

Human Intelligence Gone Ape

Josh Greenberger

Copyright 1993, 1986

Originally published as a soft-cover book entitled "Human Intelligence Gone Ape" (98 pgs.)

Research done largely in 1983 for an earlier version entitled

"A Thin Line Between Theory And Fantasy"

Human Intelligence Gone Ape

PREFACE

Written in the layman's language, this book disproves the theory of evolution in more ways than one. It shows how evolution is genetically impossible. It recounts space explorations of other planets which also confirm that evolution is a baseless theory. In addition, it shows how massive random genetic mutations -- the alleged mechanism behind evolution -- over a period of billions of years, instead of perpetuating an evolutionary process, would actually have wiped out an already populated planet.

This book also demonstrates how scientifically accepted theories of the evolution of our solar system are not supported by space exploration, how scientific accounts of the evolution of the entire universe are against the very scientific principles which they are based on, and how the ultimate origin of the universe could not possibly have been of a physical nature and is beyond scientific explanation.

Finally, this volume attempts to decipher some of the psychological aspects behind the acceptance of some scientific theories.

Although it covers many topics, this book does not delve into a given subject beyond what is necessary for a particular discussion. A detailed description of every topic covered could very well have turned this work into somewhat of an encyclopedia. And that was not its objective.

THE AUTHOR

Josh Greenberger: A computer consultant for over two decades, the author has developed software for such organizations as NASA's Goddard Institute of Space Studies, AT&T, Charles Schwab, Bell Laboratories and Chase Manhattan Bank. He has been responsible for training technical personnel as well as management in design and programming of applications systems.

Since 1984, the author's articles and letters have appeared in The New York Times, The New York Post, The New York Daily News, Newsday, The Village Voice, The Jewish Press, and other publications. His writings have ranged from humor to scientific to topical events.

Aside from being a science enthusiast since his teens, he has also written several screenplays.

Human Intelligence Gone Ape

Contents

The Worm-Train Theory	1
Genetics	4
Extraterrestrial Life	20
Bones, Fossils, And Dating Methods	30
An Unscientific Approach To Science	35
The Solar System	36
Commentary	42
Strange Planets	45
The Universe	49
The Psychological Aspect	57
Venereal Disease	63
Creation	68
A Theory About Nothing	76
Twentieth Century Superstition	79

THE WORM-TRAIN THEORY

There is overwhelming evidence suggesting that if you incubate three dozen worms in a solution of amino acids and carbon compounds for approximately one and a half million years they will eventually evolve into the Long Island Railroad. The only problem with this theory is that if this were true some species of fish would have a natural tendency to ride the Long Island Railroad. But fish have never actually been observed commuting between Long Island and Manhattan.

A group of enterprising archaeologists, however, found the missing link to this apparent puzzle. Digging through the ruins of an old Long Island Railroad yard, they came across a fossil of a fish believed to be extinct for billions of years. In fact, after taking a radiocarbon reading of the fossil and the brown paper bag it was found in, they confirmed that their find dated back to the "big bang," give or take six months. This proves conclusively that prehistoric fish did commute via the Long Island Railroad.

Now, the question arises, did prehistoric fish commute on dry land or did prehistoric trains run underwater? No one really knows for sure. But, the famous Dr. Imust Beagenius (pronounced I-must Be-a-genius) is grappling with a theory. Dr. Beagenius suggests that prehistoric fish must have travelled on dry land. He points out that extensive laboratory tests show that railroad tickets are not waterproof.

There you have it -- a theory which links fish, worms, and the Long Island Railroad. It couldn't be more logical.

MORE PROOF

Unfortunately, not everyone is that easy to please. There are those who, believe it or not, would demand a more detailed explanation of such a theory, no matter how logical it sounds. "How do a bunch of worms," they would naively ask, "turn into the Long Island Railroad?"

In spite of the absurdity of such skepticism, I offer the following evidence which should render this theory proven beyond a shadow of a doubt.

Our archeologist friends went back to the same railroad yard and made some more astonishing discoveries. They lined up some of the old cars side by side and noticed how each car was slightly bigger and better developed than the one before it. The car at one end had a highly sophisticated and powerful air conditioning system, while the car at the other end had not even a fan. The only trace of air conditioning found in one underdeveloped car was the fossil of a conductor slapping an old woman with his cap to create some air disturbance. (His cap, incidentally, has been known to be extinct for at least seven and a half billion years. It had no union label.)

Then, scientists took a worm crawling in the same railroad yard and put it under a powerful electron microscope. And behold, they made an astounding discovery: A worm's cell magnified three billion times has an uncanny resemblance to a train window (without the shades).

It's quite obvious that the evidence presented for the worm- train theory overshadows the somewhat popular but fanatical notion that trains may have been manufactured by intelligent beings. The "intelligent beings" theory would imply a labor union. So far, none of the trains studied showed any traces of major medical benefits, pension funds, or sick leave. How such a ridiculous theory even got started is hard to imagine. So much for this nonsensical "intelligent beings" theory.

By now you must be saying to yourself, "Well, the evidence for the worm-train theory is certainly overwhelming. Any idiot can see its scientific validity. But where did the first worm come from?"

HOW IT ALL BEGAN

I'm glad you asked. The theory widely accepted by the scientific community

and also strongly supported by our famous Dr. Imust Beagenius is the "big bait" theory. In the beginning there was a big ball of fishing hooks. Nature found it rather absurd to have so many fishing hooks without worms. In a few short billions of years, worms began to materialize around the hooks. When the first trout started biting, nature found it necessary to produce more worms to keep up with the fishing season. And so, worms began materializing on virtually every hook around the globe. Then, in the off-season, there were more worms than hooks. So, the problem at that point was storing these excess worms. This brought about the invention of the can. So, you see, the worm-train evolution began with the Big Bait. And the Big Bait began with a can of worms.

AN INVITATION

If you believe the theories just presented, you're invited to attend my upcoming garage sale. I'm selling the New Jersey Turnpike, Lake Erie, and the Gulf of Mexico. Please bring with you an attache case containing billions and billions of dollars in small unmarked bills.

READY FOR ANOTHER ONE

My worm-train and big bait theories were presented to show how ludicrous theories can sound when the mechanics quite obviously don't work. The next theory I present may not be that easy to see through. But by the time you're through reading this book, it'll probably sound just as silly.

GENETICS

PRIMITIVE TWENTIETH CENTURY

To most people, science is seen as "today," modern, up-to-date, and perhaps even the promise of futuristic wonders. A generation which possesses supersonic jets, Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM's), space shuttles and sophisticated computers can hardly be called primitive. Or can it

In the midst of all of this state-of-the-art technology, there seems to be a rather primitive theory which, although steadily losing credibility even among those who have adhered to it for a long time, still has many convinced that it is based on science. This theory has proven one thing beyond a shadow of a doubt: although modern technology is nearing Star Wars sophistication, modern man is still capable of some embarrassingly primitive thinking.

To understand how such a theory could have gained any support at all, one must look back at the reasoning which prevailed in the days of sorcery and witchcraft. These notions were certainly not the result of tangible evidence. Obviously, the human mind is highly susceptible to super-human distortions and misinterpretations. Although sorcery and witchcraft per se have gone the way of the horse and buggy, the kind of imagery which facilitates the acceptance of irrational views of reality apparently has not. I'm talking about the "scientific" theory of evolution. If this theory is not honest misinterpretation, it may very well be the most sophisticated hoax ever perpetrated on the human race.

THE TASADAY TRIBESMEN

If you think a hoax on such a large scale is not possible, consider this:

On August 14, 1986, ABC-TV's news program 20/20 aired a segment on the Tasaday tribesmen in the Philippine jungles, uncovering a hoax of monumental proportions.

In the early 1970's, a tribe was found in the Philippine jungles "living" under the most primitive conditions. The Tasaday tribesmen, as they became known, seemed "untouched by modern civilization." Their mode of life resembled

modern man's image of cavemen: they hunted for food, wore clothes made of leaves, and lived in caves. Nothing could be more exciting -- and more convincing.

The discovery of a "prehistoric" tribe in modern times was so fascinating that it got front-page coverage worldwide, a book was written on the discovery, and pages of "history" were added to some encyclopedias.

Twelve years passed before it was uncovered that the world had been taken in by a sinister hoax. By the mid 1980's, in attempts to follow up on earlier suspicions, the news media learned that these "tribesmen" were in fact modern-day Philippine natives; they ordinarily wore blue jeans and sweat shirts, smoked cigarettes, etc. They had been put up to this charade by a Philippine official who led them to believe that they would receive financial or other assistance if they "looked poor" for the cameras. In the end, they received no assistance, were abandoned by the Philippine official, and the charade was over.

And so, a "major anthropological find" enjoyed over a decade of "historical significance" before turning into a "major historical fraud." And had it not been for diligent investigation by the news media, this hoax could very well have remained the "anthropological find of the twentieth century" in history books.

THE EVOLUTION OF EVOLUTION

Ever since Charles Darwin published his book "On The Origin Of Species" in 1859, the theory of the evolution of life has undergone changes, updates, and "advances" -- and the theory is still "evolving." By the time scientists are through with this theory, if ever, the "origin of species" may have more versions than species. This may make "natural selection" (of one version) extremely difficult.

The scientific concept of the origin of life on earth begins with the premise that life first appeared billions of years ago with the formation of microscopic organisms out of inanimate matter. In the billions of years which followed, small organisms evolved into higher and more complex forms of life, and one species evolved into another. The chain of events leading from the first single-celled organism to the most complex organ, the human brain, was at first believed to have been a slow and gradual process.

But archaeologists have worn out many shovels trying to uncover evidence supporting evolution. At last count, they had enough bones to make friends with every dog in Chicago and enough fossils to open a mail-order fossil business. But no evidence. No series of fossils or sets of bones show unmistakable intermediate species. If one species evolved into another, "linking" species would have to have existed in profuse quantities at various points in earth's history. But profuse quantities of missing links which could be termed "indisputable evidence" have never been found.

This brings us to a new version of evolution called "punctuated equilibrium." This version of evolution is held by many scientists who oppose the "slow and gradual" version. "Punctuated equilibrium" says that species appear more suddenly and retain their basic forms until they become extinct. Now that sounds a whole lot better. It conveniently does away with the need to find missing links. What's wrong with that? If you can't find the murder weapon, convince the jury the accused shoots bullets through his ears!

And the theory goes on and on, twisting and turning around every discrepancy and contradiction.

If the logic and mechanics of the theory of evolution make much sense to you, you probably haven't scrutinized it too objectively. Hopefully this book, and particularly this chapter, will help you towards that end.

BORN OF IGNORANCE

For one species to have evolved into another, massive genetic changes would have to have occurred throughout earth's history. Probably the strongest thing going for evolution at the time of its inception, over a hundred years ago, was that virtually nothing was known about genetics in that era. Even today, the vast majority of the public, although somewhat familiar with terms like "genetic engineering" and "random mutation," are still pretty much in the dark with respect to this modern branch of science. And with constant exposure to the purported mechanics of evolution, it's no wonder that a theory with so little substance has been able to grab such a strong foothold on society; the average person simply does not know enough to say why evolution does not work.

I am convinced that if the public had had a decent understanding of genetics,

and random mutation in particular, before being presented with the theory of evolution, the theory could never have been taken seriously and certainly could never have been accepted as legitimate science.

Furthermore, another thing going for evolution is simply the constant exposure of its ill-founded concepts to the general public. I think it is human nature to become accustomed to an idea after repeated exposure no matter how insane the idea may be. And in the case of evolution, its constant exposure coupled with the general public's lack of understanding of the mechanics of certain genetic properties is what has helped perpetuate this theory.

Here's a rough idea of what a theory might sound like for the first time when you know quite well that the mechanics don't work:

THE WORM-TRAIN THEORY

Scientists took a worm crawling in a railroad yard and put it under a powerful electron microscope. They discovered that a worm's cell magnified three billion times has an uncanny resemblance to a train window. They concluded that if you incubate three dozen worms in a solution of amino acids and carbon compounds for approximately one and a half million years they will eventually evolve into the Long Island Railroad.

THE COMEDY OF SCIENCE

Of course, the above was only a tongue-in-cheek version of a "theory." However, in the following pages I hope to demonstrate how the theory of evolution is not that far removed from such a comical scenario.

EVOLUTION: A GENETIC IMPOSSIBILITY

Genetic engineering, or "gene splicing," is probably the hottest and most fascinating subject in modern medicine. It seems to hold answers to questions raised by some of the most baffling diseases. And it looks more promising every day.

Genetic engineering is the business of altering genes. Found by the hundreds, sometimes by the thousands, within the nucleus of every cell, genes cause the development of characteristics such as hair color, height, the shape of some living organisms, etc. Altered genes can cause an organism or its offspring to

take on new dimensions -- its physical characteristics may literally change. Sometimes these changes may be for the good. At other times, these altered genes, generally referred to as mutations, may cause genetic diseases which can destroy the organism. Although the potential of genetic engineering and the extent of its impact on biological systems are far from fully realized at this point in time, science has made great advances in the field.

A MISCONCEPTION ABOUT 'COULD'VE' AND 'DID'

It is human nature to sometimes see the possibility of an event as synonymous with the actuality of an event. This couldn't be more misleading when dealing with the subject of how genetic breakthroughs relate to the theory of evolution.

Many people, evolutionists and laymen alike, are exposed to media coverage on the progress of genetic engineering. However, by not putting the facts into proper perspective, it is easy for one to misinterpret "what is possible" as "what actually happened." That is, the idea that genetic research could confirm some arguments in support of evolution, is one misinterpretation one could easily make if not aware of the ill-founded logic involved. The logic may go something like: if scientists could change the makeup of a species to a considerable degree or change one species into another through genetic mutation in the lab, it could verify evolutionists' arguments that this could have happened naturally in the past.

Not quite.

A faulty logic we must rid ourselves of is: if you could prove that John Doe is the greatest artist that ever lived that would prove that he painted the Mona Lisa. To prove that John Doe painted the Mona Lisa, you'd have to do just that. Merely proving that he is capable of it does not prove that he actually did it. Elephants can shoot water through their trunks, but that doesn't prove African elephants have their own fire department.

No matter what scientists do in the lab in relation to biotechnology, it has little or no bearing on what actually happened in earth's past. Recent biotechnology has produced mixed-breed animals which doubtless never existed in earth's history. Thus, what is produced in the lab says nothing more than that it is possible in the lab. What earth produced in its past is a different story.

A MORE SERIOUS PROBLEM

But the fact that capability does not prove actuality is the least of evolutionists' problems. What modern man has learned thus far about genetic mutation does not only not support evolution but actually deals the theory a devastating and embarrassing blow.

To begin with, it is important that we differentiate between mutations affected by two different means:

RANDOM MUTATION

One, random mutation. This type of mutation comes about in a random fashion, without any preconceived design or plan on the genetic level. According to evolutionists, random mutation is purportedly what brought life from the one celled stage to its present complexity. That is, through a series of beneficial accidents of random mutations, they claim, simple organisms evolved over billions of years into new and more complex species.

'INTELLIGENT MUTATION'

Two, a process we can label "intelligent mutation." Tinkering and tampering with genes in a laboratory would come under this heading. Genes are "recombined" or "spliced" with the intent of affecting a change in the organism or its offspring.

Intelligent mutation has been responsible for two impressive genetic breakthroughs. First, scientists bred red-eyed fruit flies from brown-eyed parents. Second, by combining growth genes from rats with genes in mice, scientists caused some mice to be born twice their normal size.

To one not too familiar with medicine or biology, such insignificant changes may seem hardly worth noting. Therefore, it is necessary to emphasize that it took sophisticated twentieth-century science to affect such seemingly trivial changes. They are nothing short of stupendous achievements.

Again, these are the kinds of genetic manipulations one might wish to point out in support of evolution: "If we can do it in the lab, why couldn't nature have done it by accident on a grand scale in the last three and a half billion years?"

A LUDICROUS COMPARISON

To begin with, comparing intelligent mutation to random mutation is analogous to comparing the skillful incision of a surgeon to the random slashing of a mugger. There is not one recorded case of a mugging victim walking away from his assailant with a successful appendectomy or the successful removal of cataracts. It doesn't take a doctor or a scientist to know that an accident of random cutting will almost invariably leave behind chaos and destruction and never result in any sophisticated surgery.

Consequently, bringing intelligent mutation as an indication that nature could have produced complex species from one celled organisms through a long series of accidents of random mutations is mixing "apples and oranges." Intelligent design is normally the result of intelligence and design. And when the design is of a highly complex nature, as many life forms are, it indicates intelligence of a highly complex nature. Randomness, on the other hand, will generally not produce intelligent or sophisticated structures. Believing that nature accidentally produced complex life forms, in any period of time, no matter how long, is roughly equivalent to believing that the New York World Trade Center was built by a pack of wild mules who kicked an assortment of building material into the right places.

LUDICROUS EVEN WITHOUT COMPARISON

However, the genetic implausibility of evolution comes from elsewhere and has far stronger arguments. And without a solid genetic basis for biological organisms evolving into higher forms of life, the theory of evolution simply disappears into thin air.

So, here's how genetics -- the most crucial aspect of evolution -- does not only not support the theory but actually contradicts it:

SOURCES OF RANDOM MUTATIONS

Modern man has been acquainted with and directly affected by random mutations long before he ever took intelligent mutation seriously. Some sources of random mutations have been around even before we knew how they caused genetic effects. What are they? Carcinogenic chemicals. Cosmic rays. Sources of radioactivity such as nuclear weapons, nuclear reactors,

nuclear waste, and medical X-rays.

LET'S TAKE RADIOACTIVITY

X-rays were discovered by the German scientist Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen, making headlines on January 6, 1896. As innocent a discovery as it was at the time, man had unwittingly taken control of a highly potent force -- radiation. These rays would some day become a source of medical cures and also disease and destruction.

It wasn't until about a half century later that man realized the awesome potential of this "invisible light." On July 16, 1945, in a desert in Alamogordo, New Mexico, the United States detonated the first nuclear bomb in the world as a test. The destructive potential of this new weapon was horrifying. It could not only destroy life and an environment in a conventional explosion, but it could also accomplish the same with just its intense heat and radiation. In addition, it could render an environment uninhabitable for years, decades, or even centuries to come.

In that same year, 1945, the United States dropped atomic bombs on two Japanese cities, Hiroshima and Nagasaki. These two bombs alone -- as weak and as primitive as they were by today's standards -- killed over 190,000 people. It became obvious that we had taken control of a power so ferocious that the meaning of the word "war" would never be the same.

Then, as late as April of 1986, the core meltdown at the Chernobyl nuclear reactor finally made man acutely aware of the destructive powers of radiation even for peaceful purposes. This accident in the U.S.S.R. spread radiation panic throughout a large portion of the world's population. Once more, man was forced to deal with a nuclear-related situation hitherto unencountered.

THE COMMON DENOMINATOR

What the above historical events have in common is an introduction of a facet of radiation to modern man. The most destructive aspect of radiation is its ability to cause random changes on the genetic, molecular, and atomic levels, partially or entirely destroying a recipient organism.

Here's an idea of what radiation does:

IMMEDIATE DAMAGE

Exposure of high doses of radiation to limited parts of the body can cause severe tissue damage and eventual necrosis.

Exposure of the entire body to a few hundred "rem" (rem is a unit used for measuring radiation effectiveness) can initially cause nausea. Then, in about a month, the person might begin suffering hemorrhages, anemia, tiredness, weakness, and an increased risk of infection. Although some may survive, others will die as a result of these maladies.

At about 1,000 rem, nausea, vomiting, and diarrhea may develop within hours of exposure. As these symptoms become worse, they are followed by fever, loss of fluids, severe infections, and finally death.

At about 10,000 rem, the dose to which a worker might be exposed during a nuclear reactor accident, vomiting and diarrhea would occur within an hour, followed by reduced blood pressure, convulsions, and unconsciousness. Death would come within one to three days.

LONG-TERM DAMAGE

The fact that radiation can induce mutations and cause genetic effects has been known for at least fifty years. Studies show that radiation can cause not just one, but a variety of different types of mutations. One of the effects of these aberrations is cancer. The cancer can show up years or even decades after the organism's exposure to radiation. If the organism does not show any signs of cancer, there is still the possibility that cancer may show up in future generations.

Some other disorders or genetic diseases which may show up in later generations as a result of random mutations are: hemophilia, congenital cataract, spontaneous abortions, cystic fibrosis, color-blindness, and muscular dystrophy.

Still other diseases such as diabetes, heart disorders, asthma, and schizophrenia could manifest themselves in later generations as a result of random mutations combined with environmental factors.

THE BENEFICIAL CHANGES

We've just gotten a glimpse of the severe effects of random microscopic changes on biological life. And it seems that no matter at what level these changes occur -- genetic, molecular, or atomic -- the result is almost always the same: deterioration, destruction, and, in many cases, death.

Does this coincide with what evolutionists have been chewing our ears off with for years?

For years we've been hearing stories about how biological life underwent billions of years of random genetic changes. We've been hearing how by accident some of these changes resulted in beneficial mutations. We've been hearing how these beneficial mutations eventually resulted in new and more complex species. Yet, when we look at what random genetic changes -- or any other random changes, for that matter -- actually do to biological life, we find nothing but disease and death. Where are all those beneficial mutations evolutionists have been talking about? Not one patient has ever developed or passed on to future generations better biceps, for example, as a result of radiotherapy. Not one of the thousands of surviving bomb victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki has developed a more evolved brain, for example, as a result of exposure to radioactivity. Not one person involved in a nuclear reactor accident has developed a more sophisticated skin, for instance, which is tougher and more durable than average. In virtually every case, random mutations have resulted in havoc and destruction.

Is it possible that modern technology has actually disproven evolution rather than helped it?

Evolutionists in the past have hidden behind the "it took billions of years" routine. Before the nuclear age it may have been necessary to get into a time machine to verify whether, given enough time, random mutations would cause life to evolve. However, with the advent of modern technology's ability to affect massive random mutations relatively quickly, there is no longer a need to dig into the past to see the contrived fallacies supporting the evolutionary powers of random mutation. The answer is right in front of us. Random mutations result in quite the opposite of what we've been led to believe. They result in nothing but illness and fatalities -- not improvements. What's more, the more massive and prolonged the occurrences of these mutations, the greater the havoc and destruction. So what do you suppose would happen to a planet subjected to random mutations for billions of years? Total annihilation!

When you take what we know as fact today about random mutation and try to reconstruct a scenario of those alleged billions of years of earth's history, instead of the fairy tale story of evolution, you come up with a picture which more and more resembles a horrible scene out of a "post-nuke" movie:

Even if earth had already been as populated in that alleged period of three and a half billion years ago as it is today, and had since been affected by billions and billions of random mutations, according to what we know today about random mutation, by now life would probably have been virtually wiped out. With random mutation being the highly destructive force that it apparently is, the process which was supposed to have caused life to evolve is precisely what would have caused, in all probability, such genetic havoc that few organisms would have survived the ordeal. Furthermore, under such circumstances, "survival of the fittest" is a totally ludicrous concept. The word "fit" would have described largely those organisms which were less disease ridden than the rest, a far cry from the "better species" of evolution. And of those "fit" survivors, many would have passed on genetic diseases to their offspring. Even if the "fit" had not been wiped out by the random mutations, their offspring still would have stood a chance of being wiped out by hereditary genetic diseases. Then, any disease-free offspring would again be threatened with annihilation when this entire mutation cycle started over again.

Thus, after billions and billions of years of random mutations, even in the unlikely event that some genes mutated in a way that might have ultimately produced some beneficial changes to an organism, an already populated planet would have been reduced to a few diseased life forms, at best. Those few beneficial genes, if they could even have existed, would have been so overwhelmed by the staggeringly high number of diseased genes necessary to produce just a few beneficial accidents, that they could never have borne any fruit. An organism would have been wiped out long before it had an iota of a chance to change or improve. In a sense, earth would have resembled a planet after a nuclear holocaust.

Now, if a planet began with relatively few life forms, as earth allegedly did, how far would life have gotten? I don't mean how far would evolution have gotten. I mean, how far would those few organisms have gotten before being wiped out by the destructive powers of random mutation? According to what we've actually seen random mutations do in modern times, life never would

have gotten off the ground, let alone proliferated into highly complex and healthy species. In all likelihood, earth would have turned into a desolate planet long ago.

Even the mice mentioned earlier who were born twice their normal size as a result of intelligent mutation had a high mortality rate. That is, not only does random mutation produce diseased life forms, but even beneficial mutations can have fatal side effects. So how do you suppose billions of years of random mutations would effect life -- even if they accidentally produced a few beneficial mutations along the way? Start a process of evolution? Destruction sounds more like it.

BASELESS THEORETICS

There is no question that intelligent mutation can effect certain beneficial changes in an organism or its offspring. There is no question that natural hereditary effects can cause a member of a species to be born "bigger and stronger" than the rest -- not as a result of random mutation, but by the manifestation of traits which may have been dormant for generations. There is no question that biological systems can adapt to their environment on a macro level. But to say that adaptation to an environment or any other natural phenomena can result in random mutations which will eventually produce new or more complex species is totally baseless. To say that life started with few life forms and evolved into today's profuse, complex, and generally healthy life forms is contrary to everything twentieth-century science has learned thus far about random mutation. To say that a one celled organism evolved even into a one inch fish is an unrealistic stretch of the imagination which requires a lot of dishonest and twisted reasoning. To say that a human being is the result of an accidental evolutionary process is sheer lunacy.

The very fact that there are billions upon billions of healthy life forms in existence today actually proves the precise opposite of what evolutionists believe -- that life on earth could not possibly have gone through any massive random genetic changes. And without genetic changes, evolution is as dead as a fossil.

Furthermore, if genetic engineering proves anything, it proves that it takes a high degree of intelligence and sophistication to do nothing more than just tamper with existing forms of life. Consequently, creating or even significantly

improving a species, requires intelligence and sophistication of an even higher degree. The notion that any random genetic process can create new or more complex species is not science, logic, or even a theory -- it is purely a product of the imagination.

A MATHEMATICAL IMPROBABILITY

Even without genetic considerations, the ludicrousness of evolution can be expressed in terms of simple mathematical probabilities. If, for the sake of argument, a process -- random mutation -- will develop life in billions of years and the same process will destroy life within a human lifetime, which will happen first? The destruction? No, it will not happen first -- it's the only thing that'll happen. In the time that life is suppose to develop, it will be destroyed literally millions of times over -- nothing can ever get to the point of developing.

Even the question "Given billions of tries, can a spilled bottle of ink ever fall into the words of Shakespeare?" has become obsolete as a result of modern man's understanding of random mutation. Till now, this question pointed out odds so astronomical that it rendered the event a virtual impossibility. Now, it's not even a question of beating ridiculous odds. Now we're shooting dice which deteriorate with each throw and eventually self destruct. That is, we're shooting dice (genetic "messages") which deteriorate (cause genetic diseases) with each throw (of random mutation) and eventually self destruct (the host organism). Thus, instead of, "Can you beat such ridiculous odds?" the question now becomes, "After relatively few tries, will you have any ink, paper, or dice left with which to try again?" Since the very life that is supposed to evolve will be destroyed in the process, it is impossible for the process to even go on for any required length of time. This makes it highly questionable, to say the least, that a trial-and-error method of genetic mutations could beat even realistic odds -- forget about the preposterous odds proposed by evolutionists. Therefore, whether life could develop in an environment (of genetic mutations) where even fully developed biological systems cannot survive is really no more a question of odds than whether a cow could survive underwater long enough to conceive and give birth -- it's simply impossible.

EVOLUTION OF ART

The insanity of evolution is also apparent in the more aesthetic aspects of man.

How could qualities such as artistry, abstract thinking, and appreciation of music have become traits common to an entire species? According to the mechanics (or imagery) of evolution, it would have been a great wonder if such qualities, so meaningless to the survival of purely physical and biological systems, would have evolved in only a minute fraction of a species. Yet, to be present -- to one degree or another -- in virtually every human being? How? This should never have happened.

The existence of such aesthetic human qualities as emotion, humor, and intellect cannot be explained biologically, no matter how ridiculous you want to get. Why, for example, did nature give us a sense of humor? How did nature even know what a sense of humor was? And how did a sense of humor render humans more "fit to survive?" There are millions of plants and animals without a sense of humor which have obviously survived. There are even humans without a sense of humor who seem to survive. How did such a quality ever evolve

MODERN SCIENCE

Evolution is certainly not the run-of-the-mill theory. For an unproven and outdated theory, it is taken rather seriously by a great number of people. Those who see through its faulty reasoning, biases, misinterpreted findings, and obvious defiance of common sense and logic, see it as just another feeble attempt to undermine and tarnish the rational person's ideals. It should be placed in the same category as sorcery and witchcraft. Such notions have one thing in common -- bereft of any plausible logic, they are "understood" only by those determined to believe in them. The most significant difference is that no one ever had the gall to call sorcery and witchcraft science.

It's ironic how, in a nuclear age, some of the same people who live with the constant fear of life on earth being catapulted into oblivion by a nuclear holocaust, can still believe that an aspect of this highly destructive nuclear force -- random mutation -- is the mechanism which brought us here. In Darwin's days they knew nothing about genetics, and certainly nothing about the unimaginably destructive nature of random mutation. But what about today? A theory which originated over a hundred years ago -- in times of relative scientific ignorance -- should have been abandoned by now. Instead, it seems that, the stronger the evidence against evolution becomes, the more determined are some individuals to believe in it.

SCIENCE FICTION

At this point, it should be at least somewhat obvious, even to those who have taken evolution seriously at some point, that the scenario proposed by this insane theory does not work and certainly could never have occurred. One may even find it puzzling how a concoction such as evolution could ever have been accepted as science in the first place. I think that if evolution can be called science, there should be several other equally qualified scientific topics included in science text books -- the physics behind Superman's X-ray vision, the story of how the power of speech evolved in Mickey Mouse, and the chemical composition of Batman's Shark Repellent Spray. If we're going to have fun theories, let's really make them fun.

EXTRATERRESTRIAL LIFE

ANOTHER DISPROOF

After disproving evolution on the genetic level, it may seem hardly necessary to delve into another branch of science to disprove the same theory. Let's face it, dead is dead. However, many nails are not knocked into a coffin to prevent the deceased from escaping. It is really a matter of building the coffin properly.

Moreover, in the case of building a "coffin" for evolution, mere "nails" are inadequate. At its peak, the theory enjoyed such widespread popularity that it may be difficult for some to accept that the theory is dead. It is somewhat akin to when a famous person dies; you know the person is dead but just can't accept it. With evolution it is therefore necessary to build a coffin around the coffin to emphasize the fact that the theory has not merely been laid to rest but that it was never really alive to begin with.

This chapter will look at some findings here on earth as well as in outer space.

'BILLIONS AND BILLIONS OF YEARS'

The phrase most often used by evolutionists is probably "billions and billions of years:" "life evolved over billions and billions of years," "the solar system developed over billions and billions of years," "the universe has been expanding for billions and billions of years." It almost seems as if these accounts of the evolution of our universe are intended to keep people from questioning unverifiable statements. That is, how do you go about disproving what allegedly happened so long ago? It's quite difficult to construct a planet in a laboratory and let it lie around for billions and billions of years to prove that life will not create itself. Unless, of course, you have a long lease.

If your lease expires within the next four and a half billion years, the following may be of interest to you:

SOME ASTONISHING FACTS

* In 1977 two scientists, in search of hot water spewing from the ocean floors,

crammed into a small research submarine named ALVIN and descended to the bottom of the ocean near the Galapagos Islands. Finding the first hydrothermal vent, an opening where water heated by earth's molten interior is released into the ocean, was not nearly as fascinating as what they discovered by accident -- the vent was surrounded by animals never seen before. Closest to the vent, in the midst of water which sometimes exceeds 450 degrees Fahrenheit, were tube worms, some of which were up to eight feet long.

For any living creature to thrive this deep in the ocean and in such scalding water was mind boggling enough. But there was more. Most animals need sunlight to survive; this part of the ocean gets no sunlight whatsoever.

Then, as if to laugh in the face of what's considered "normal" for biological life forms, these tube worms had no eyes, mouth, or intestinal tract. There may not be much to see in the dark, but how did these creatures eat or digest food?

It took scientists years to figure out how tube worms receive their nourishment. Without getting too involved with the details, these tube worms have a symbiotic relationship with bacteria which grow in profuse quantities near the underwater vent. The bacteria find their way into the tube worms, literally between their cells. The tube worms receive nutrition from the bacteria, and the bacteria in turn receive some vital functions from the tube worm.

If you think this sounds too bizarre and must be another one of my worm-train theories, I don't blame you. But it's not. Such creatures really do exist. And you haven't heard the most astonishing aspect of these creatures.

An additional factor in the area around the vent makes it an even more hostile environment than described above (if you can imagine that). The bacteria on which the tube worms depend, thrive on a chemical called hydrogen sulphide, which is found in the water coming from the hot vent. To most higher animals, hydrogen sulphide is as poisonous as cyanide!

We've just described a world which before its discovery was hard to imagine and certainly impossible to predict. The hostile environment in which the tube worms and their life-sustaining bacteria exist is truly "out of this world." It makes one wonder if biological life forms are limited or restricted in any way

whatsoever to any kind of environment.

* Since 1977, several more vents have been discovered on the ocean floors. Besides tube worms, other exotic animals have been found thriving in the immediate vicinity of the vents -- pink fish, snails, shrimp, sulphur-yellow mussels, and foot-long clams. Similar animal populations have since been discovered in waters only a few degrees cooler than freezing. In all, scientists have found three totally new forms of life and dozens of new species.

In addition to the adverse conditions under which these creatures live, apparently they can also survive in a wide range of temperatures.

* Cacti are known to survive the most difficult and unusual climates. Their ability to sustain themselves in areas of little rainfall, hot dry winds, low humidity, strong sunlight, and extreme fluctuations in temperature is nothing short of phenomenal. It's almost as if the physical structures of these plants, which help conserve the little water they receive and shed some of the excess sunlight, were designed by someone. Some cacti can survive internal temperatures of near 145 degrees Fahrenheit. Most plants haven't got a chance where some cacti prosper.

* Lichens, a combination of fungus and algae, have been found thriving in an area of Antarctica where temperatures sometimes get colder than 70 degrees below zero Fahrenheit. As far as hostile environments go, this seems to be the extreme opposite of deep, dark, hot waters.

* There are insects in the Antarctic which produce natural "antifreeze" to keep from freezing at lower temperatures. Another insect in the Antarctic produces anti-antifreeze. When temperatures get so low that other insects freeze to death, this natural compound allows this insect to freeze gradually. When temperatures get warmer, the insect thaws and lives on.

* Bacteria have been found growing an amazing 25 feet underground. For life to survive such depths is incredible, to say the least.

* There are animals and insects which carry venom strong enough to cause disease and death in other living organisms, yet these carrying organisms are unaffected by the venom. Mosquitoes spread yellow fever, malaria, dengue, and encephalitis to animals thousands of times their size. But no mosquitoes have been known to die of these diseases. Snakes, too, discharge venom which

kill other animals, yet they themselves are unaffected by the poisons they carry.

* Earth now has millions of species of plants and animals. The sheer number of species is overwhelming. The precise number of living organisms is nothing short of mind boggling. And the diversity of these creatures -- from such monstrosities as whales right down to microscopic life forms such as the amoeba -- is probably beyond the imagination of even Steven Spielberg.

IT IS BELIEVED . . .

In the course of earth's history, about a half billion animal species have been in existence. That's a half billion before you even bring plant life into the picture.

IT IS ALLEGED . . .

The sun, earth, and the other planets in our solar system, according to scientists, were formed about four and a half billion years ago. It is further alleged that the most primitive forms of life already appeared on earth about three billion years ago. Huge creatures such as dinosaurs roamed our planet as far back as 200 million years ago. They ruled for an enormously long period of over 100 million years. Finally, humans appeared about two to three million years ago. That is, something as complex as the human brain has allegedly been around for at least a staggering two million years. An optical instrument as sophisticated as the eye (of the non-human variety) has been around even longer.

VERIFICATION

Now, how does one verify how all these living organisms came into existence? That is, if you can't build your own planet and cultivate it for billions of years, what's the next best thing? Perhaps finding a planet in outer space which has been around for as long as earth. Not quite. That's not the next best thing. That's even better.

Why?

Because the science of planetary evolution, if you can call it that, is far from an exact science, to say the least. After 30 years, some scientists are having

great doubts about the generally accepted view of the composition of earth's atmosphere in that alleged period of three and a half billion years ago. For a long time scientists believed that earth's primordial atmosphere contained little or no oxygen. Now some studies suggest that earth's atmosphere may have contained one million times more oxygen than previously believed, and the ultraviolet rays of the sun may have pounded earth at levels thousands of times higher than today.

Whether the new interpretations make any more sense than the old assumptions is irrelevant. What is relevant here is that laboratory simulations and scientific deductions of primordial conditions on earth are obviously based on much guess work and unverifiable assumptions. So why resort to such vagrant concoctions when a real "living" planet tells the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

LIFE ON MARS

Two Viking spacecraft landed on Mars in the summer of 1976. Viking 1 landed in the Chryse Planitia region and Viking 2 landed in the Utopia Planitia region. One goal of these missions was to find life or evidence of life on Mars. The spacecraft spent months analyzing the Martian soil and atmosphere, with no luck. Not a trace of past or present life was found. No dinosaurs. No microorganisms. No carcasses. No bones. No fossils. Absolutely nothing. It became obvious to scientists that for evidence of life to be found on Mars, they'd have to send Frank Perdue up there to pluck his chickens.

Of the planets we've explored to date, Mars seems to resemble earth more closely than any other planet does. If life were to have existed anywhere else in our solar system, Mars would probably have been the place. But no trace of life has been discovered on Mars, or any other planet, for that matter.

FAVORITISM IN NATURE

Now take what is known, what is "believed," and what is "alleged," about earth and compare it to what is known about Mars. What do you get? Verification of theories? No. You get inexplicable contradictions! We live on a planet where life proliferates in virtually every corner. You'd be hard pressed to find a place on earth where there is no life whatsoever. And the environment doesn't seem to matter either. Life on earth thrives under the most adverse conditions. Yet, when we look at a planet right next to us in

space, what do we find? We find a barren world with no trace of life ever having existed. How's that possible?

Are we to believe that this god called evolution, who has given earth such a sophisticated organ as the human brain as far back as two million years ago, has to this date not managed to put forth on Mars so much as a dumb ass? Are we to believe that the same evolution which has given earth living creatures the size of dinosaurs 200 million years ago has in a staggering four and a half billion years not given Mars simple one-celled organisms? Are we to believe that this glorious evolution which has to this date given earth an astronomical total of literally millions upon millions of plant and animal species has in the same period of time not given Mars even one species of plant or animal?

Sure the Martian environment is hostile. But then, here on earth, two miles down at the bottom of the ocean near vents which spew hot water mixed with hydrogen sulphide in total darkness is not exactly my idea of a vacation spot either -- that's about as hostile as an environment can get! But life thrives there in complete defiance of what are normally considered ecological adversities. Antarctica is also a hostile environment. So is 25 feet underground. So is the desert. Furthermore, in that alleged period of three and a half billion years ago, the entire earth, according to scientists, was hostile. Life on earth allegedly began in an environment which would be hostile to many of today's life forms. And many of today's life forms live in conditions which would have been intolerable to the organisms which allegedly brought life into existence billions of years ago. But life on earth thrives in spite of it all.

Life on earth goes even a step further. Some organisms do not simply thrive in adverse conditions, they actually become immune to conditions which are designed to, and at one point did, kill them.

Bacterial dysentery is becoming more and more difficult to cure. There is a strain of gonorrhoea which is resistant to penicillin. A certain form of leprosy cannot be treated with the standard drug, dapsone. These are only a few of the cases of bacteria becoming resistant to antibiotics as a result of being overexposed to the very drugs which have killed them in the past. In some cases, bacteria even transfer this resistance to other bacteria which have not had such exposure to the drugs.

There is a species of South American bee which has become immune to DDT. The bees can carry doses hundreds of times the amount needed to kill other bees without suffering ill effects. Some mosquitoes are also immune to DDT.

So, you see, life on earth is as potent as it is diversified. It pushes forward, overcoming many seemingly insurmountable obstacles, and sometimes in spite of these obstacles. Looking at the diversity of conditions under which life on earth thrives, looking at the life forms which have learned to fight environmental hazards and man-made poisons, it's hard to imagine life on earth ever being completely wiped out by any kind of disaster, natural or manmade. But somehow, life on Mars has either been completely wiped out -- and the telltale traces mysteriously hidden -- or something prevented life from coming into existence. How do you account for the complete absence of any trace of life on Mars? Does evolution have favorites? It is totally inconceivable that something as powerful and as diversified as life has not left its mark on Mars. Where is all the evidence of an evolutionary process? If not living creatures, at least bones and fossils.

Some find it difficult to explain. But is it really difficult to explain? Maybe some people are just looking for the wrong explanations. Maybe they're looking for preconceived explanations and discounting the facts. The fact is there is no sign of life or evolution on Mars.

NEW LIFE FORMS

Let's take this one step further. Who made the life forms on earth the standard for life? That is, why does life have to have anything to do with oxygen, carbon dioxide, or even carbon compounds? As accidentally as life allegedly formed of what was available on earth, life could have formed of what ever happened to be available elsewhere in space. After all, we're still having problems grasping the limits to which biological life can go -- as is acutely demonstrated by tube worms and other unusual biological life forms -- we're certainly not close to understanding consciousness and intellect on a scientific level. We may know that consciousness and intellect "attach" themselves to certain biological systems, but we haven't the foggiest clue as to how or why; no scientist has yet shown any physical relationship between a biological system and the psyche. So why isn't there life on the moon? That's right, the moon's own version of "biological" life. Perhaps intelligent creatures made up of lunar soil which receive their nourishment through cosmic rays?

And what about Venus? Sure it's 900 degrees there. But by astronomical standards, when you talk about stars which burn at temperatures around ten million degrees, Venus could be the "Siberia" of the Milky Way. Why are there no creatures there which live in a 900 degree environment and drink sulfuric acid for nourishment

If some of this sounds a little facetious, it is not meant to be. Remember, we're not talking about a Supreme Intelligence with a plan, design, and purpose, which would imply that life was put precisely where it was meant to be and nowhere else for reasons we may or may not fully understand. We're talking about a mindless force of nature which purportedly creates life at random out of inanimate matter. What made life on earth so "feasible" and life elsewhere so "impossible?"

A PROBLEM IN LOGIC

To say that it is "difficult to explain" why life is in such abundance here on earth yet nonexistent elsewhere in the universe is just another case of sticking one's head in the ground. Explaining why a cigarette lighter will not work underwater is only difficult for someone who for some insane reason remains convinced it will work in spite of all contradictory evidence. Why it will not work is not difficult to explain. The difficulty lies in explaining why one continues to believe it will work. Similarly, why there is no extraterrestrial life is not difficult to explain. Our space explorations have found the irrefutable answer: the process we call evolution simply does not work. The difficulty lies in understanding those who prefer to ignore the facts.

According to NASA, microorganisms were inadvertently taken to the moon by an unmanned spacecraft. When the equipment of this spacecraft was brought back to earth more than two and a half years later by our astronauts, it was discovered that an earth microbe had survived the lunar environment, which is harsher than the Martian environment. Obviously, for life to have thrived on extraterrestrial bodies there was no need for nature to resort to biologically "strange" creatures. In spite of the hostile environments of these spheres, life forms with which we are familiar could have survived. Yet, these worlds show absolutely no signs of ever having been inhabited by any forms of life -- normal or strange. So, where does all this leave evolution? Not on very solid ground.

A HOSTILE EARTH

Strangely, even earth today, which is considered a hospitable environment to present life forms, only gives that appearance superficially. It took a twentieth-century epidemic -- AIDS -- to make us aware of the true hostile nature of the very environment modern man thrives in. AIDS is caused by a virus which attacks the immune system and leaves the body susceptible to a host of deadly diseases which are caused by other viruses and microbes. AIDS accentuates the grim reality that earth today is so contaminated with deadly viruses and bacteria that were it not for a complex and ingenious immune system, the average human being, and probably a host of other living organisms, could not survive beyond infancy. Is outer space really more hostile than this? A little hard to imagine. So why hasn't life in outer space evolved and developed an immune system to ensure its survival? A hostile environment? Hostile environments apparently do not deter life. Obviously, there is no such mechanism as evolution.

BONES, FOSSILS, AND DATING METHODS

THE 'EVIDENCE'

After disproving evolution from two different perspectives, it is not really that important to even consider the "evidence" which scientists rally in support of the theory. Circumstantial evidence, no matter how strong, cannot stand up in face of irrefutable proof to the contrary. And circumstantial evidence -- of a rather flimsy variety, I might add -- is all scientists have gathered to this date. Thus, dismantling the "evidence" at this point becomes more of an option rather than a necessity. With this in mind, I would like to briefly touch on some of the so-called "evidence."

RADIOCARBON DATING

Radiocarbon dating is a commonly used method to determine the age of archaeological finds. The process, sometimes referred to as "radiocarbon reading," involves measuring carbon decay.

Radiocarbon dating is basically this: a radioactive isotope of carbon, C-14, is formed in the atmosphere by cosmic rays. As a result, all living organisms absorb an equilibrium concentration of radioactive carbon. When organisms die, C-14 decays and is not replaced. Since we know the concentration of radioactive carbon the organism had when it was alive, and we also know that it takes about 5,600 years for half of that C-14 to decay, and another 5,600 years for half of what's left to decay, and so on, by measuring the remaining concentration of radiocarbon we can tell how long ago an organism died.

One obvious flaw in this technique is that we don't really know the level of radiocarbon concentration acquired by an organism which lived before such recorded history. Scientists make a bold assumption that the atmospheric concentration of the radioactive material -- carbon or any other element -- being measured has not changed since the organism's death. In addition, scientists make the assumption that the element's rate of decay has not changed since that time. Are these valid assumptions?

After everything scientists have told us, how can they make such assumptions? On one hand, we're being told that the universe has undergone drastic

changes since its formation. One moment before the big bang, the universe was nothing like one moment after the big bang. Gas clouds in space have condensed and turned into stars and planets. Moons have formed around some planets. Some planets have undergone evolutionary changes even after formation. Some stars have collapsed into neutron stars, others into black holes. Our universe has seen more changes in those past alleged ten billion years than the fitting room of a busy tailor.

Now, on the other hand, we're being told in effect, "Sure everything changed, but not radioactive bombardment and its rate of decay -- they have remained at the same level for billions of years." It's almost as if nature knew that some day archaeologists would have to find fossils which appear to be billions of years old to stay in business.

How does one explain the notion that everything in the universe has undergone drastic changes for billions of years except earth's radioactive bombardment levels and rate of decay, which happen to be crucial and integral parts of any attempt to substantiate evolution? "Nature" owed Charles Darwin a favor?

PROVEN TO FLUCTUATE

The fact is, radiocarbon concentrations have been proven to fluctuate. One of the oldest known living things on earth today is Methuselah, a bristlecone pine tree in California estimated to be about 4,600 years old. Another bristlecone pine believed to be older than Methuselah was cut down for scientific research. Comparing radiocarbon readings with the natural time clock of the tree's year by year rings, showed the radiocarbon dating system to be inaccurate. This inaccuracy showed up in a time period which, by astronomical standards, was only yesterday. Simply extrapolating this known range of inaccuracy over billions of years will show radiocarbon reading to be far less reliable than what scientists would like to believe. Then, taking into consideration that radiocarbon inconsistencies have shown up in such a relatively short period of time, who's to say that the rate of today's radioactive bombardment is not totally out of whack with what it was billions, millions, or even thousands of years ago.

Consequently, a fossil which an archeologist finds to be billions of years old by radioactive dating may in fact be no more than several thousand years old. What's more, an organism could conceivably seem to be, by today's

assumptions of yesteryear's radioactive bombardment levels and rate of decay, thousands or even millions of years old only days or months after its death.

ANOTHER DATING SYSTEM

There is another scientific dating system besides the radioactive method. This one analyzes the structural changes in a body's amino acids after death. The same human fossils were analyzed using this method and also using the radioactive method. The two dating systems showed discrepancies between 39,000 and 59,000 years. The proponents of each of the two dating methods argued that the other one was wrong. Obviously, one of these "scientific" methods must be wrong beyond a shadow of a doubt. And the other one? The other one doesn't exactly sound right beyond a reasonable doubt.

So, to find out how long ago an organism died, you might be better off using an old and far more reliable dating method -- a seance in which you conjure up an organism's spirit and simply request the precise date of demise. This may not sound terribly scientific, but you meet some very interesting (living) people at seances.

BRITTLE BONES AND FUZZY FOSSILS

Materials dated in support of evolution quite often turn out to be a bigger farce than the dating methods themselves. Bone and fossil records maintained by paleontologists contain so many gaps and discrepancies -- which of course is not surprising since the events they are supposed to depict could never have occurred -- that they suggest a history of evolution in much the same way that a worm's cell suggests the early stages of a train window. The "proofs" seem to get lost in the gaps, and the "logical" deductions attempting to bridge these gaps are as brittle as the bones. Strangely, the only ones who seem to "understand" how all the pieces fit together are the ones who were totally convinced of the "truth" long before the "proofs" were ever found.

The only way bones and fossils could be taken seriously is if profuse quantities of intermediate species linking other species in an evolutionary chain were found. That is, not just many members of one intermediate species -- that would only indicate that a species existed which was simply similar to two other species. And not just isolated members of several intermediate species -- that would only indicate that some species occasionally produced deformed

members. But many intermediate species and many of their members, showing an unmistakable transformation of one species into another. As it stands, however, not only are there no profuse quantities of many intermediate species, but there are no profuse quantities of even one intermediate species. What archaeologists have are the kinds of isolated samples of bones and fossils which must be interpreted and "given meaning;" the findings by no means speak for themselves. The "scientific" method of interpreting bones and fossils appears to be somewhat similar to interpreting the ink blots of psychologists, in the sense that what you see depends a great deal on who you are and the particular inclination of your imaginative faculties. Along these lines, if you discovered a thin string buried together with some old chicken bones, for example, you could, if you tried hard enough, interpret it to mean that prehistoric chickens had teeth because they obviously used dental floss. The fact that no teeth were found would only mean that a "minor" missing link still remained to be found in this otherwise solid theory.

What the "science" of interpreting bones and fossils pretty much boils down to is a game in which any interpretation is correct as long as it cannot be disproven. Proving the interpretation doesn't seem to be part of the game. And for very good reason. The interpretation cannot be proven for the same reason that it cannot be disproven -- bone and fossil records are grossly deficient of cold, hard facts.

COMMON TRAITS

The above two topics -- dating methods and archaeological records -- have one thing in common: as they stand, neither one proves or disproves the theory of evolution. And, as limited as these branches of science seem to be in their ability to uncover strong leads in reconstructing past events, I find it unlikely that either one will change drastically as relates to evolution in the foreseeable future. I therefore did not find it appropriate to spend much time on these topics when in the best case they lead in circles.

Ironically, when it comes to trying to substantiate evolution, it is archaeological discoveries which evolutionists harp on the most. Perhaps they do this for the same reason that I cover it only briefly -- because it leads nowhere, pro or con. And if you're trying to avoid being disproven, what safer ground is there to tread upon?

Furthermore, even if profuse quantities of many intermediate species did

exist, which of course they do not, they still could not stand up in face of the case built against evolution in the previous chapters on genetics and space exploration. The genetic impossibility of evolution and the fact that there is no extraterrestrial life would necessitate another interpretation of such archaeological findings. Such findings could by no means prove that evolution is genetically possible, when modern science shows it is not. And such findings could not suggest that there must be life elsewhere in space, when space exploration shows there is none. Consequently, even if such archaeological discoveries did exist, they still would not come close to being a "formidable opponent" of genetics and space exploration -- with genetics and space exploration on one side and such archaeological findings on the other side, the archaeological findings would have to give way. Needless to say, as far as present archaeological findings go, they couldn't be worse off if they were still buried deep in the ground.

.

AN UNSCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO SCIENCE

THE THORNS WITH THE ROSES

Before moving on, I'd like to clarify something. I happen to be a strong advocate of scientific research, exploration, and development. Scientific discoveries have certainly benefitted mankind in many ways, ranging from luxuries to health. Scientific theories are a natural by-product of the business of pursuing the "hows" and "whys" of the laws of nature. Unfortunately, however, there's a dark side to scientific study which cannot be taken lightly. As stimulating and as uplifting as the study of nature may be at times, allowing emotion and zeal to overshadow truth and objectivity is not in the interest of science and certainly not in the interest of a public eager to understand the world it lives in. And I, for one, am not in favor of accepting theories as facts simply because they have been "long held." Theories do not turn into facts merely because they have been around for so long that we've grown accustomed to them. To be accepted as fact, a theory must still be proven. And clinging to theories of evolution in the face of hard contradictory evidence which render evolution more a fantasy than a reality, is about as unscientific as you can get, not to mention insulting to the intelligence of every human being who is subjected to such stubbornness in the name of science.

A NEW BREED

Fortunately, there's a growing list of competent scientists who are abandoning old, outdated, and disproven theories of evolution. Evidently, clinging to evolution has little to do with the business of being a scientist. If this trend continues, we may someday boast a scientific community which is honest in its search for the truth and all its ramifications. Who knows what discoveries lie on this relatively new frontier.

THE SOLAR SYSTEM

A GAS CLOUD

The theory of the evolution of life is not the only "science" not supported by facts. In these days of space exploration, the theories behind the evolution of the solar system are not quite on solid ground either.

The theory held by many scientists concerning the evolution of our solar system is basically that a large gas cloud in space condensed into what we now call the sun. Chunks of this cloud flew off into orbit around the sun and eventually condensed into planets. That is, the other planets in our solar system were allegedly formed by the same process which formed our own planet, earth.

Sound logical? It might have -- in the eighteenth century. Not today. Space exploration does not seem to support this.

EXPLORATION OF VENUS

On February 12, 1961, the Soviet Union launched Venera 1 into solar orbit, making it one of the earliest attempts to probe Venus. By the time Veneras 13 and 14 landed on Venus in early 1982, man had already landed several modules on Venus which relayed good data back to earth. Throughout these missions it became painfully clear to scientists that the real Venus had no resemblance to the Venus about which they had theorized before the probes.

Venus was once thought of as "earth's twin." It is our nearest neighbor in the solar system, and it is approximately the same size and density as earth. Although Venus intercepts twice as much sunlight as earth because it is closer to the sun, it was thought that its surface conditions were similar to earth's since the thick global clouds of Venus reflected most of the extra light. Scientists reasoned further that since earth and Venus condensed from the interstellar clouds of the same region in space their elemental composition must be roughly the same.

The theories about Venus went as far as saying that its atmosphere was made up of the same gases as that of earth, and one day on Venus was about the

same length as a day on earth.

The picture we had of Venus was of a planet similar to earth except for something of a "murky jungle" spanning the entire globe. The impression scientists gave was that astronauts landing on Venus would need little more than London Fog coats.

As exploration of Venus proceeded, facts began replacing completely erroneous theories. Not only were conditions on Venus not what we had anticipated, but the data returned by the Venera and Mariner missions showed Venus to be so different that it appeared highly unlikely that earth and Venus could have evolved from the same gas clouds. We found Venus to be a far more hostile environment than the "murky jungle" we had envisioned.

So much so, that Venus' climate is probably more hostile than any other planet in our solar system. The only ones more disappointed than scientists were Bangladesh tigers -- they were convinced that after death they went up to the jungles of Venus.

Here's an idea of what it's like on Venus: the temperature is around 900 degrees Fahrenheit -- that's great vacation weather, if you happen to be a tube worm with poor circulation. The atmosphere is about 97 percent carbon dioxide, as compared to earth's atmosphere of about 90 percent nitrogen and oxygen.

Bright sunny days on Venus are nonexistent; every day is like a heavy overcast. And if the sun did come out, you could never go to the beach on Venus because there are no oceans. Venus is so dry that the relative humidity rarely reaches one percent; forget about "raindrops fallin' on your head." But then, on Venus, the last thing you'd want is rain. Rain on "earth's twin" consists of sulfuric acid. Such a rain would dissolve sulfur, mercury, lead, tin, and most rocks. To go out in weather like that your Totes hat would need a lining made of tempered steel, and Tarzan would have to wear a lot more than "Fruit of the Loom."

If you still think conditions on Venus are similar to those of earth, I strongly suggest you move to another neighborhood -- your present one has completely deteriorated.

Venus has a surface pressure of about 90 times that of earth, which is the equivalent of going about a half mile down into the ocean. The sun rises in the west and sets in the east.

One day on Venus takes approximately eight earth months; a couple living on Venus could have a baby almost every "day."

AGAIN, CONTRADICTIONS

Of all the great differences between earth and Venus, one in particular poses a very strong and obvious question: if earth and Venus formed of the same gas clouds, how can 70 percent of earth's surface be covered with water yet the only trace of water on Venus is a relative humidity of about one percent? What happened to all the water on Venus? Or, where did all the water on earth come from?

AND THEN, THE THEORIES

One theory, and perhaps even the only one, about where all the water on Venus went is this: millions of years ago, the greenhouse effect of Venus' atmosphere caused its temperatures to soar above 2000 degrees Fahrenheit. This caused water to break up into hydrogen and oxygen. The hydrogen escaped into space and the oxygen mixed with molten rock forming the Venusian crust.

Then why is there a large volume of water on earth?

Scientific studies suggest that earth, during its alleged formation, was hot enough that to this day it retains a molten core. So, if earth also went through extreme heat during its infancy, why didn't water on earth take the same course as water on Venus? By the time earth cooled, there should have been about as much water left on it as there is on Venus today -- practically none.

Furthermore, there is no evidence indicating that there was ever any large volume of water on Venus. There are no gullies, trenches, or craters left vacant by oceans, lakes, or rivers. If all the waters on earth were to disappear, they'd leave some unmistakable natural landmarks behind.

The answer given by some is that perhaps Venus' high temperatures never allowed water to even reach a liquid state.

Then why is there no water on Mars? Mars is cooler and farther away from the sun than Venus and even earth; it has no scorching atmosphere, but it is an extremely dry planet. That is, Mars does not have the kind of atmosphere which might have kept water from condensing or might have caused water to disappear as it allegedly did on Venus. Yet, Mars has only some ice at the poles and small traces of water vapor in the atmosphere. No oceans, rivers, glaciers, or even ponds. Where did all the water on Mars go? Or why wasn't any there to begin with?

So, you see, no matter what your vantage point, earth's surface being 70 percent covered with water is, from an evolutionary standpoint, an inexplicable phenomena. Did the planets really evolve of the same stuff in space? Did they evolve at all? It certainly does not seem that way. How do you explain three planets are right next to each other and one is a dry oven, one is an arid desert, and the one in the middle is flooded with water? Evolution? Think again.

And while you're thinking, try explaining why earth has a magnetic field while Venus does not. And why Venus revolves differently from the other planets. And why most of the planets are flat at the poles while Venus is round. And why the surface of Venus is smooth in comparison to that of earth and Mars.

Because the planets in our solar system were formed by the same evolutionary process? There is no better proof than the planets themselves that presently held theories of planetary evolution do not "hold water."

A BETTER THEORY

Maybe what we need is simply another imaginative theory concerning the disappearance of water on Venus: About 648 million and a half years ago, 7 billion little aliens with big bladders landed on Venus in a spaceship the size of Krakatoa.

They drank up all the water, then flew to earth and went to the men's room. (The women stayed home to take care of the babies -- with bladders like that, babies need a lot of attention.)

THEORIES DO NOT CHANGE FACTS

The question of whether scientific accounts of the origin and evolution of the planets actually occurred is premature at this point. There's a more fundamental question here: do theories of planetary evolution make any sense? In spite of the onslaught of "scientific" theories, which sometimes give the impression of being designed to make sense out of the irrational, our space explorations seem to indicate that these theories make no sense.

Strangely, here on earth, accurate weather predictions are limited to a matter of days. The course of such commonplace weather conditions as storms and hurricanes sometimes cannot be accurately predicted a mere twenty four hours in advance. But somehow, there are "experts" who can state with astonishing certainty how the weather patterns on Venus over alleged billions of years caused entire oceans to go up into space and down into rocks. Maybe we ought to send some scientists to live on Venus so they can give us better weather predictions here on earth?

NEW TOOLS

The problem apparently is that scientists are trying to solve new puzzles -- puzzles brought about by space exploration -- with outdated "tools" -- old theories. It's time to stop bending and twisting these tools in a futile attempt to make them fit the facts. It's time to get new tools. What we need are theories which fit the facts and do not pretend to explain what they cannot. We need theories which do not become obsolete every time science takes another step forward. Perhaps such theories will come when we finally realize that although every physical phenomenon must have an origin, not every origin must necessarily be of a physical nature.

COMMENTARY

WHY DOES IT LINGER ON

We have just refuted the theory of evolution from three different standpoints. One showed how biological evolution is genetically impossible, one showed how space discoveries seem to confirm the inability of biological systems to evolve, and one showed how even evolution of the solar system makes no sense. So why are there still people who believe in theories of evolution?

One article I read pointed out the sophistication of an eye. Without even getting into the genetic impossibility of evolution, the article showed how for evolution to have been a reality, several improvements in the eye would have had to evolve simultaneously -- a scenario of such a high degree of improbability that it rendered the theory a virtual impossibility. This article alone should have been enough to lay evolution to rest. Although it probably did just that for some, it apparently did not do away with the theory for all. Why not?

Extensive literature has been written disproving the theory of evolution. Many of these books are more technically involved than this one. Each one of these books should have been enough to lay evolution to rest. Yet, although some of these books have caused many to realize the insanity of evolution, they have obviously not managed to do away with the theory entirely. Why not?

After all, it is not necessary to disprove every aspect of evolution in order to disprove the theory. To show that a space vehicle will never land on the moon, for example, it is not necessary to prove that every component of the craft will malfunction. Simply proving that at least one vital component essential in reaching its destination will malfunction -- a booster rocket, the guidance system, the lunar module which descends upon the moon -- renders the mission's goal unattainable. The same is true with evolution. Disproving only one crucial aspect of it should be enough to do away with the entire theory. Which means that anyone acquainted with only one of these disproofs should have given up the theory by now. Surely anyone familiar with many of the disproofs should have dropped the theory like a hot potato. Why is it that all the disproofs seem to make little impression on some people?

I think the problem lies in "killing the wrong horse." My experiences have shown that many laymen who believe in evolution, ironically, know little about it. Apparently, they have either taken a liking to the theory or have simply put their trust in the scientists who perpetuate it. This, I believe, explains why all the literature already in existence disproving the theory has not had the kind of impact one might expect. If some people never cared enough to find out on a scientific level why they thought the theory was legitimate, what good is going into the technical details of why the theory doesn't make any sense? Neither common sense, logic, nor the theory's legitimacy was the reason these people accepted it in the first place. So by continually disproving evolution, you just keep "killing the same dead horse." It's not a question of whether the horse is dead or not. The problem is in the perception of those who refuse to believe the horse is dead in spite of the fact that there is a carcass lying in front of them. The point I'm making is that belief in the theory of evolution has origins outside the realm of scientific validity. The facts seem to have little impact on some people. To them it's a matter of personal inclination.

I believe evolution is as much a psychological problem as it is a scientifically technical one. After having disproven evolution on a scientific level, as others have done before me, but perhaps with a somewhat different approach, my goal now is to touch the psychological aspects of the theory. Searching for the reasons or motivations -- unrelated to scientific technicalities -- behind the acceptance of evolution by so many, so blindly, can perhaps shed the kind of light necessary for some to find their way out. Perhaps showing how logic is being tainted, or totally replaced, by emotions, might help some see evolution for what it really is -- a whimsical concoction of modern imagery.

My objective, therefore, in the next few chapters is to show how the layman's acceptance of evolution is largely due to a sort of double standard in logic. That is, the kind of "logic" by which some people accept "scientific" theories is not the kind of logic by which they actually live.

STRANGE PLANETS

ACCEPTANCE WITHOUT JUSTIFICATION

Before demonstrating the layman's ill-justified acceptance of some scientific theories, it is necessary, as you will soon see, to recount some of the strange and inexplicable discoveries in our solar system in addition to the ones already listed above.

THE MOON

On July 16, 1969, Apollo 11 was launched with three astronauts aboard: Neil A. Armstrong, Edward E. Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins. Their mission: to land on the moon. This mission, being the first manned exploration of an extraterrestrial body, received unparalleled media coverage. The first step on the moon was replayed on TV so many times that my parrot learned to say, "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

Before manned exploration of the moon, a widely accepted theory concerning the state of the moon was the "dead boulder" theory. Scientists believed that the forces which brought our moon into existence could only have produced a "dead chunk." They apparently could not envision any activity or history of activity -- fires, volcanoes, molten rock, and the like -- on the moon.

By the time the Apollo program ended, our astronauts had brought back so many lunar rocks that the full moon looked a bit lean. The rocks were analyzed for years, and the findings were astonishing: the moon, it turned out, was not a "dead rock" after all. The lunar rocks were various forms of igneous material. At some point in the moon's history it must have been flooded with oceans of white-hot, melted rock. Scientists concluded that the moon was once the scene of large scale thermal, chemical, and mechanical activity.

Theories surrounding the evolution of the moon were rewritten. No, not by scientists. By the moon rocks themselves. The moon had now become a "once living little planet," a far cry from the original "dead rock." And although exterior activity seems to have died, there is even speculation that the moon's core is still active today.

At this point, it is far from clear where the moon's "life" came from.

The ironic thing is that before the Apollo program began, scientists had had three basic theories concerning the origin of the moon. One, the moon came from outer space and somehow swung into its present orbit. Two, the moon was a chunk which broke off earth and flew into orbit. Three, the moon was formed by accretion of smaller chunks in space. Strangely, scientists had never been sure to begin with whether the physics of theories one and two were even possible. And the Apollo program ended with scientists no closer to an answer; although the rocks gave some insight into the moon's composition, they created a great mystery around its origin and formation.

So, the moon went from misconceived notions before exploration, to inexplicable findings after exploration.

SATURN

On August 25, 1981, Voyager flew past Saturn. Again, facts made a laughing stock out of theories. We couldn't have been much farther from the truth about Saturn's rings if we had thought them to be an intergalactic creature's bagel collection.

After exploration, the rings of Saturn were described by scientists with words like "outrageous," "perplexing," "maddening," "puzzling," and the like. What scientists once thought was a three-ring system with a "well understood" structure turned out to be a bewildering system of thousands of ringlets. And the rings of Saturn suddenly turned into a confusing mystery. Science has yet to come up with the physics to explain them. How are they formed? How do they change patterns?

And the mysteries surrounding Saturn went beyond the formation of the rings. One of our spacecraft picked up intense radio emissions about one million times as powerful as lightning emanating from Saturn's rings. The discovery was so bewildering and unexpected that scientists at the time thought the spacecraft's instruments had malfunctioned. These radio emissions remain as baffling a mystery today as the rings themselves.

Some think it may be years before scientists explain all that they have encountered during exploration of Saturn and its rings. Some are not that

optimistic and don't think we will ever explain it all.

URANUS

On January 24th, 1986, Voyager 2, after about an eight year and 3 billion mile journey, flew within 51,000 miles of Uranus. The data relayed back to earth was just another indication of how little we really understand about cosmological physics.

Uranus, too, is nothing short of a great big puzzle. The planet lies on its side; instead of its equator, one of its polar regions points toward the sun. Added to this enigma is that the north pole on Uranus is 55 degrees away from the north magnetic pole; on earth, it is only about 12 degrees away.

Of the five major moons found orbiting Uranus, one in particular, Umbriel, amazed scientists. While the other four moons had long ridges, glacier flows, and deep fractures, which are signs of internal activity, Umbriel showed none of these. A statement by Dr. Lawrence A. Soderblom of the United States Geological Survey echoed scientists' puzzlement: "Sandwiched between objects that are very active, there is one (Umbriel) that's very dark and very old and inactive." He also indicated that scientists were at a loss to explain why Umbriel should be so different from the other moons.

After viewing photos of another one of Uranus' moons, Miranda, scientists described it as one of the most bizarre worlds in our solar system. Its features are as puzzling as Umbriel's but more pronounced.

Dr. Edward C. Stone of the California Institute of Technology summed it up this way: "The Uranus system is just totally different than anything we've seen before."

A HUMBLING EXPERIENCE

Can it be that in these days of great technological advances our understanding of cosmological physics is still so shallow that we cannot satisfactorily explain some discoveries in our very own solar system? As if to add insult to injury, Saturn and Uranus seemed to thrust themselves a notch beyond simply destroying theories. Exploration of these planets has shown that there are phenomena in our own solar system which defy explanation even after discovery. That is, not only have theories been shattered, but our entire

inventory of scientific data is insufficient to explain some existing phenomena. And we're talking about phenomena relatively close to us -- not millions or billions of light-years away. We're talking about events in our own time -- not in the universe's distant past.

The point in noting the disappointments and puzzles encountered within our solar system will be made clearer in the next chapter.

THE UNIVERSE

UNFATHOMABLE

To date, our space explorations, manned and unmanned, have uncovered a world of intriguing, perplexing, puzzling, fascinating, and even awe-inspiring phenomena. Whether we understand it or not, the universe we live in seems to be a highly organized system or set of smaller systems functioning in harmony. All of its components work within a framework of very structured, precise, and clearly defined laws of nature. If this were not so, the universe could not possibly have survived in its present state of complexity for any long period of time, certainly not for thousands of years. If the laws of gravity were to cease functioning for only one moment, all orbiting bodies throughout the universe would move into different orbits. For life on earth, this would be catastrophic. If the "strong force" which holds together sub-atomic particles were to cease functioning, all matter in the universe would disintegrate. Obviously, the laws of nature function every moment of every day, with utmost precision.

Our universe contains atomic and sub-atomic particles not visible to the naked eye and sometimes not even visible with sophisticated instruments. It also contains planets, stars, huge galaxies spanning tens of thousands of light-years across space -- some of which are so far from earth that they appear as mere specks in the sky -- and galaxies billions of light-years apart. The laws of nature are so complex that they support millions of forms of life on our planet while maintaining the integrity of the cosmos as a whole. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for the most intelligent human being to even imagine a more complex system, let alone come up with a functioning design of anything nearly as complex.

And as much as modern man has already learned, we're just beginning to see the tip of the iceberg concerning the complexities of the laws of nature. There have been people who have devoted virtually their entire lives to discovering and studying the laws of nature. Doctors have studied medicine. Astronomers have studied the skies. Biologists have studied vast numbers of life forms. Physicists have studied the laws of nature governing the cosmos right down to those governing events on the quantum level. And the list goes on. Yet, not one of these endeavors has thus far resulted in the complete knowledge of even one

subject. I'm not talking about knowing everything about every subject. I'm talking about knowing everything about only one subject. It hasn't happened yet. And you'd think that after all the scientific discoveries, achievements, and sophistication of the twentieth century, such knowledge might at least lie in the foreseeable future. But that doesn't seem to be the case either. In many instances, it's quite the contrary. Some branches of science seem to become increasingly elusive in direct proportion to our sophistication. For the "cut and dried" physical world this is supposed to be, this kind of complexity almost rivals spiritualism itself.

Now, an intelligent person would ask himself, "Where did all this complex ingenuity come from?"

A 'BIG BANG?'

There is a theory generally referred to by scientists as the "big bang." No, it has nothing to do with the fourth of July. When the fourth of July ends, we're usually left with a lot of exploded shreds of garbage. When this purported "big bang" ended, it allegedly left us with debris which somehow evolved into a highly complex and organized universe. How? Beats the heck out of me. Let's see if it beats the heck out of you.

Big-bang theorists hold that the universe began between ten and twenty billion years ago. There was this "something or other" which exploded. Since then the universe has been expanding. Everything in it evolved from the stuff of that explosion.

Let's see if we understand this. In spite of the fact that just about any kind of an explosion we could cause would result in nothing but chaos and destruction, we're being told, against all logic, that an explosion is what began the process of building the inconceivably complex system we now call our universe. Isn't that a bit like saying that if you blew up a Rubik's cube the little pieces could conceivably become more complex than the original cube? It is common sense that an explosion will create a general state of fragmentation and disarray. After ripping a system apart, isn't it rather absurd to expect the resulting chaos to become more intricate and organized than the original system? When you think about it, after an explosion, it is unrealistic to expect a system to even maintain its previous level of complexity, let alone evolve into something more complex.

An example: If you took every nut, bolt, and part necessary for the construction of a car, piled them up on top of a bomb, and blew them up, would you ever expect the parts to fall down into a functioning car by mere chance? How many times would you say you'd have to blow the pieces up to get a functioning car? Fifteen million? Seventeen billion? Or do you think it could never happen? Sure the pieces would fall into different configurations and shapes after each explosion; configurations which may be pleasant to look at with an abstract, artistic eye. Configurations which may even inspire you with thoughts like, "Where's the broom?" But to think that you could eventually get into a car and drive off is confusing the laws of probability with intelligent design. If you blow up the pieces of a car, all you will ever get is a pile of junk. And maybe a few lumps on your head from falling debris. But that's about it.

The scientifically accepted theory of the origin and evolution of our universe says, in effect, that if you blew up the parts of a car you could get a lot more than just a car -- you could accidentally get a supersonic jet or a space shuttle! This is a better story than what used car dealers give you.

UNSUPPORTED BY SCIENCE ITSELF

If the idea that chaos cannot accidentally turn into design and organization makes sense to you, congratulations! You have something of a knack for thermodynamics. The second law of thermodynamics states that energy decreases in utility, moving from a state of order to disorder and finally to a stage of randomness and decay. The notion that a "big bang" can be the seed for a universe such as ours is in direct violation of this law. In a big bang scenario, rather than order turning into disorder, the precise opposite happens -- chaos not only turns into organization, but into an ingenious system of mind boggling complexity. This doesn't coincide with scientific principles, and it certainly doesn't hold up logically.

When confronted with the second law of thermodynamics as it relates to the evolution of life, many scientists respond that this law does not apply to an "open system." Earth, they say, is an open system since it is influenced by extraterrestrial systems. So, let's say you cannot use this argument against life on earth. (We've already taken care of life on earth with genetics and space exploration.) But, how do you do away with the second law of thermodynamics when it comes to the entire universe? The entire universe cannot possibly be an open system -- there are no outside systems to influence

it. Even if we were to discover "other universes" (of anti-matter, for example), it would still not make our universe an open system. Anything we discover becomes part of the "big picture" of our entire universe or part of one big super universe. Thus, after all is included, we inevitably wind up with one huge closed system. How did this entire system turn into a workable machine of inconceivable sophistication by accident?

Answer: It didn't, because it couldn't. There is no logical or scientific basis whatsoever for an entire universe to develop out of chaos. Such an occurrence would need an "outside" force. And since we've already included literally "everything" in our definition of "our universe," there are no outside forces left. Consequently, since our universe is in existence and is in a complex state, its only possible origin would have to be a force not within the confines of our physical world. In short, we'd be talking about a force unlike anything we are acquainted with on a physical or scientific level -- quite conceivably something of a spiritual nature. Perhaps it is this spiritual aspect, the only true logical option, which scientists are trying to avoid.

Without getting involved in the spiritual implications of our physical universe for the moment, let us note what is relevant here: that the structure of our universe, like genetics, shows a high degree of intelligence and sophistication in its design and implementation. Perhaps the intelligence required is so overwhelming that some individuals simply find it too mind-boggling to consider. But attributing the super-phenomenal feat of the development of our universe to an accident of chance is not the answer. Aside from it not being scientific, it falls somewhat short of sound, level-headed thinking. There's certainly no evidence supporting such an accident. The mere existence of our universe does not prove it was formed by accident. If anything, our universe does give every indication of having been designed with intelligence. Studying just about any branch of science will tell you, without any great reasoning abilities, that there is intelligence in the design and implementation of the laws of nature on every level. So, it might be more scientific to take this into account rather than adopt a fantasy which cannot be scientifically or logically substantiated.

THE DOUBLE STANDARD

This brings us back to something mentioned in an earlier chapter -- the "double standard" in logic by which some people accept scientific theories.

When the layman accepts theories of evolution without possessing much knowledge of them, he obviously puts his trust and faith in those who perpetuate these theories. This trust is sometimes expressed as "they're the scientists, they must know what they're talking about." And it is this kind of blind allegiance which sets the layman's science-related logic on a different level than the logic he uses in daily life.

How so?

To date, virtually every planet and moon explored in our solar system, as pointed out in previous chapters, has proved to be full of inexplicable puzzles, mysteries, and contradictions of theories. Some of these discoveries are beyond present scientific understanding. Some are even beyond anything we expect to understand in years to come. In addition, some events outside our solar system are so baffling that scientists can only explain them with strange entities like black holes and quasars, which are themselves only theoretical. Some events outside our solar system cannot be explained even with theoretical science. Some events on the quantum level are so baffling that they seem to defy common sense and logic.

So, how is it that when it comes to explaining "how it all began," scientists give the impression of having a sufficient understanding of the laws of nature governing the entire universe allegedly billions of years ago? Wouldn't one first need at least an impeccable understanding of what is happening in his own "backyard," our solar system, before explaining the mechanics of the entire universe? Surely the entire universe is more complex than our "puny little" solar system. And wouldn't such an "expert" have to possess an impeccable understanding of quantum mechanics as well as the mechanics of distant heavenly bodies in his own time before attempting to describe events which allegedly brought all of these entities into existence billions of years ago? Certainly events billions of years in the past cannot be easier to decipher than events in our own time. So how can anyone seriously claim to understand how our universe developed into its present state?

Perhaps it is necessary to go into the dimensions of our universe to put this question into proper perspective:

The diameter of our sun is about 865,400 miles. Our solar system is about 9 billion miles in diameter. Our nearest neighbors outside our solar system are the stars Proxima and Alpha Centauri, each about 4 light-years away. (One

light-year is about 6 trillion miles, the distance light travels -- at 186,000 miles per second -- in one year.) These stars are only two of the billions of stars which make up our galaxy, the Milky Way. An average galaxy is believed to have a diameter of approximately 100,000 light-years. The Milky Way is only one galaxy in a local group of 30 galaxies spanning a total of about 3 million light- years across space; if you travelled at the unimaginable speed of light, it would take you about 3 million years to cross this local group of only 30 galaxies.

It is estimated that there are at least ten billion galaxies in the universe.

When you think about these proportions for a moment, you begin to realize the awesomeness of this place we so casually refer to as our universe.

Then, after hearing the theories behind the phenomena believed to exist deep in space -- black holes, supergiants, supernovae, quasars, pulsars, neutron stars -- you begin to realize that the "other end" of the universe is not only far away but also holds wonders which only a few years ago would have been considered somewhere between science fiction and the absurd. Even today, most of these objects are speculative and far from pat concepts.

Is this the universe which came into existence through a series of accidents billions of years ago? And who are the ones perpetuating this? The same people who have given us "pat" answers about our own solar system in our own time?

We do not yet understand how phenomena deep in space work in our time. We do not yet understand how our solar system works in our time. We do not yet completely understand how our own planet, earth, works in our time. We do not yet understand how many living organisms on our planet work in our time. We do not yet understand how even some small organisms of the bacteria and virus variety work in our time. We do not yet understand how sub-atomic particles, so fundamental to our existence, work in our time. But, somehow, we do understand the process which allegedly brought all of this into being billions of years ago and caused it to evolve. Is someone pulling our leg?

How can anyone simply accept theories of how a universe of such unimaginable proportions and complexity came into being from the same scientists who seem so confused every time we send a rocket to explore an area

of space only a stone's throw from earth? How can anyone accept theories of the origin of our universe, which implicitly include the origin of the basic elements of matter, when these same elements are not yet understood today? Isn't it obvious that our comprehension of the universe is shallow, at best?

FORGET THE BEEF -- WHERE'S THE LOGIC

This is where the big puzzle of the double standard comes in. The greatest mystery of all is how some people put trust and faith into scientific theories when, given the same circumstances in a more practical situation, the absurdity would be conspicuously obvious to them. Suppose you had your bicycle checked out by a mechanic who gave you a three hour speech on how bicycles work. He described in depth the physics of pulleys, gears, momentum, and friction, then told you that your bike was in excellent shape. But the moment you got on your bike it fell apart. Would you go back to the same "mechanic" to have your car checked out? Better yet, would you fly a plane that had been okayed by this mechanic? Who, in his right mind, would reason, "He may be dishonest and ignorant about bicycles, but, after that speech on pulleys and gears, he must be competent when it comes to planes and other complicated mechanics." Most people would not allow this crook to adjust their kites, let alone evaluate the condition of their planes.

Why, then, does it not seem odd to these same people that scientists have little problem figuring out how a vast and complex universe with the staggering dimensions of hundreds of billions of light-years of space allegedly worked billions of years ago, yet have difficulty understanding how our "drop in the bucket" solar system works today? How do scientists go from relative ignorance of the laws of nature of our own solar system in our own time to a well rounded understanding of the forces behind the entire universe in a time long gone?

The answer, of course, is that scientists obviously do not have a well rounded understanding of the physics and mechanics of our universe today, and certainly cannot have any kind of a decent understanding of the universe in the past. Consequently, readily accepting accounts of the origin and evolution of our universe only shows a tolerance for misinformation in scientific matters which goes far beyond what one would accept in more practical circumstances. This constitutes a double standard -- science or scientific thinking it is not. Perhaps this kind of attitude stems from personal feelings and inclinations. However, when it comes to searching for the truth, this kind

of approach is highly inappropriate. The facts do not change with one's feelings. "Truth" -- especially in scientific matters -- can best be arrived at through cold facts and unfaltering logic.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECT

DIFFERENT CATEGORIES

I believe there are a wide variety of reasons behind the acceptance of evolution. The layman's double standard probably holds true for a vast majority who simply rely on scientists. Others have different reasons. Even scientists have their own reasons. This chapter will try to touch on some of these reasons.

THE LAYMAN

When emotionally involved, the human mind is susceptible to perceiving the illogical as logical. That is, an emotionally charged situation -- the pursuit of monetary gain, a desire for physical gratification, or something as simple as seeking the thrill and excitement of an emotional high -- can cause logic or reality to become distorted. This is evident in the way we try criminals. There is a difference in the way our criminal system handles a premeditated murder and one which was committed in the heat of the moment. Society sees the first as a cold-blooded, heartless act; the second as an act by a (perhaps, temporarily) disturbed individual. Although both are serious offenses, what makes the cold-blooded type worse is that such an individual can commit the act in a normal state of mind, while the latter might not have committed such a severe act under normal circumstances. It's this latter type which shows, in whatever extreme manner, that reality or logic can indeed become distorted under emotional upheaval.

The same process -- an emotionally induced distortion of reality -- takes place in situations where the emotions may not be that obvious. The term used for this -- especially in government -- is "conflict of interest." Some people in high office or in the judiciary system are barred from being personally involved in areas which may somehow be related to their posts. If anyone considered these individuals dishonest, either they would not have been appointed to their posts in the first place or they'd be removed on the basis of such doubts. Barring them from certain personal involvements is a precaution against their judgement being influenced by emotions. Sometimes such strong emotions simply distort reality, at other times they cause outright dishonesty. Either way, the result can be an emotionally induced state which lacks honest and

objective evaluation.

THE EXCITEMENT

This, I believe, is the process which allows some laymen to accept evolution. The kind of media exposure often given to the theory and the scientists who perpetuate it, giving the impression that believing in evolution is perhaps "in" or "with it" and anything else is "living in the past," gives the theory a certain aura of excitement and attraction which appeals to many who are simply looking to be "in." And when evolution has all this going for it, it really doesn't take much "logic" to be convincing -- acceptance of the theory is based more on an image rather than on irrefutable facts. Consequently, there is very little logic which can do a good job of "unconvincing," because to these people it was never a "logical" issue to begin with.

THE SCIENTIST

Although also susceptible to the above emotions, a scientist sometimes has additional reasons or incentives for "believing" in or perpetuating the belief in evolution. These reasons or incentives are as follows:

BUREAUCRACY

Bureaucracy is as widespread as it is self-defeating. It certainly has nothing to do with efficient and logical decision making. Yet, in some of the most powerful organizations it just about dictates policy. Many agencies within the U.S. and local governments have bureaucracies in motion which work to the obvious and blatant detriment of their objectives. But these bureaucracies exist in spite of this. Why? Aren't these people intelligent enough to know that "the system" isn't working?

Obviously, knowing something isn't working isn't enough to prompt change in some cases. Without any logical or moral justifications, the simple business of being comfortable with the way things are is enough for some individuals to avoid change. Are scientists above this type of behavior?

MORALITY

From a moral standpoint, I don't believe scientific endeavors are any different from other professions. If you found out that the head of some large

corporation was falsifying data for profit or favors, mismanaging funds, or skimming money off a pension fund, would it shock you? Would it shock you if these accusations were directed at a union official? How about a politician? How about the President himself? Unfortunately, we've seen it all, and most people today would not be terribly shocked. But, strangely, a good number of people would find it quite alarming to discover that a scientist had been dishonest or fraudulent for profit, to further his career, or to gain recognition among his peers or the general public. Why? Are scientists made of some sort of higher moral fiber than the rest of society? Perhaps they should be. But are they?

INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Although premiums for just about every type of liability insurance have soared to unprecedented heights in recent years, few, if any, have risen as dramatically as those of physicians. These high premiums have literally driven many doctors out of business. Seemingly unrelated to our topic at first glance, this may ultimately be a direct result of the same kind of shrugging off of moral responsibilities which I believe is prevalent within scientific circles.

The high insurance premiums, of course, are largely the result of an increase in successful malpractice law suits against physicians. The question is, why are such law suits so common and so successful today? Are patients getting smarter, realizing there's a buck to be made by someone else's mistake? Are physicians more negligent? Or, is neither one the prime cause, and the situation can be attributed to a breakdown in the ethical standards which governed most doctor-patient relationships in the past?

I believe it is mainly the result of a deterioration of the doctor-patient relationship. Years ago, a doctor was a friend of the family. Running over to a patient's house at an off hour to render medical services was not uncommon. Combining his profession with a genuine concern for people was a doctor's trade mark. A consuming desire for money and prestige, if it existed, was certainly not obvious.

When a doctor erred in diagnosing a patient and administered the wrong treatment, the idea of suing "a friend" seemed almost immoral. How do you sue someone who was genuinely concerned about your health? I know of a doctor who years ago killed a child by injecting him with penicillin, not realizing the child was allergic to it. The family never sued. By today's

standards, not suing for negligence under such circumstances would be incomprehensible. But, apparently, that's the way it was. Patients were more tolerant because doctors were generally more dedicated.

How are things different today? Or is that a stupid question?

For starters, most doctors today don't know how to spell "house calls." Just hearing the phrase sends many of them into traumatic shock and convulsions. This is probably the strongest gauge of how drastically the profession has changed. I refuse to believe that doctors of years gone by were not intelligent enough to understand that in the time they spent travelling from house to house they could have made more money by having their patients come to their offices. Apparently, it was a higher regard for their patient's health than for their own pockets which made doctors of old what they were. Needless to say, that feeling of closeness between doctor and patient is all but gone. The human element has vanished, and, in most cases, it's turned into nothing but a business. Most doctors today are seen by their patients as having the same interest in money and prestige as the rest of society and are not seen as personal friends.

Then, add to this the overall moral deterioration of today's society in general, and you're left with a lot of "throat grabbing." There is simply less to restrain a patient today from proceeding with a law suit at the slightest error on the part of a doctor than there was years ago. The doctor holds no special place in the patient's heart, because the patient holds no special place in the doctor's heart. Suing a businessman (the doctor) for shoddy workmanship is not immoral. And even if it were, today's society wouldn't be all that concerned with it anyway. Then, when a case goes to court, the jury, usually consisting of common folks, sees the doctor no differently than the patient does. So, we inevitably wind up with not only many malpractice law suits but also many successful ones.

Of course, you might spend hours arguing whether doctors have the same "right" to be as greedy and as morally lax as the rest of society, or, because of the nature of their profession, should maintain higher moral standards. Then, your answer might be something like, being greedy or morally lax is not a "right" -- it's a disease. You might also add that the staggeringly high number of malpractice law suits may be a sign that doctors should return to the dedication and concern of old. But such a discussion is beyond the scope of this book. The point here is that years ago doctors did have that stronger

moral fiber. Today, many apparently don't.

Now, if greed and moral deterioration have changed the face of the medical profession, the most sacred of all, how can anyone honestly believe that any profession is totally free of such unethical deviations. It is apparently a sign of the times. The medical profession is probably nothing more than a symptom of our ethically ailing society. It is hard to imagine that scientists could be immune to this epidemic.

THE 'CULT'

Strangely, what may be the strongest motive in some cases, for scientists and laymen alike, to accept or perpetuate evolution, is probably the most difficult to explain -- a fanatical determination, lacking any apparent personal gain, to believe that our universe is simply not governed by a Supreme Being.

The emotional process involved in such a strong determination, I believe, is probably not unlike that of some fanatical cult movements, although cult movements are usually of a more extreme nature. Under such circumstances, misguided ideals gain momentum largely as a result of strong personal motives and inclinations rather than levelheaded logic. Belonging to fanatical cults has driven many to the extreme of suicide. When such a strong drive takes hold of an individual, what the average person sees as objective reasoning ceases to play an important role in this individual's thinking. And if such a drive happens to be the root of a belief in evolution, to what avail are disproofs? We're dealing with a strong psychological drive, not a scientific endeavor.

MORE THAN JUST A POSSIBILITY

Please note that I am not suggesting that scientists must be guilty of error or deception merely because the possibility exists. Given the fact that evolution does not hold up under scrutiny, as pointed out in this and other publications, the error or deception is obvious. I am merely laying out some of the possible causes.

VENEREAL DISEASE

OVERSIGHT

Although many topics have a direct and adverse bearing on the theory of evolution, a number of them are completely overlooked by evolutionists. VD, in a subtle yet powerful way, is one such topic. And in view of the many aspects of evolution which are based on "proofs" ranging from subtle to flimsy to nonexistent, it is hard to imagine simple oversight as the reason for omitting such topics from discussions on evolution. Perhaps they are overlooked because they simply suggest a nature which is diametrically opposed to the purported mechanics of evolution.

THE EPIDEMIC

According to the Center for Disease Control, syphilis struck about 90,000 people in 1984. The number of visits to doctors for genital herpes rose dramatically from 29,560 in 1966 to 416,059 in 1983. Gonorrhea struck about 2,000,000 people in 1984. A lesser known disease, Chlamydia trachomatis, strikes about 3,000,000 people a year and causes sterility in about 11,000 women annually.

About 25 diseases are known to spread through sexual contact.

At least some of the sexually transmitted diseases which have spread in epidemic proportions appear to be the result of promiscuous sex. Some experts agree that monogamy seems to be the answer to curbing these epidemics. The "sexual revolution," it appears, is not quite what it's been hyped up to be. "Free sex" is not free at all -- it comes with a high price.

EVOLUTIONARY ENIGMA

The very survival of a species depends on reproduction. Monogamy is of no concern to some blind bat called "nature." Nature would "prefer" that a species reproduce at any and every opportunity. So, you'd think that after allegedly "improving," "perfecting," and "eliminating the less fit" for billions of years, nature would have had enough "sense" to eliminate all diseases which hinder or interfere in any way with procreation. After all, nature has

been intelligent enough to put pleasure into reproduction to ensure a species' survival. (How in the world nature ever figured out what pleasure was and that it would help perpetuate a species, boggles the mind. Plants reproduce without any apparent pleasure, but they manage.)

So, after bringing life to the point of ultra sophistication and giving us an ingenious incentive to reproduce, nature throws in a bomb -- it gives us a host of deadly and debilitating venereal diseases which not only have not been wiped out but which have the potency to spread like wildfire when sex becomes too free and indiscriminate. How do you account for such sudden counter-productive behavior on the part of nature? How could nature not have "figured out" after billions of years, as it has allegedly done so wonderfully in many other respects, that VD is, from a biological standpoint, not in our best interest and in direct opposition to what nature has been doing for those alleged billions of years. Instead of developing life and removing obstacles, nature now appears to be hindering the very process which brought us here. Is this nature's idea of a practical joke?

AIDS

Probably the most dreaded of all sexually transmitted diseases is AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome). AIDS is a disease which attacks the immune system, and, as some evidence suggests, also the nervous system. Without treatment or a cure, the life expectancy of an AIDS victim is about eighteen months. Even with treatment the disease produces a high mortality rate. Death is usually brought on by the inability of the victim's immune system to fend off other diseases and infections.

The spread of AIDS is believed to be largely the due to homosexual activity.

One phenomenal aspect of this dreaded disease is that it was virtually unheard of before the 1970's. In 1979 there were only 10 known cases of AIDS in the United States. By 1986, with the total number of cases soaring to over 17,000, the fear of AIDS had created panic virtually everywhere. The panic grew so strong that parents kept children from attending schools, hospitals began more stringent screening procedures for blood donors, gay bath houses were forced to shut down, and even heterosexually promiscuous establishments were under scrutiny by government agencies. The fear of this deadly disease had "come out of the closet" and penetrated virtually every corner of society.

ANOTHER EVOLUTIONARY ENIGMA

If it isn't strange enough that nature has not managed to wipe out VD, nature suddenly, after those alleged billions of years of "evolving" and "improving" life, springs a strange killer disease on us -- AIDS, a virus which, of all things, destroys the ultrasophisticated immune system which nature has been evolving since the beginning of time. Such a virus should have been one of the first things to be wiped out by nature before going ahead with "plans" to populate an entire planet. How do you figure this? Nature spends billions of years building sophisticated life forms. It devises this ingenious immune system which can, and apparently does in many healthy humans, wipe out virtually every harmful virus and bacteria. Then nature comes up with a disease which destroys the immune system and kills its host. Has nature gone mad?

WHERE ARE EVOLUTIONISTS

Why don't we hear more talk on this topic by evolutionists? Obviously, this topic seems to point in the "wrong" direction -- it depicts nature as having properties contrary to the mechanics of evolution. And some of it even smacks of a nature capable of sending out messages of morality. Is this possible?

COINCIDENCE

Let's face it, sex, illicit or otherwise, was not discovered by the generation of the sexual revolution. Sex is as old as time. And VD is probably just as old. Why the sudden epidemic? Is it a mere coincidence that VD began spreading wildly at a time when indiscriminate sex became accepted as simply "the sexual revolution?" And is it a mere coincidence that VD continued to spread in epidemic proportions as society continued its more relaxed attitude toward sex?

Homosexuality isn't a new phenomenon either. How or why did AIDS suddenly crop up seemingly out of nowhere? Is it just a coincidence that AIDS came at a time when homosexuality was beginning to be viewed by homosexuals as just another lifestyle and not anything that needed to be kept "in the closet?" And is it also just a coincidence that AIDS began spreading to the heterosexual community at a time when some portions of (heterosexual) society were beginning to accept homosexuality as a "right" rather than a perversion?

A REDEFINITION

Evolution is not evident in even the very act of reproduction. Ironically, what is evident are the messages that the sexual revolution of the twentieth century is not the way to go, and that "two consenting adults" is not necessarily a good criteria for sexual behavior -- heterosexual or homosexual. Such messages of morality, rather than supporting evolution, actually beg for a redefinition of our understanding of nature as a purely physical phenomenon.

A 'HIGHER NATURE?'

Is it possible that what scientists have been referring to as "nature" all these years is actually a "nature" of a different kind -- the kind that doesn't lend itself that easily to scientific scrutiny? And maybe scientists cling to their purely physical version of nature, attributing the genius of our universe and the hidden messages of nature to accidents and coincidences, just in a stubborn determination to avoid recognizing that our physical universe may in fact be governed by a "Nature" which goes far beyond any imaginable science? Perhaps it's time we realized that it takes a lot more than a scientific mind to recognize that there is a great deal more to our universe than meets the eye. Perhaps recognizing that some events in our physical world may be manifestations of a grander "Nature," takes intelligence, guts, and a high degree of honesty. How many people can honestly boast a combination of such qualities?

CREATION

THE BEGINNING

Probably one of the most dishonest and unrealistic arguments I've heard in support of our universe being billions of years old was by a scientist trying to refute the belief that the world came into existence approximately 6,000 years ago according to the Bible's account of Creation. He argued: There are stars which are billions of light-years away. This means that it took the light rays of these stars billions of years to travel to earth. Doesn't this make the universe at least billions of years old? And if the universe is only approximately 6,000 years old, wouldn't that make God a bit dishonest in trying to deceive us?

This kind of reasoning is so twisted that if this guy had the power of telekinesis he could start his own pretzel factory. What he perceives as "dishonest" is little more than his own dishonest evaluation and perhaps a lack of reasoning abilities.

According to the Bible's account of Creation, God did not create man and woman as infants and wait for them to grow up. God did not create the first plants and animals in early stages and wait for them to mature. Why should cosmic rays have been any different? For God to have waited billions of years for cosmic rays to reach their intended destinations would have been inconsistent with the rest of Creation. Thus, for cosmic rays to have been created in a "state of arrival" should not seem that far-fetched.

Besides, can you imagine God creating an entire universe in six days and then waiting billions of years just for cosmic rays to fly across the universe? Sounds a little absurd.

Of course, when considering an act of Creation of an entire universe, there is another possibility. During the Six Days of Creation all the laws of nature, as we know them, were obviously not yet in place. The fact that light travels at the speed of light is only a law of nature in our completed universe. It is quite conceivable that before all the laws of nature were put into place light travelled at a far greater speed than it does in today's universe. Consequently, a distance which may take many light-years for light to traverse today may have taken only seconds during Creation. Was this really that complicated for

this scientist to figure out?

This scientist's totally insane argument is only one example of how perverted logic can get when a narrow minded and fanatical determination to get one's own view across sets in. There are endless additional examples of arguments showing the bias and dishonesty of some scientists in dealing with subject matters not particularly to their liking.

NO CONCERN FOR TRUTH

Another "logical" argument was presented by a famous scientist in his weekly television program: "Many people believe our universe was created by God. This leads to the question, 'Where did God come from?' So, why not save a step and just ask, 'Where did our universe come from?'"

What this scientist was saying, in effect, was that there is no need to go through an extra step when you can conveniently eliminate it. The impression he gave was that it wasn't a question of which of the steps were true or false. It was more a matter of how you preferred to look at it. I believe it is this kind of "reasoning" which brought the insanity of evolution to the forefront of the scientific community in the first place, and it is this kind of approach which keeps scientists from making any real progress in some scientific endeavors. It is indeed rather pathetic to see a well-known scientist display such an obvious disregard for objective evaluation.

I'd like to point out in this chapter how the step this scientist would have liked to so conveniently eliminate cannot be eliminated for scientific reasons.

'SUPERNATURAL SCIENCE'

First, it should be noted that scientists have learned to entertain only those "supernatural" ideas which lend excitement to their own line of work and credence to their own ways of thinking, as will be pointed out here.

BLACK HOLES

Ask any scientist, "What lies inside or 'beyond' a black hole?" and you will probably get a picture of a world more bizarre than any science fiction concept ever dreamed up.

To begin with, the concept of a black hole is at this writing still only theoretical. A black hole is a heavenly body which has such a strong gravitational pull that nothing, not even light, can escape its gravitational field. Inside a black hole, time stops, no communication system known to man can communicate with the "outside world," and an object "sucked" in would not retain any resemblance to its original shape, form, or size. Even observation of a black hole from the outside by any conventional means is impossible. Were it not for the strong gravitational pull it exerts on its neighbors, a black hole would be undetectable. In short, black holes are likely to remain theoretical, at least until modern technology provides us with a method of directly proving and verifying their existence.

Consequently, what might lie beyond or inside a black hole is certainly nothing more than fanciful speculation. Yet, this speculation is considered science.

OTHER UNIVERSES

Sometimes you hear discussions on universes made up of anti matter. (Without getting involved in much of the details, anti matter is basically some sort of "counterpart" of matter. When matter and anti matter collide, they "neutralize" each other's properties.) To date, we have not found or proven the existence of such universes. Like the inside of black holes, they are purely speculative. But this hasn't stopped some scientists from pondering the possibility of their existence.

The same willingness to speculate exists when confronting many scientists with the question, "What was our universe like before the 'big bang?'" Although scientists will admit that most, if not all, of the evidence of the properties of a universe which may have existed before that alleged big bang would more than likely have been destroyed in such an explosion, there are scientists who will speculate that such an earlier universe may have had properties completely different from those of our present universe. In other words, not only is the notion of another universe having existed not inconceivable, but it is also imaginable that such a universe may not have resembled anything with which we are familiar. Yet, as "unnatural" or as "supernatural" as such a universe might have been, and as unverifiable as such a universe might be, it does not stop some scientists from speculating.

WHY THE SUDDEN CHANGE

Why is it, then, that when it comes to the concept of God most scientific speculation stops? Surely the concept of God is no more removed from science than the inside of black holes, universes comprised of anti matter, and a universe before that alleged big bang. So what if the concept of God implies "laws of nature" completely different from what we are accustomed to and God cannot be scientifically detected or communicated with. Black holes, other universes, and a host of subatomic particles which come under the heading of theoretical physics, are not exactly tangible phenomena either. The fact that some scientific phenomena have come into "existence" through nothing more than logical deductions rather than hard facts did not preclude their serious consideration. The fact that we still cannot prove the existence of some of these theoretical entities does not keep scientists from accepting them as science. These unproven phenomena, as speculative as they are, are given a status of legitimacy. Why has the concept of God, with far more pointing towards the certainty of His existence than many so called scientific phenomena, not been introduced into science as at least a "theory?"

SPECULATION ENDS WHERE IT SHOULD BEGIN

Aren't there enough ultra-sophisticated phenomena in this universe, from the microscopic to the macrocosmic, to warrant at least a consideration of an Intelligent Being as the source. I'm not talking about religion. I'm not talking about blind fanatical acceptance. I'm talking about an option which, by virtue of logic and reason, has at least as much merit as many scientific topics. In the twentieth century, the "theory" of God should tower high above many other scientific theories. An Intelligent Creator being introduced into science as a direct logical deduction stemming from the unfathomable genius behind the entire universe, would not be inconsistent with other topics discussed among scientists. Completely dismissing the concept of God merely because it has been associated with religion for too long is as illogical as dismissing the idea of using wheels on a lunar module because wheels have been associated with cars for too long. If the concept of an Intelligent Creator seems to manifest itself in every corner of scientific endeavor, how can you simply dismiss it? Is entertaining thoughts of God really more "religious" or "spiritualistic" than some notions scientists have learned to accept yet have no idea whether or not they really exist? Or has scientific speculation become totally devoid of logic and completely a matter of whim and bias?

Although many notions which go beyond the basic concept of God might come under the heading of religion, the concept of God itself has in our time become

more evident in scientific research and exploration than in any other time in earth's history. "Mixing science and religion" is not the case here. The outdated misconception that God is strictly a product of religion has been disproven by twentieth-century science. The concept of God can apparently be arrived at through more than one avenue of thought -- through science as well as religion. And it's this very fact that should move the concept of God away from the domain of philosophy and more toward reality. After such mind boggling concepts as black holes, exploding universes, anti matter, elusive subatomic particles, warped time, and curved space, God should hardly seem all that philosophical. Probably a lot more awe inspiring -- if all this is only His handiwork, God Himself must certainly be beyond human comprehension -- but not all that philosophical.

With all the logical evidence supporting the existence of God, there can be little question that the refusal of some scientists to entertain the concept of God, not even as a theory, constitutes more biased thinking than logical reasoning. Accepting God in the twentieth century hardly takes much complex reasoning. Not accepting God takes a lot of misguided determination.

SUBTLETIES BEYOND THE GRASP OF SOME

There are times, however, when we cannot accuse scientists of being biased or outright dishonest. Sometimes their misinterpretations appear to be the result of a lack of insight into the subtleties of the very fields they study.

The questions of "Where did our universe come from?" and "Where did God come from?" seemed to be the same in principle to the scientist mentioned before. To him, it seemed like just a matter of adding or eliminating a step. But if he'd had any deeper understanding of the subject matter, he'd have known that his argument sounded as ridiculous as: if you say, "The baker baked the cake," then you have to ask, "Who baked the baker?" So why not eliminate the baker and just ask, "Who baked the cake?"

The answer, in a nutshell, is that when you talk about our universe you are not talking about the same set of rules which apply to God. Here's why:

"Where did our universe come from?" is a legitimate scientific question. Nothing in our universe seems to have been around forever, nor does anything within it seem to have the potential to exist for eternity. This is apparently the process of our physical universe -- birth, accretion, formation, death, decay,

destruction, etc. This makes curiosity about the origin of our universe downright scientific and not in the least bit philosophical. Furthermore, such curiosity is essential in studying the laws of nature. Anything less would be stopping short of a truly scientific endeavor.

This, incidentally, is one reason why, as far as origins go, the big bang is a totally meaningless and "empty" theory. It really doesn't answer much. If our universe came from a big bang, where did all that mass or energy that caused the explosion come from? That is, long before that alleged big bang, when, where, and how did the basic elements of our universe come into existence? And this is not being philosophical or clever. This is a legitimate scientific question which must be answered if we are to take some scientific theories seriously. Was the evidence of "how it all began" destroyed in the explosion? Well, you don't need evidence to list the possibilities. What could possibly have caused our universe to come into existence? Another universe perhaps? Then where did that other universe come from? Or did it come from some big mass-spitting or energy-producing machine or monster? Then where did that machine or monster come from? No matter what you come up with you will always be left with the question, "Where did it come from?"

Moreover, in a physical universe, being plagued with such an endless array of "Where did it come from?" seems quite puzzling. Although, the question has such a strong philosophical aura, it deals with a real and physical dilemma. How is it possible that the origin of something so fundamental as the basic elements which make up everything in our universe could be so difficult to prove scientifically? These basic particles are all around us; their origin should have been the easiest thing to prove. It's obvious that science has no answer. But not even a plausible theory? It's almost as if there was no way for our universe to have come into existence.

A 'DIFFERENT SOURCE'

Well, maybe that's the answer -- there was no physical way for our universe to have come into existence. The laws of nature, giving every indication that our entire universe is comprised of elements of finite potential, point in the direction of something of an infinite nature as the source of our physical universe. This "source" may not necessarily be easy to comprehend. Nevertheless, in light of the impossibility of sources to which we can relate on a physical level, this source, as incomprehensible as it may seem, must be the only rational explanation -- our universe must have come into existence

through "something" which did not itself have to "come from" anywhere. What's more, this is not the "best" or the "most probable" explanation, this appears to be the only truly plausible explanation; the being which created our universe must be a being of eternity. For without this, we are left with explanations which cannot be verified or substantiated by science or logic.

Finally, common sense will tell you that to bring a universe such as ours into existence, this being would have to possess powers beyond our imagination and intelligence beyond our conception, and this being could not possibly be bound or limited in any way by the laws of nature which govern our universe. Then, after putting these logical deductions together, you should arrive at a startling conclusion -- the concept which is God.

APPLES AND ORANGES

Now, the scientist's question "Where did God come from?" is not only not scientific, it's not even philosophical. It's downright nonsense. The notion that "something" has to come from "somewhere" is only a limitation of the universe we live in. Just as nothing in our universe can exist without time or space, so can nothing exist without having been born, formed, created, etc. But when you talk about God, the concept of "birth" is not applicable. When we talk about a Being which brought everything that exists into existence, we're obviously talking about an Ultimate Source to which we were logically led to for want of any other possible explanation. Which means that what we've actually done is reached the "end" -- there simply cannot be a source beyond this. As a result, the concepts of "origin" and "birth" cease to exist at this point and are only products of His Creation, and He can obviously not be bound by them. If He were bound by such things, He could not possibly be the source of all that exists; something would have to have existed before Him, and we'd be back to square one. So, when we talk about God, we're talking about "that Final Source," an Original Source, or an Ultimate Existence, before Whom nothing else could possibly have existed. The concept of God, therefore, implies an Existence unlike any other existence; an Existence to Whom the terms "beginning" and "end" simply do not apply; an Existence to Whom "limits" and "boundaries" do not apply; an Existence from Whom every other existence must have originated; and an Existence so unique that His nonexistence is not even possible.

So, I don't think you can simply ask, "Where did our universe come from?" just to "save a step" and avoid asking "Where did God come from?" as our

scientist would have preferred. Our universe, according to our laws of nature, had to come from somewhere. And wherever it ultimately came from, that Source had to be the kind of Existence just described. As a result, not only can you not eliminate God from a discussion of the origin of our universe, but the very presence of our universe, even if it were not in any complex state, points to His unquestionable Existence. Consequently, eliminating the Creator of the universe from any discussion of the origin of the universe, is equivalent to eliminating trees from a discussion of the origin of apples. Instead of clarifying the issue, such an arbitrary elimination -- by a famous scientist who is presumably highly intelligent -- only shows dishonesty, some lack of reasoning abilities, and perhaps even a lack of respect for other people's intelligence. A truly scientific endeavor it is not.

A THEORY ABOUT NOTHING

SPONTANEOUS CREATION

In an apparent attempt to avoid Creation-by-God at all costs, some have come up with a "creation" of another kind. Although not taken seriously by most scientists, this "theory" says that the origin of the universe may have been "spontaneous creation" -- the universe appeared in some primitive form out of literally nothing. This notion is supported by the claim that sub-atomic particles have been observed appearing from "nowhere."

IMPOSSIBLE TO PROVE

There are two things wrong with this "theory." First, there isn't an experiment in the world that can prove that something came from "nothing." Whatever apparatus or experiment you set up to detect such an occurrence, you will always be left with the question of whether your apparatus or experiment was faulty. That is, you can never prove whether something came from nothing, or whether your apparatus or experiment was just not sophisticated enough to detect some form of existence where you believed there was nothing.

In other words, before you can prove that something came from nothing, you'd first have to prove that there really was nothing there to begin with. And that's impossible.

But wait, there is a way to prove something. If, as time goes by, your experiment becomes more sophisticated and eventually registers "something" where it previously registered "nothing," you will have proven that your previous experiment was in fact faulty. And that's precisely what has happened in the past to scientific experiments in quantum physics. Some sub-atomic particles originally observed going to or coming from "nowhere," were in time proven to have other forms of existence, as smaller, more subtle particles. So, "something" has been found in what was previously thought to be "nothing." But the existence of nothing has never been proven.

Remember, we're talking about elusive particles which are smaller than atoms. Some sub-atomic particles only "live" for a fraction of a second. Some

can only be detected by the effects they exert on other particles or objects. The sophistication needed to track down some particles which are known to exist is nothing short of phenomenal. Making claims of detecting "nothing" is a tall story.

HOLDS UP LOGICALLY

Second, the idea that "nothing" cannot produce "something" holds up logically. The concept of "nothing" implies complete and total nonexistence -- no energy, no matter, no gravity waves, no magnetic fields, absolutely devoid of any substance whatsoever. Such a state would have no force, drive, "motivation," or power to produce anything. In other words, the inability to produce something is an inherent part of the state of nothingness. Therefore, an experiment showing something coming from "nothing" is, ironically, concrete evidence that something must beyond a shadow of a doubt exist where the experimenter thinks there is nothing.

A 'SUPERNATURAL' THEORY

This being the case -- that something coming from nothing is illogical, cannot be proven to have ever occurred, and cannot be duplicated in a laboratory for scientific study -- spontaneous creation cannot be labelled science. Which means that some scientific minds are actually looking for answers from "supernatural" sources while claiming -- or perhaps even believing -- to still be within the domain of science.

Of course, it goes without saying, the mere fact that some can even contemplate such a scientifically and logically irrational notion, shows the great loss at which scientists are to put forth with traditional science a truly plausible scenario for the origin of our universe.

A NEW BEGINNING

Ironically, spontaneous creation may very well become a new beginning, leading back to the road to rationality. If this theory should ever become widely accepted by scientists, they will unwittingly be at the threshold of accepting God into science. Although spontaneous creation makes no mention of God, and it is not quite the traditional account of Creation, it points to the only real possibility -- our universe must have been created out of nothing. The difference of course being that spontaneous creation is a purely physical

world is illogical, impossible, and raises more questions than it answers, while Creation by God is both fully supported by logic and also the only piece in the puzzle that really fits. After that, a little logic and a touch of desperation should eventually lead any "spontaneous creationist" to Creation-by-God.

TWENTIETH CENTURY SUPERSTITION

TOO FAR AHEAD

Anyone who takes science with the degree of seriousness it deserves, should realize that as advanced as modern civilization is, the laws of nature are without a doubt way ahead of us. So far ahead, in fact, that we are unlikely to ever catch up.

It's interesting how theories of "origin and evolution" hold up best before first hand exploration. The planets and moons in our solar system which we've already explored by spacecraft talk strongly of uniqueness. Scientifically speaking, it is difficult to attribute their beginnings to a common natural origin; a common natural origin could not have spawned such unique entities. And without a common natural origin there simply is no evolution.

Neither is the evolution of life supported by space exploration. And on top of that, modern man's understanding of genetics show's the evolution of life to be an impossible scenario.

Then, when you combine this with the second law of thermodynamics, which precludes the evolution of the universe as a whole, you inevitably wind up with a world quite different from what scientists have led many to believe. All told, the world we live in could not have had an origin resembling anything depicted by scientists.

What scientists have done in effect is taken a bowl of spaghetti and meatballs and convinced people it's a bowl of noodle soup and big raisins.

TRUTH AND HONESTY

The most disturbing aspect is not merely that space exploration and other discoveries have proven many scientific theories wrong. It's that "truth" and "honesty" would dictate abandoning old theories and coming up with new theories which fit the facts. Instead, the basic framework of old theories is being adhered to, and new theories are being formulated, theories which only stretch the imagination in the process of trying to patch up discrepancies between new found facts and old contradictory theories. This is neither truth

nor honesty nor science.

Perhaps this is all just the result of a dreaded realization by scientists that in the final analysis science will never have all the answers. Is it possible that the very people whom we rely upon for scientific facts are fearful of facing the possibility that the ultimate origin of our physical universe may very well lie in a Supernatural Creation? This may perhaps, in their view, make science just a little less scientific. But how can you discard the truth simply because it doesn't fit into your scheme of things? After all, it's the truth which should shape and mold science, not scientists who should decide what the truth is.

YESTERDAY'S SCIENCE

For too long we've been looking at the universe from earth's point of view. Modern technology has opened a new window. The theory of evolution has probably come into existence out of nothing more than man's need to explain the world he lived in. However, the world man lived in before the space age is not the same world he lives in today. The Darwins of yesteryear may have found it necessary to explain the things which seemed so natural to them. We probably have the same psychological need, the difference is that what seemed natural to them does not necessarily seem natural to us.

Space exploration has shown that life is a rather unusual phenomena -- it's not all that "natural." Looking at earth from just about any other point in the universe, you may suddenly view "lifelessness" as more natural than "life." It should therefore be far easier from a scientific perspective to accept the fact that nature does not produce life naturally, and then try to decipher how we got here; rather than to adhere to a baseless notion that inanimate matter can come to life, and then try to decipher why there is no life anywhere else in the universe. It may be difficult for someone, a twentieth-century scientist for example, who has believed in evolution for so long, to suddenly realize the insanity of it. But I wonder: if Darwin were alive today, would he have dared to come up with his shortsighted answer to the "natural" process of life? I say that modern technology would have stopped him dead in his tracks.

THE TABLES HAVE TURNED

Twentieth-century technology has shown that our understanding of the very universe in which we live has previously been far overestimated. The complexity of our universe will probably continue to baffle us for many years

to come. In addition, some notions of the world around us may turn upside down. Whereas for some time now evolution has been considered science and God philosophy, God is increasingly becoming as real as the rays of the morning sun and evolution is receding into a category of theories such as "the world is flat."

After taking into account everything which has thus far been discovered by science, you really don't have to be a religious person to take Creation more seriously. In this day and age, Creation-by-God is, ironically, the most scientific -- that's right, scientific -- explanation you will ever get concerning the origin of our universe. Nothing else even comes close to explaining our existence.

TODAY'S 'SUPERSTITION'

Could some of what we call science today be really nothing more than the twentieth century's version of "superstition?" In every generation there seems to have been the need for some people to believe in something beyond the rational. Strangely, these irrational notions have often been pitted against the concept of God. In the old days, it was a preoccupation with unfounded gods and imagined powers of the supernatural. Nowadays, it is the obsession to show that the universe developed by itself, without any force or power behind it.

Interestingly, nothing in recorded history has ever been as controversial as the concept of God. At the same time, no concept unproven by physical means has so successfully endured the rigorous test of time on such a universal scale as the concept of God. This may not physically prove God's existence, but it certainly gives God a few points over evolution and the like.

Why is it that such irrational concoctions as the unfounded forces of the paranormal and evolution always seem convincing enough in their own time to make it difficult for some people to choose between these ideas and God? Are these forces real? Is evolution real? Hardly likely. Is "freedom of choice" real? That seems to be the most logical explanation.