocean considering the age of the ocean according to the theory of evolution. Every year 450 million tons of sodium are poured into the ocean by rivers and other sources. Only 27% of the salt gets back out of the ocean each year. Scientists believe that long ago the salt input was slower and has grown greater over time. But even when the calculations are very generous in favor of an older ocean, the maximum age of the ocean would be around 62 million years. However according to the evolutionary theory the earth is at least 3 billion years old.

Evolution teaches that all living things were made through small

incremental steps that were all beneficial. This is impossible because many things have what is called irreducible complexity. Irreducible complexity means that something wouldn't still function if it were less complicated. The flagella motor has 40 complex proteins that independently or put in the wrong order would no longer be beneficial. Going from not having a flagella motor to having one is a huge step and there is no way to do this in small beneficial steps.

According to evolution, every incremental change was beneficial. This should mean that simple life forms should have gone extinct while there should be many transitional forms of complex organisms. Evolutionists recognize this difficult and spend a lot of effort looking for these "missing links." However most of the "missing links" which people have claimed to find, been shown to be false. This is a real problem to the evolutionary theory. If evolution were true, many of these "missing links" should still exist today. Let's examine some of the "missing links" scientists have discovered, and what they really were.

Nebraska Man and all his relatives were created from a tooth. Scientists said they knew all about him, what he looked like, and when he lived. Later scientists discovered he was made from one pig's tooth.

Java Man was reported to be a perfect skull of a prehistoric man. Who walked erect and had a tail. This was put in text books and is still in text books and encyclopedias today. 32 years after the discovery of Java man, Dr. Ales Hrdlicka revealed that the "Perfect Skull" was actually the knee bone of an extinct elephant. But for over 30 years this was considered a proof for evolution.

41 years after Piltdown Man was 'discovered' he was showed to be a fraud. Piltdown Man was created in 1912. He was made of chimpanzee, orangutan, and human bones.

Zinjanthropus was discovered in 1959 by Dr. Leakey. He said that they had found a "remarkably well preserved" skull, and that it was 1,750,000 years old. This "well preserved skull" was actually in more than 400 pieces. Dr. Leakey later said it was a mistake, his "find" was actually a "non-human vegetarian."

Charles Darwin himself realized the problem that "missing links" gave his theory when he said, "Why, if species have descended from other species

by fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion, instead of the species being as we see them, well defined?" Francis Crick, famous for DNA research said "Biologists must constantly keep in mind that what they see was not designed, but evolved."

Evolution says that dinosaurs went extinct long before people evolved. But there are many things that say that people and dinosaurs did live together. In some ancient tombs in Peru some textiles with living dinosaurs show that the Nasca people saw and lived with dinosaurs. There are also many very old pots and burial stones with pictures of dinosaurs. If these people had not seen living dinosaurs then how would they have known what dinosaurs looked like and been able to weave and draw dinosaurs if they had not seen them with their own eyes. There are also many Incan burial stones with dinosaur pictures in them.

Evolution tries to explain why animals migrate by saying that for example there was a bird in Texas, and one year it was really cold so the bird flew down to Mexico for the winter and then went back to Texas. Then there was an especially hot summer and so the bird flew north and slowly the distance he flew grew greater and greater until he went to the north and south poles each year. But the Pacific Golden Plover goes from Alaska to the exact same spot in Hawaii every single year. This little bird weighs one half pound but they eat and gain weight until they are 70 grams and burns about 1 gram of fat per mile but it is 88 miles to Hawaii so this bird will drop into the ocean a few hours short of their destination. These birds fly in Vs and alternate the leader so that they don't run out of energy. What the leader does is break the airwaves and that makes it easier for the others. But there is no way for this bird to slowly go farther and farther each year until they reach their destination. All there is between them and their destination is ocean. Their land spot is only a few miles wide so if they miss it they will just fall into the ocean. Their destination would have already had to of been set in their minds.

Monarch butterflies also migrate great distances. Every few generations fly to Mexico and the next generation flies back. These butterflies fly from Mexico to the United States in one generation and back several generations later. But how would the butterflies know to go back to

the same spot if they have never been there before.

Not only are the so-called proofs for evolution not proof, but there are many scientific facts that contradict evolution.

More interesting facts

- the coelacanths supposed to be extinct 70,000,000 years was found in the Indian Ocean in 1938, hundreds have been caught and sold.
- In 1968 a trilobite is found with human footprints, one was actually crushed under the heel of a shoe print.
- People learn languages from other humans, and there is no proof of language evolving so the first person would have had to know how to speak.
- If evolution happened on earth than shouldn't it have happened at least simply on the moon or mars?
- Why are animals going extinct instead of there being more animals evolving.
- Human minds already have the capability to speak but apes don't have the right tongue, their larynx is not low in their neck, and they could not understand grammar or vocabulary because their mind is not made for learning that.
- If macro evolution happened then you should be able to find life forms with 2,3,4,or 5 celled organisms. But there is single celled organisms and parasites have 6-20 cells.
- Butterflies start as caterpillars and then wrap themselves in a chrysalises and their complicated organs disintegrate and then 2 weeks later another complicated thing comes out of the cocoon and evolution says that this should cause the monarch butterflies' extinction.
- The arctic tern's round trip is 22,000 miles. The birds navigational equipment is like the equipment of a transcontinental airplane. But the terns's stuff is miniaturized, needs no work, cane reproduce, and the arctic tern doesn't even need training to use his equipment.
- Some Incan cloth has woven pictures of dinosaurs. There are also burial stones with dinosaurs drawn on them
- There are also cave drawings of dinosaurs proving these people had seen dinosaurs.
- There was a rubber-soled boot with a petrified cowboy leg in it found around 1980. The boot type wasn't made until early 1950's then that only took 30 years to get petrified. Evolutionists say it takes millions of years to petrify stuff. The boot wasn't fossilized. Some stuff fossilizes quicker than

others.