

#### 4. A Third Option (Life's Origin)

Should we cannibalize others with sharp teeth or butcher them with swords? Current ideologies seem to imply that one of those notions are correct. However, I postulate that nature is supposed to function peacefully and harmoniously. Since most people are entrenched in their worldview, I must use complicated argumentation to open hearts and minds.

##### Life's Possible Origins

All knowledgeable people today believe in evolution; namely simple change in organisms over time, selective breeding, or species developing adaptive characteristics. I call this evolution with a lower case e: microevolution, which is not the focus of this discussion.<sup>1</sup>

I'm discussing the two big alternatives; higher life forms evolving from lower life forms and non-living matter (abiogenesis & Evolution: upper case E: macroevolution), and major species specifically created by a higher being (Creationism). Some postulate that life originated on other planets. However, if that were so, life either evolved on other planets, was created there, or a combination of both. Beliefs of Evolution and Creationism alike have existed throughout recorded history.

##### Problem with Current Ideologies

Neo-Darwinian Evolution is problematic since it is connected with "survival of the fittest;" depending largely on defeating and destroying competitors. It's impossible to reconcile this belief with the idea of peace being natural; most adherents ignore Evolution's implications, while insurgents have acted upon its inherent principles. Moreover, the endless search for life's origin by evolutionary archeologists, astronomers, biologists, and others is funded by our tax dollars.

Creationism based on stories from holy books is even more problematic. Besides being unscientific, religious texts following their creation stories focus upon killing and destroying competitors, or mistreating others. Again, most adherents ignore their implications, while insurgents act upon their inherent principles. Therefore, I challenge the assumptions on both sides of this either-or fallacy, and propose a loving, peaceful solution: a third position.

##### Evolution's Dominance

Most people adhere to Evolution reflexively, since teaching Creationism is disallowed, even in many religious schools, while Evolution is taught as fact. In public libraries Creationist books are scarce, while there's plenty on Evolution. Many people from diverse fields are barred from expressing Creationist views. See the film *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*.<sup>(2)</sup> Best sellers by atheists audaciously claim that Evolution disproves Christianity. Creationists are even ridiculed and insulted on television. However, this is understandable because those who push a literal interpretation of the Bible account are dominant. Other Creationists, who believe in a different creation story, or Creationists who only want to explore science and biology, have no voice.

Evolution would not disprove God, but many cannot reconcile Evolution with a personal, loving God carefully and lovingly fashioning humanity for a special purpose. For them, this denigrates God into an impersonal First Cause, which is incompatible with their faith. Again, Darwinian "Survival of the Fittest" is generally known as animalistic conflict, instead of peace, harmony, and cooperation. Peace, harmony, and cooperation have been absent since time immemorial, but Survival of the Fittest ideology potentially justifies barbarianism. Almost everyone accepts some form of natural selection, but Darwinian Natural Selection doesn't consider the survival of creatures by God's grace. Many religious

people embrace Evolution and supposedly aren't adversely affected, but this is a major stumbling block for others. Some Creationists seem hostile, but considering all this oppression, no wonder they're hostile. However, if something can be shown to be true, no matter how unpleasant, I'll wholeheartedly embrace it.

Evolution pertains to genetics while supposed origination of living genetic organisms from lifeless matter is termed abiogenesis. However, I combine these ideas under the umbrella term "Evolution" for simplicity's sake and because they are intimately related. Now, are abiogenetics/Evolution as established as gravity, as claimed, or are there serious problems with these theories? Note the following:

### Thermodynamics

Though energy is constant, theorists stubbornly extrapolate the universe back into a basketball-sized mass, which supposedly exploded to create our present universe. But since the well-established First Law of Thermodynamics scientifically states that energy cannot be created nor destroyed, it's impossible for superfluous matter and energy to naturally emanate over and above from what actually exists. Therefore, the universe cannot create itself. Attempting to circumnavigate around the 1<sup>st</sup> Law, some state that at velocities approaching the speed of light, which occur in nuclear reactions, energy and matter are interconvertible. However, producing nuclear energy requires a nuclear energy source which previously exists. It's theorized that stars are giant nuclear reactors, but even structures as simple as a mousetrap never emanate or evolve from nuclear reactors which can be observed in action. So why suppose that every complex physical structure could emanate from them? The number of times this could occur in stars doesn't help: more and more energy simply dissipates in every direction.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics or Entropy: Everything moves from order to disorder, and wears down as surely as objects on Earth fall down, not up, via gravity. With molecular motion, a minute fraction of working energy irreversibly turns into useless (symbol S) heat energy. It's postulated that molecules themselves will devolve into chaos, the universe eventually suffering "heat death." The only possible way to suspend entropy, stated by the Third Law of Thermodynamics, is having objects frozen to absolute zero. Hence, perpetual motion machines cannot exist. Evolution postulates many perpetual motion machines, which additionally start themselves up.

Though the perpetual gyration of subatomic particles supposedly demonstrates perpetual motion, individual subatomic particles do not obey gravity like matter does collectively. Rather, individual quantum particles are subject to quantum physics and are not the building blocks of our physical universe. For example, parked cars have ceased moving on the macroscopic scale; they must be started to regain motion. As their paradoxical atomic motion is irrelevant to their drivers, the perpetual motion of subatomic particles is irrelevant to the theory of biological perpetual motion machines and evolution. Rather, the endless movement of subatomic particles supports the First Law, since kinetic energy is motion.

Though plenty of solar energy and food are continually added to drive alleged evolutionary systems, life cannot harness solar energy for any benefit without having systems already in place to process it. Solar energy can't even help a dead plant, which already has those systems in place, become alive again, let alone creating life from non-living matter. It does the opposite: breaking down life's complex molecules.

Evolutionists cite examples of increases in order, such as jumbled bunches of paperclips naturally forming paperclip chains. However, their examples are of \*useless\* order. You're worse off with paperclip chains or rubber band balls than separated items because you must separate them for use. Metal parts may couple by shifting, but eventually they'll uncouple, not continually connect and form.

Some theorists fancifully transform ominous black holes and hypothetical wormholes into gallant and heroic knights who can transport their visitors through time, thereby reversing the 2<sup>nd</sup> Law of

Thermodynamics and rescuing them from any impending judgment. First, wormholes are strictly theoretical, with no evidence whatsoever of their existence. Secondly, we now know much more about black holes. Per one theory, matter sucked into a black hole stays there forever. Surrounding matter forms an accretion disk, from which particles are expelled. Another theory is that black holes eventually disintegrate, regurgitating their contents.<sup>(3)</sup> Regardless, time travel is counter-scientific; it will never happen. Other theories considered impossible have been vindicated because nobody could see the future. But time travel lacks the excuse that it hasn't been discovered yet. Time travelers would have innumerable chances to appear to us and any previous generation. Since they have not, we know they will not. And I, along with some other philosophers, understand that technically speaking, time does not exist any more than measurements of weight or distance exist. Time is simply the gauging of changes in events.

And nature, being retrogressive, has no examples whatsoever of increasing complexity. Nature "evolving" multi-patterned snowflakes is misunderstood. Running water has billions of water molecules constantly positioning and repositioning themselves, potentially harboring every possible geometric crystalline shape extant. Contrarily, snowflakes are static, locked into only one crystalline shape, therefore far less complex. If we could individually color dye water molecules, and have them magnified and run in slow motion, the resultant dynamics would be the king of all kaleidoscopes. Thermodynamics are universal laws.<sup>4-6</sup>

### Biodiversity

Far more species exist than are necessary for survival in particular circumstances. There are hundreds of types of reptiles, insects, and mammals. Sea creatures are even more diverse. Besides fish of every color and pattern, there are swordfish, flying fish, and sailfish; there are wide varieties of starfish and mollusks; there are tiger sharks, hammerheads, dolphins, whales, seahorses, sea cucumbers, sea snakes, eels, stingrays, sand dollars, coral, octopi, squid, lobsters, jellyfish, et cetera. There are over ten thousand species of birds. According to "survival of the fittest," the fittest animals would have bodily configurations with a survival advantage over other configurations, thereby rendering other configurations obsolete. Instead, nature mirrors architectural design, calling for an architect who purposely created structural variety.

### Transitional Forms and Developmental Stages

There's a colossal gap between non-living matter and the "simplest" life form. Single-celled organisms have thousands of moving parts. Non-living matter making such a gigantic leap would be like a fancy pocket-watch having completely formed from molten lava. In response, transitional forms are said to exist, such as compounds which make up life's basic building blocks, and alleged prototypes or components of life's simplest forms. Yet these were formed in intelligently designed laboratories. *Ipsa facto* this attempt to refute intelligent design is invalidated. For a complete exegesis read *Darwin's Black Box*.<sup>7</sup>

Besides, no intermediate creature that's required as a stepping stone between one major species and another is living anywhere on Earth, or is known from recorded history. Lungfish are often cited as a candidate for an intermediate form, but lungfish cannot exist as deep sea creatures, having to constantly surface to breathe. On land, they do little more than hibernate. They're not an advancement on anything. Also, plants don't have transitional forms. Algae is often cited as an intermediary candidate, but algae has fully developed methods of photosynthesis and reproduction. Most species of algae also have a great advantage over trees, being able to thrive on the surface of water, tolerating higher temperatures than any other organism, and enduring extreme dryness and light intensity. Algae also

comes in a variety of colors. Don't be fooled by algae's appearance; it's a fully developed life form.<sup>8</sup> Besides, the fossil record is absent of true transitional forms.

My criteria for a transitional form is simple: a life form with every characteristic of an existing life form, plus partially developed characteristics of another. For example, every step in the completion of a house (its evolution) is an unequivocal improvement from its former state. There are no downsides. Even being down in a pit is better than nothing; this could help discourage predators, and avoid certain angles of wind and rain. But nothing in nature betters anything else without a deleterious condition. For example, bats, as flying rodents, improve over mice, but can barely see or scurry on the ground. Creatures with legs have benefit over snakes, but lose flexibility, sense of vibrations, and heat radar.

### Primitives?

Undoubtedly, creatures such as *Homo habilis*, *Homo erectus*, and *Homo neanderthalensis* roamed Earth. However, there's no proof that they transitioned from Australopithecines and apes. Moreover, the most established Australopithecine-type creature is a 45% complete skeleton. Display skeletons are made of plastic and are extrapolated from these bone fragments. Besides, evolutionists admit that Australopithecines and genus *Homo*s lived concurrently. This explodes their previous assumption that genus *Homo* would necessarily replace Australopithecus. And before Darwinism, the entire slew of "hominid" fossils were classified as either apelike animals (genus *Gorilla*, *Pan*, *Pongo*, et cetera) or human (genus *Homo*). Fossils were re-classified to mirror Darwin's theory.

Besides, all dogs, whether toy poodles, dachshunds, greyhounds, bulldogs, Siberian huskies, Saint Bernards, English sheepdogs, Shar Peis, Doberman Pinschers, Great Danes, Mexican hairless, Irish wolfhounds, Afghan hounds, bloodhounds, Dalmatians, and other extremely diverse animals are all labeled *Canis familiaris*. Yet the difference between dog breeds is many times the difference between modern man and primitive man, who have a different classification. Therefore the classification system is biased and inconsistent. Moreover, the lack of a missing link, perfectly portrayed by Cha-Ka on *Land of the Lost*(9) should actually disprove the evolution of apes to man.

*Homo sapiens* may have come from "primitive" people through breeding over aeons. However, that doesn't prove our superiority. Let's say a caveman and a *Homo sapiens* climbed a mountain together to get food, and were caught in a rockslide. The *Homo sapiens* with the thinner skull gets his head bashed in and dies; his bigger brain did no good. The caveman with the thicker skull survives and thrives.

Actually, Earth's large population in modern times causes most problems and therefore needs modern technology to address them. Also, people purposely make life unnecessarily complicated. This requires others with bigger brains to develop and maintain the technology to counteract these problems. However, with small populations of cave-people, there would be enough caves, mountain clefts, and unspoiled land for them all. If they all loved and respected each other, that would make life easier than highly technological yet antisocial societies. They would enjoy reproducing, and relish God's green Earth; Paradise. Famous author Ernest Hemingway said "Happiness in intelligent people is the rarest thing I know." Besides, *Homo sapiens* and "primitive" people could have lived concurrently; dating methods are unverifiable. Also, our gigantic leap in life expectancy is fictitious. See 20. Technology under Life Expectancy and Modern Medicine. Regardless, there's no connection whatsoever between primates and fish, amphibians, or reptiles.

### Life's Interdependence

There are hundreds of symbiotic relationships (life forms mutually dependent on each other). Though some plants thrive by being non-edible, encased in barbs, or poisonous, which is logical for "survival of

the fittest,” most plants thrive by being edible. This attracts animals, which carry or eat their seeds, which fall off or are expelled, sprouting into new plants. There is also obligate symbiosis: relationships which are absolutely necessary to both symbiotes. For example, mitochondria and humans are related by obligate symbiosis, since mitochondrion organelles cannot live independently, and produce cellular respiration, fats, proteins, and enzymes, without which humans would die. Skeletons and exoskeletons could never develop or exist on their own. That would be like animated spook-house skeletons having roamed the earth. Skeletons cannot even exist as independent cohesive units; movie skeletons are held together by wires. And mammals could never develop or exist without skeletons. If so, we’d be a planet of creatures resembling *The Blob*. Life is interdependent by design.

And oil and water don’t mix (unless purposely mixed, and won’t stay mixed unless intelligence is used to purposely affix them). Yet animal and human bodies are mixtures of oil and water. Consider intelligently designed automobiles with designated parts that variously use oil (engines) and water (radiators).

### Piecemeal Development?

There are no adequate explanations for supposed piecemeal structural development. Consider the eye. Although there are successive degrees of eyes within nature and therefore successive degrees of light sensitivity and vision, in advanced eyes numerous parts are interdependent, and so would have to develop simultaneously. Despite evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkin’s props which illustrate supposed stages in eye evolution, they are far too simplistic. For example, if we suppose that our eye sockets developed to create shadow images and direct light, a lens later growing over the eye socket as Richard demonstrated with a glass lens wouldn’t work, since bone grows out of bone, not something made of flesh. Human eye sockets having been designed to protect our eyes is more logical. And unlike Richard’s model, real eyes would have immediate need for optic veins and arteries. Moreover, the parts in advanced eyes fit together like automobile parts fit together, whose diverse parts serve the functions of the other parts. To create eyes without God, a galaxy of favorable effects would have to occur, far exceeding the magic of *Harry Potter*.<sup>10</sup>

Reproduction is all or nothing. Every life form on Earth needs a fully developed reproductive means before its generation’s end. Even being almost able to reproduce would be an obvious failure. Moreover, there are many other examples of irreducible complexity; the inability of a complex biological structure to have formed by numerous, successive, and slight modifications.

The pseudoscience of vestigial (trace) body parts says that humans have organs which Evolution has rendered useless. For example, the human “tail bone”, correctly termed coccyx (cited as proof we evolved from animals with tails) gives ligaments and nine muscles a place to attach to. It’s also a weight-bearing structure to support a sitting person; it’s not vestigial. Moreover, everything in nature occupies an important place. Mosquitoes are assumed useless, although they pollinate flowers and provide an important food source for a wide range of creatures such as fish, turtles, frogs, birds, and bats. Butterflies, mites, ladybugs, and other insects pollinate flowers, remove debris from the ecosystem, digest feces, and do other important functions that we rely upon insects to perform. The moth *Bombyx mori* is the most prized insect of all; its larvae produce all the world’s silk.

### Codes of Life

The gene pool dictates the parameters of any species’ potential offspring; that’s the extent of their ability to “evolve.” Dogs can never produce cats; orchid seeds can never produce apples. Even crossbreeding, such as lion and tiger (liger or tigon) and donkey with zebra (zebrass) always produces sterile animals. So creatures cannot transmute into anything not already encoded in the genes (Mendelism).<sup>11</sup>

Mutations are copying errors in genes that nearly always lose information. Since harmful mutations always far outnumber beneficial ones, this source would cause life to run down much faster than it could evolve upward. Also, advantageous mutations have downsides. For example, fused appendages in sand dweller's "webbed" feet is countermanded on any terrain outside of sand. As for extraordinary bone density among humans, which can save lives in cases of major car accidents, it can cause drowning in situations involving water, due to inability to float. Besides, there are never any transmutations towards another genus.

Sharing over 90% of our DNA with chimps and baboons means little. Though we share 50% of our DNA with bananas we're not half banana. DNA molecules themselves have almost a billion parts, each constituting bits of information. Even a 1% difference in the genome (complete set of genetic information), would be enough information difference to fill a thousand telephone books. If chromosome numbers were of primary significance, apes and monkeys (48 chromosomes) would more closely resemble tobacco plants (also 48) rather than humans (46). Ferns (480 chromosomes) would then be the highest evolved species. Interestingly, pig and human zygotes look identical, while zygotes from other "primates" look much different.<sup>12</sup>

### Evolutionary Geology is Dried Up

The geologic column is simply an idea, not an actual column of rocks together at one particular location. Gaps and reversals of this imaginary sequence characterize real rock formations and sediment deposits. To see the entire geologic column in its proposed sequence, you'd have to traverse the globe. "Pre-Cambrian" and "Paleozoic" strata exist at the Grand Canyon; "Mesozoic" stratum exists in Eastern Arizona; "Tertiary" formations are visible in New Mexico, et cetera.

Every conceivable contradiction to "the geologic sequence" is found. Anomalous fossils in the wrong stratigraphic order are conveniently explained away to credence evolutionary geology. Fossils found too low in a column (before they supposedly evolved) are coined stratigraphic leaks. Specimens found too high have been "re-worked." Often, huge stratum chunks are in the wrong stratigraphic order. An example of such upside down conditions is Glacier National Park's block of "Pre-Cambrian" limestone (supposedly 1 billion years old) sitting atop "Cretaceous" shale (supposedly only 100 million years old).

Fossil plants, animals, and tree trunks (petrified wood) were found vertically through many stratigraphic layers, refuting the notion that these sedimentary layers formed over eons. The evolutionary model requires ages to cover several vertical feet. But for fossilization, subjects need rapid burial, before rotting away and escaping preservation. Sudden and extreme hydraulic pressure from massive floods, creating geologic upheavals for rapid burial, would explain this and natural wonders such as the Grand Canyon. Numerous factors likely formed our present Earth, including continental drift, meteor impact, and even instantaneous creation, but the idea that geology demonstrates Evolution unravels upon close examination.

A hydraulic sorting action may account for why fossils of like shape, size, and weight tend to be found on the same level, as opposed to being of the same evolutionary and geologic phase. Subscribing to the Biblical flood account is unnecessary. Flood legends were pervasive throughout antiquity, with Xithutheros, Prithu, and Deucalion as similar heroes to Noah, giving core essentials of cataclysmic flooding universal witness.<sup>(13)</sup> Although "The Great Flood" is dubious, there is much evidence for torrential local floods.

Also, many written records throughout history consist of eyewitness accounts fitting the descriptions of dinosaurs, along with drawings and artwork depicting dinosaurs. These predate paleontology's relatively recent extrapolation of dinosaurs from fossils by thousands of years. Dinosaurs having lived contemporaneously with humans utterly contradicts the neo-Darwinist construct.<sup>14</sup>

## Evolutionary Models are Self-Defeating

Earth's quintessential evolutionary genesis, innumerable volcanoes, is extremely antithetical to life. Beneficial attributes of volcanoes heating water, creating land masses, and rich soil is dwarfed by deadly lava and explosions (volcanoes have more destructive force than atomic bombs). The beneficial steam and carbon dioxide they release is countermanded by belching carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, and tons of ash, which block out the sun, sustainer of all life.

Evolution's staple, fish into frogs, before becoming mammals, is backwards. Besides subject to being stepped on, frogs are solitary creatures with limited mobility, have many predators, and are no improvement over fish. Survival of the Fittest would necessitate fish evolving into apex predators such as sharks and humans evolving into vampires and werewolves. Primates evolving into *Homo sapiens* would be backwards in that primates are pound for pound three times stronger. So-called "environmental niches" or glitches would necessarily be backwards for eons. Besides, there's generally no one set direction life forms could take to push forward towards definitive survival.

The obvious advantage bigger animals have over smaller ones by topping the food chain and dominating their environment is countermanded by lessened capacity to produce off-spring and having a much harder time foraging to supply their mass. Elephants often starve to death, while, outside of humans, small bugs rule the world.

An ability in one area denotes a disability in another. The necessary basic structure of either land, sea, or air-dominating animals makes them incompetent in the other two environments. For example, birds have largely hollow bones, conducive to flying, which makes them weak land creatures. In contrast, the solid, thick bone structure of dominant land creatures prevents flying.

When one populace dominates another, the other group tends to become indignant and retaliate. Humankind is now so mentally and physically advanced, we have the technological capacity, via nuclear weapons, of wiping ourselves out several times over.

If Survival of the Fittest was true, why would animals evolve into creatures which are subservient to man, instead of a lion's dynasty, or tiny plants evolve into colorful flowers, instead of all giant Sequoia trees? The answer is clear: Life was created to declare God's glory.

### Evolution's Mechanism?

As stated earlier, life forms may change over time, but only within the parameters of their gene pool, however wide that may be. So can one life form affect the gene pool of another, when it cannot even alter its own gene pool? Can non-living matter create life and intelligence when intelligent life cannot? There's a set method and apparatus to precisely measure gravitational pull, electromagnetic waves, wind speed, light intensity, chemical composition, and so on. But this supposed effect of Evolution has no concrete cause.

Although Creationism lacks a natural cause, Creationists believe life originated from a supernatural God, who is beyond the natural order. Since neo-Darwinists insist that Evolution is part of nature, they must show by what process it works. Something in the physical realm without cause or process cannot exist. Otherwise, it's like cars evolving into airplanes. And there's no evidence that the ability to self-replicate has anything to do with the ability to evolve. Otherwise, we'd have to suppose that self-replicating robots would evolve. And creatures would have to first evolve the ability to self-replicate, which would originally be non-existent.

### Time and Achievement

I don't believe in the existence of time any more than I believe that Poseidon controls the tide. Therefore, my argument is NOT that there is not enough time; I argue that time lacks relevance. As stated

earlier, time is not a scientific fact. It is a mathematical formula describing the ratio of one event to another, such as X decays Y amount per Z times Earth revolves around the Sun. Now with X perpetually frozen at absolute zero, it would never decay whatsoever; hence it would be timeless. So the reverse, speeding up an inherent generative process a million-fold, should produce a desired result instantly, such as people becoming vampires, an apex predator.

If that's ludicrous, consider the time factor in other realms of achievement. Some extraordinary men have trained for twenty years to lift 200 kilograms overhead or hit a baseball 170 meters, doing so within seconds. Yet training for sixty years would produce no examples of such achievement. Nor would taking an hour to lift or hit produce achievement. Rather, it would render achievement impossible.

Extreme examples of taking undue time to achieve would be the supposed evolution of simple, innocuous species into more complex, dominant ones, such as frogs into humans. This would allow innumerable chances to be devoured by predators, decimated by disease, have fatal accidents, and acquire genetic damage, destroying even the continuance of the selfsame creature. Besides, macro-evolution would be far more radical than human into vampire, werewolf, or creature of your choice. Therefore it is utter fantasy.

### Why Animals Act like "Animals"

Many Creationists believe that originally, all people and animals were vegetarians, plants being the designated food source. For example, lions and Tyrannosaurs have teeth suitable for devouring coconuts, cacti, and stone fruits such as avocados and peaches, while horses don't. Modern society, with its processed foods, forgets that raw plants are more challenging to consume than raw meat. An excellent example of teeth with destructive power like a T. rex used strictly on plant life are old fashioned two-man saws. Even today, eating meat isn't always necessary to maintain strength; many vegetarians are quite healthy.

Some animals, such as poisonous snakes, help to humble arrogant men; a ten pound snake can physically defeat a two hundred pound man. Other animals such as sharks are far more powerful than men; excellent illustrations of God's power. Apparently God anticipated the fall of humanity and the need to address it.

Besides, animals often exhibit cooperative self-sacrificing behaviors that favor the herd over selfish "survival of the fittest" behavior. And while some big dogs bully small dogs in competition for food, our family's toy poodle would attack our large dog in the presence of food and didn't want to share. The big dog tolerated that behavior. Our previous big dog picked out pieces of dog food, dropping it in front of the smaller dog to eat. According to one philosophy, after sin entered the world, a curse enveloped all creation, and things changed. Yet eventually, all creation will purportedly be at peace after God eradicates sin. However, if all creation was originally at peace, there would be no need for immune systems to conquer hostile microorganisms. So evidently immune systems evolved.

### Don't Yolk the Ox with the Ass

Christendom was Evolution-free before Darwin's time. Now, most believers have swallowed neo-Darwinism; others view it as devilish heresy. This is another division within Christendom that prevents unity, while Atheists and skeptics are somewhat unified, all teaching Evolution as fact. Believers conceding on this point simply reflects public sentiment. It's hard to oppose the zeitgeist who aggressively push Evolution, and it's impossible to deal with someone well-versed in neo-Darwinism while lacking knowledge of Creationism; hence this discussion.

Most Modern Catholics along with liberal Protestants teach neo-Darwinism as fact, having God starting out with a Big Bang, everything subsequently evolving from a primordial soup. When



questioned about this, Catholics have either downplayed this belief or lied about it to avoid confrontation. With the current position that God issued creatures spirits after they evolved into full humanity, a whole generation of people would then have wild animals as parents. Catholics are welcome to believe whatever they want concerning life's origin. However, almost 100% of Catholics embrace the Big Bang theory and neo-Darwinism instead of thinking for themselves.

A fatal error is the theory of Ongoing Revelation, which jettisons the early Church Fathers. Macro-evolution is foreign to the early Church, but not because the Fathers never heard of it. Many of macro-evolution's basic tenets were taught thousands of years ago by men such as Greek philosophers Epicurus and Democritus and were completely rejected (*A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs* by David W. Bercot and *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*-Hendrickson publishers).

Though theistic neo-Darwinists abound, neo-Darwinism potentially weakens morality. Violators of established morals now blame their animal nature. In most cases, it simply fosters doubt. Scholar Patrick Glynn described his path to atheism as starting with his Catholic grade school teaching him Evolution, which destroyed his faith. Other renowned atheists also have a strong Modernist Catholic background, while traditional Catholicism was Creationist. Many Protestant groups also embrace Evolution. Moreover, Charles Darwin's research led him to become agnostic.(15) Despite some bright ideas, he overemphasized nature's brutality, which caused his discouragement. So billions of believers have entrusted an unbeliever with guiding them in their faith.

Understand that Christian teaching presupposes belief in God, and acknowledging Divine Design is paramount to believing in God. Though faith comes by hearing the Christian message, why would anybody listen to the message if they thought there was no God to begin with? You don't hand a little child religious paraphernalia and say "Read it." We see God through nature. That is, before Modernism warps your mind's eye. You take children to the zoo, saying "Someone created these wonderful creatures: God." Many adults haven't gotten this basic concept, and that's where they may have to start.

Although I reject the idea of one genus or broader classification evolving into another, I accept micro-evolution, one species evolving into another species. For example, Anglerfish may have evolved their special appendage which acts like a fishing rod and lure.(16) But they are all fish, no more, no less, as are fish without any appendage. And Neanderthals evolving into modern blokes is worlds away from dead carbon specks becoming people. Such micro-evolution doesn't prove macro-evolution any more than the Flat Earth Society calling the Bolivian salt flats a "micro-flat Earth" means they're half-way to proving their theory.

If neo-Darwinism were true, the natural world would not reflect God's character. We wouldn't see Him through nature, original images would be obliterated. You may say: The fact that there's a creation itself shows God; but Judeo-Christian tradition has God creating all things very good, not blobs of raw elements. Historic Christianity says we see God through creation \*clearly.\* Everything man makes, he develops, or at least tinkers with to improve it. That constitutes legitimate micro-evolution. But an Omniscient God would never need to tinker around with something to improve it. Ultimately, this implies God as only part-creator. After initial creation, the universe, or Mother Nature, the second god of Evolution, takes over. Again, Evolution is known as an unloving, conflictive process, akin to Ares, god of war, not the Christian God.

### Are Evolutionists Completely United?

Lauding neo-Darwinism is having confidence in scientists who lack self-confidence and disagree amongst themselves. Some admit that, deep down inside, they have no answers on many points. Quoting evolutionary ichthyologist Errol White: "I've often thought how little I'd like to have to prove evolution in a court of law."(17) Quoting evolutionist T.N. Tahmisian, physiologist for the Atomic Energy Commission: "Scientists who teach that evolution is a fact of life are great con men; the story they're telling may be the greatest hoax ever."(18) A peculiar type of elephant bones were discovered, once classified

by Evolutionists as a prehistoric proto-elephant long extinct. A while after, this same elephant was discovered walking around alive. Instead of acknowledging their error, it was labeled a mutation.

Actually, most evolutionary scientists are united; they're united against Christianity. They are also united against Charles Darwin himself; today's neo-Darwinism contradicts Darwinism in important respects. Consider that an alternate title to Darwin's book was *The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*.<sup>(19)</sup> So they threw out his politically incorrect ideas and anything that hinted at Divine Design, and pander something much different.

### Objectionable Creationism

In a modern day Scopes trial, Kitzmiller vs. Dover, the argument devolved into whether Creationism should be taught alongside Evolution. To have Creationism taught in schools, Creationists hid their ulterior religious motivation. That was exposed, and Creationism expunged, since our laws dictate separation of Church and State.

Now Bible fundamentalists insist that Earth was created in six twenty-four hour days and is around six thousand years old. Some condemn Old Earth Creationists, who don't take the Genesis account literally. This causes many to dismiss Creationism entirely. And Earth's age, shape or travel through space are inconsequential as far as how life came about, how it's sustained, and where creation is headed. The essence isn't changed one iota. Moreover, most Creationists try to gather evidence to fit their bible instead of following the evidence wherever it leads. Worse yet, some base their Creationism \*only\* on the Bible, convincing nobody. And the universe is NOT fine tuned; the vast majority of the observable universe is chaotic and completely inhospitable to life.

Creationists may represent the odds against various life forms originating by chance as an astronomical number with hundreds of zeros, and blanket a chalkboard with it, supposedly aweing and overwhelming unbelievers. Atheists capitalize on this, declaring that with an infinite amount of time or an infinite number of universes, the odds would actually be against their not originating. Despite their intelligent comebacks, Creationists are sent on a tangent, like trying to pick up a barrel of spilled marbles. The argument essentially concedes that, though infinitesimally unlikely life possibly appeared without God. Rather, NO, it's impossible. Besides, macroevolution would have NOTHING to do with chance or improbability. If anything complex almost certainly needed God to have arisen because of its extreme unlikelihood, then God would necessarily need to be even more complex and therefore even more unlikely to exist. I believe in an ultra-complex God, but understand evolutionary theory and therefore do not refute my own position.

Summarily, declaring that Creationism is true is like stating that great scientific and engineering minds created the nuclear submarine, while declaring exactly how it was put together, how long it took, and its functional intricacies is far different. Removing the presumptions on HOW God created life removes the difficulties.

### Sneaky Strategies

Special Pleading: Showcasing close similarities among various species while ignoring their differences seems compelling, such as comparing people and apes. Especially with this one guy I knew with terrible body odor, who could be considered a missing link. Rather, many things bear remarkable resemblance, such as water and gasoline, blood and transmission fluid, and bratwurst and poo. Yet they are dramatically different.

Ad Hominem Fallacy is ignoring another person's argument, and instead attacking their character. Evolutionists claim to be smarter than "hillbillies", "stupid idiots" and various ornery people. Yet I could comparatively intertwine Evolution's Big Bang Theory with an ignorant ancient belief that

the universe hatched out of a cosmic egg, since it bears uncanny resemblance. Instead of calling people names, we can say that people believe what they want to believe in order to suit themselves.

Pigeonholing: It's decried that "Scientific Creationism" originated in the 20<sup>th</sup> century with Protestant Evangelicals. However, "Scientific Creationism" wasn't needed all these years because we didn't have aggressive opposition from atheistic scientists. You can be a Creationist, and have never heard of the bible, despite most Creationists being Bible Fundamentalists. Forms of Creationism have been postulated throughout recorded history.

**Straw Man Argument:** Debates devolve into trying to refute Genesis's 3,500 year-old creationist view, which many unfortunately use as a scientific textbook, instead of focusing on 21<sup>st</sup> century Creationist arguments. That's like comparing modern evolutionary theory to the ancient evolutionary theory of spontaneous generation, such as leaves birthing frogs, or the subsequent theory of bears being man's immediate ancestors.

**Double Standard:** An Evolutionist told me "Don't pretend what you believe is based on anything other than faith which cannot be tested for reproducible results." Yet Evolution, which cannot be tested for reproducible results, "Is as factual as gravity"; bias indeed. And merely teaching that an intelligent designer exists is not religion. America's founding fathers accepted a Creator as they accepted gravity. What they demanded was that Church doctrine be separated from secular institutions. Since neo-Darwinism cannot be replicated in lab experiments any more than Creationism can, in fairness, schools should teach both Creationism and Evolution or neither.

**Splitting Hairs:** Some complain that Creationists see Evolution as evolving from goo or monkeys instead of a primordial soup or ape-like man. Others state that one species doesn't evolve into another, they split into two species. Others cry that it's not Evolution or neo-Darwinism, it's "evo-devo." That's all irrelevant to the Creationist argument. The point is, God designed and originated life, not non-living matter or creatures themselves.

**Fake Empathy:** Religious folks are sometimes encouraged to celebrate their faith and are welcome to believe that God was the First Cause that started the Big Bang and Macro-evolution. This is like a waiter gobbling up your steak and leaving the meat juice, saying "You're welcome to call that a steak." And don't think for a moment that evolutionary scientists aren't seeking a scientific explanation for the First Cause. Besides, neo-Darwinism completely contradicts Christ's teaching. Jesus taught that God created humans as male and female. Yet according to neo-Darwinism, from the beginning, asexual life forms, neither male nor female, evolved into us.

Creationists often use similar sneaky strategies; but I have no affinity with other Creationists; I stand alone. Furthermore, even if neo-Darwinism were true, there's an overemphasis on its accompanying fields of anthropology, paleontology, and suchlike. What matters more is mastering universal life skills, and gaining knowledge to help make the world a better place.

### Reaffirming my Purpose

I aim to promote peace, harmony, and love of God, humanity, and our natural world. And although many say that what one believes about life's origin doesn't matter, one of these positions must be true while the other is false. Christ taught that there is a world of difference between truth and falsehood. Besides, neo-Darwinism postulates that life forms designed themselves, not God. Modernist ideas such as string theory and M theory are then used to explain the first cause, removing God altogether. Yet these Modernist ideas are even less reasonable. For example, string theory rests on the principle of there being one-dimensional objects. Show me a one-dimensional object and I'll show you a chair with no legs, back, or seat.

Though few evolutionists use Evolution to justify atrocities, they deem it natural for animals to terrorize and devour one another, with teeth "naturally designed to kill." If we're considered highly evolved animals (along with sharks) what's going to discourage other brutal dictators from arising?

Evolution is most often misused to repudiate historical values. Modernists consider themselves “evolved” from “primitive” traditional families and their mores.

Even if one could argue that the nature of life’s origin is inconsequential, one postulation is basic truth; the others are false. We recognize the value of seeking truth from childhood. True answers on tests make us pass. False answers, blanks, or writing “It doesn’t matter” makes us fail. This carries over into adulthood, as we either care about the difference between truth and falsehood or we don’t.

### The Ultimate Question

Are humans just another animal or are they clearly and unequivocally distinct? And how close are other “primates” to us? The closest primate shares 95% of our DNA, not 98-99%.<sup>(20)</sup> A 1-2% difference might allow the ability to inter-mate like lions and tigers, while our five percent difference equals a difference of 150 million DNA base pairs.

Besides, Evolution would have had to function naturally without any modern advantage. Yet we’ve now decoded the DNA molecule, positively identifying many minute parts. We can splice and align the codes of life in any fashion we choose; even cloning is available. Since we still cannot create a supposed evolutionary ancestor, neo-Darwinism is fictitious.

The main idea is that animals supposedly are not accountable to God, while people are; neo-Darwinism is promoted for the very purpose of escaping ethics and morality. Yet unlike other Creationists who believe that animals have no spirits and will never see God, and bad children automatically attain Heaven because they haven’t reached an “age of accountability” (dubious positions indeed), all creatures who can choose between good and evil may be accountable and be judged in proportion to their God-given abilities. All animals are God’s children in varying degrees. Mere Evolution would allow no escape regardless, but there being no God would. “By providing a naturalistic explanation of biological origins, Evolution promotes atheism..... Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist.”(Richard Dawkins, 1986)<sup>21</sup>

Thoroughly covering every aspect of this subject is not possible in a work this size. For advanced research, the Internet and full books have a wealth of information on this subject. Assuredly, every point of those who seek to dethrone God can be refuted. Like Escher’s infinite staircase<sup>(22)</sup> their assertions look good on paper, but are nonexistent in real life. Life could never have existed without our Creator.

