

EVOLUTION HAS BEEN DISPROVED

Brothers and Sisters, you came here to learn about evolution, and you will in a minute. But first, let me just tell you this – not just evolution, but ALL of the sciences, *ALL*, bear witness to our King.

For instance – **Cosmology**, has proven that the universe had a Beginning... (in other words at one time there was NOTHING.) And yet Julie Andrews sang (And **Quantum Physics** has since proven), that “Nothing comes from nothing, nothing ever could”... (and even Stephen Hawking couldn’t disprove her).

Therefore...well, you figure it out. ♪

The first claim of evolution

The first claim of evolution is that life can originate from nonlife. It was based on Darwin’s own description of living cells as extremely simple “blobs of jelly.” However, within the last 20 years science has revealed that even the simplest living cell is something like *a million times more complex than our greatest supercomputer...*

But here’s the kicker. Science has also discovered that all of this complexity in the first cell had to arise, *in its complete form, in one instant*. This is due to the irreducible complexity of the cell, and basically what it means is that the first cell’s complexity couldn’t have been “built up to” gradually. This is because, in the first place, none of a cell’s inner structures can exist on their own (thus

they cannot be waiting around in a “biotic soup”), in the second place, because none of a cell’s structures can replicate themselves, and in the third place, a cell needs to have all of its structures in order to live. Everything that makes up the cell – the DNA, the RNA, all the myriad organelles with all their vast and unimaginably precise innerworkings, had to arise *in one instant from that which bore absolutely no resemblance to it at all just a moment before*. When you understand the miracle of DNA, just to mention *one* of the parts that make the cell alive (and which itself is irreducibly complex), you realize that this chance creation is impossible. And yet, evolution **utterly** depends on it. End of story.

There have been experiments conducted in which a simple *protein* has been created in a laboratory. And evolutionists constantly point to this to distract attention away from the obvious impossibility of their case. But the creation of a protein is completely insignificant. First of all, proteins do not have DNA, and cannot replicate themselves. Thus, like the other parts of the cell, they cannot be waiting around in a “biotic soup” – they are going to have to be created *in that same instant* separately, just like the cell they are to join. Second of all, the protein able to be created in the laboratory is “right handed,” but only left handed proteins are part of living cells. Thirdly, there are about a hundred thousand different kinds of proteins present and necessary in a living cell, but only a few kinds have been created in the laboratory. And fourthly, a protein compares to a living cell in roughly the same proportions as a paragraph in a Sears catalogue compares to the library of congress...

Evolutionists, confronted with the absolute impossibility of life arising from nonlife, vacillate between completely avoiding the issue; throwing up the smokescreen of the protein they created; and saying “well, in *so many* millions of years, with *so many* ‘raw materials,’ who can say?...its closed minded to think its impossible...” They resort to unreason, delay tactics, and political correctness to avoid the truth.

The origin of Species

The second claim that evolution is built upon is that one species can become another.

This proposition of Darwin claimed that evolution moved forward by “natural selection,” with the fittest members of a species passing on their genes, and over time transforming their species into another. But (unbeknownst to the public) **this is no longer even considered by evolutionists themselves to be possible.** Natural Selection and survival of the fittest are no longer even on the table.

The reason for their demise is simple – genetic science has revealed that they are not possible. **First of all**, Natural Selection only affects the gene pool within a species’ DNA, it does not affect the DNA molecule itself. In other words, tall members can mate with tall members ad infinitum, but all this does is act on the “tall capacity” already built into the “tall gene.” No new information is ever created, no new addition to the DNA, hence, no new species. Period (That’s what makes it possible for instance, for wolves to be bred down into chihuahuas, all the while staying canine,

and never becoming anything else). **Second of all**, Natural Selection as it has been observed, actually stabilizes a species, and increases its chances for adaptation/survival as a species when confronted by various environmental factors. In other words, Natural Selection is *conservative*, not innovative. Nevertheless, evolutionists continue to point to adaptation in flies, beaks of birds in the Galapagos, heights of plants placed into new climates, etc., as “evidence” for species transformation (because it still confuses the public, even though these are only evidences of adaptation *within* a species, a stabilizing factor).

With the demise of Natural Selection, most of the *new* evolutionary models rely on the effects of mutation for species change. Sounds impressive, but there are just a few things about this which evolutionists don't want you to know –

Mutations are characterized every time by a *loss* or *decay* of genetic information. Like Natural Selection, they never *add* information to the DNA Code. And yet, for one species to change into another, information must be added. Furthermore, mutations only occur in about 1 in every 100 million gametes, and are almost always *detrimental* to the possessor. Yet for one species to become another, it would take literally millions of *beneficial* mutations. In addition, DNA simply doesn't have the capacity to add information (nucleotides) to itself. Built in safety device...

DNA is, in many ways, *qualitatively*, not just quantitatively, different from one species to another. And no amount of special selection or mutation within a species can bridge this difference. The DNA molecule is replete

with what can only be described as amazing “integrity.” And there is as yet no mechanism put forth by which one species could become another...

The Fossil Record

Darwin stated that when paleontology really got going, the fossil record would “reveal so many transitional forms that you won’t be able to walk out your front door without tripping over them.” 150 years later, not one verified transitional form has been discovered. **This wouldn’t be possible if the Theory of Evolution (in any of its forms) was true.** There would be thousands of them...

On the contrary, what we find in the fossil record is that each species appears *suddenly, fully developed*, and fully a member of its species (they appear in the phase referred to as the Cambrian “explosion,” the earliest geologic phase). There are people who argue that some of the fossils discovered show evidence that transitional forms exist, but so far, their arguments have had no weight. If they had, we would no doubt have been made very familiar with them by now...(and yet, willingness of textbooks to create fanciful drawings, has, once again, left the public in the dark).

Faced with the dire state of the fossil record, evolutionists have modified their theory into many new and highly complex scenarios. The most noteworthy of these is the Punctuated Equilibrium Theory, put forth mainly by the

late Stephen Jay Gould. Aware of the dearth of fossil evidence for evolution, Gould basically said that species arise in *sudden bursts* of mutational transformation. The *speed* with which this happens is the reason why we can find no fossils of transitional forms...

This is the #1 apologetic going today for the sorry state of the fossil record. And it is absurd in the extreme. First, it's impossible. It flies, unheedingly and unapologetically, in the face of all genetic science, biological science, and natural science. And it flies in the face of all common sense, too – first Gould says that the reason we don't see any evidence for evolution occurring *today* is that it takes too *long* and happens in too rare a circumstance, and then he turns around and says that the reason we don't see any evidence for evolution in the fossil record is that it happens too *fast*, and too ubiquitously.

All the evidence, genetically and observationally, backs the Special Creation of species, all “created after their kind.”

p.s. The earth is not 4 billion years old, either... Let me explain. The primary method of measurement that scientists use to arrive at 4 billion years is the radioisotope method. This method measures the amount of *lead* that is present in igneous rocks – the assumption being that, since uranium decays into lead over time, the higher the percentage of lead to uranium in a given igneous rock, the older that rock is. But there is one problem – What if God created the world, igneous rocks included, in an *already mature* state, i.e. with lead already in the rocks?

If we can allow for the possibility that God created the world in an already mature state (which Genesis definitely indicates), with lead already present, then the radioisotope method of dating has no relevance. And the radioisotope method is *the only* method that yields an old age for the earth. All the rest of the methods by which an age can be determined for the earth – measurements of the decay of the earth’s magnetic field, decay of the moon’s orbit, decay of comets, salt content in the seas, helium in the atmosphere, erosion of continents, etc.- all point to a young earth, in the order of *thousands* of years, not billions (check out the book Young Earth).

And here is another thing that evolutionists don’t want you to know – there is no method for estimating age, no “rock chronometer,” that can tell us how old a sedimentary rock (the fossil bearing kind) or any other kind of non-igneous rock is. We simply don’t know how old they are. But what evolutionists do is say “well, *assuming* evolution is true and natural processes created everything by themselves, it would take about so or so many millions of years or so, we are estimating, for this trickle of water over this sand to create this sedimentary rock.” In other words, they fool us by using circular reasoning, where the assumption of evolution is the precondition for its “proof.”

And, as far as the much vaunted “Universal Geologic Column” is concerned, which by the “ascending” order of the fossils contained in its layers, supposedly proves evolution and the passage of great spans of time – In the first place, there is really no such thing as a “universal” geologic column at all. Far from being “universal,” it is actually highly variegated and diverse. In the second place, since all fossils are found in **sedimentary rock**, which is formed by the *transportation and deposition of moving waters* (read “flood”), the depositional process must have been **very rapid** or else the dead plants and animals on the ground would have decayed long before being able to become fossils (so much for the necessity, or even value, of millions of years). And in the third place, the “geologic column” doesn’t really contain

primitive fossils at its lowest layers at all. To be more accurate, it contains *marine* fossils at these layers. And the simple reason that it contains *marine* fossils at its lowest layers (some of which happen to be very advanced and adaptive, i.e. the trilobite, which possessed one of the most complex eye designs ever known) is simply because marine species inhabit the lowest elevations on earth, and always have.

So much for the “geologic column.”

We can trust Genesis.

[Why what we believe is important](#)

The main problem I encounter is trying to make people understand that it is important what they believe about our origins...

So, to that end, I have listed the top 5 reasons why it is important...

1. As the Church, it is our duty and our strength, to stand for the whole, literal truth of the Word of God. And the fact that evolution **has been disproved** helps us to do that. We can stand firmly and say that God created just as He said He did in Genesis. We can stand for the truthfulness of His Word.
2. Ever since Evolution muddied our thinking, we have had a hard time believing that God is *great enough* to create in the way Genesis said He did. Nature was far too complex, far too interrelated for a merely supernatural creation. Surely Natural Processes *had to have* something to do with it...But now with the dawning awareness that Natural Processes did not have anything to do with it, we can begin once again to conceive just what this means about how *Great*, how infinitely *brilliant*, our God is.

3. We can once again affirm the *Goodness* of God, that He would never use such a cruel, evil, wasteful process as Evolution, in which millions of years of suffering and death are the main tools. God pronounced his Creation “very good” when He finished it and He could hardly have said this about such a world as Evolution presents...
4. The Bible says that death came into the world as the result of sin, and that Christ had to die as the sinless lamb in order to pay the penalty for our sin. However if Evolution is true, this means that death was in the world for millions of years before sin. Therefore death is neither the result of sin nor the penalty of sin, and the meaning of Christ’s mission is obscured, if not wholly lost...
5. What we believe about our origins/identity determines how we view life and others. For instance, Evolution is directly responsible for such evils as Nazism, Communism, and abortion. While the idea that we are created by God in His image is responsible for most of the humanity found in the world.