

DARWIN'S RELIGION

Linda Camp, MS, NT
Orthomolecular Medicine

The evidence against evolution is mounting in the scientific community. Theories change almost daily as to the origin of the universe and of life. The one constant seems to be that neither scientists nor religionists will allow for a third camp, a theory that disproves both evolution and creation "science" in defining life and its origin.

In any argument for or against evolution we must ask the following:

Does microevolution lead to macroevolution?

How macroevolution progressed in the past cannot be determined from the study of microevolutionary processes.- Harold R. Bocher, PhD, Origins, Icons and Illusions

<http://www.amazon.com/Origins-Icons-Illusions-Exploring-Psychology/dp/087527515X>

Microevolution does not lead to macroevolution – such a connection has never been observed to happen. The concept of "macroevolution" is highly dependent upon faith as there is no evidence in real science to support it. Yet it has a zealous following in academia and the media.

The concept of "microevolution" is often referred to as the adaptation of a species. These adaptations have never produced a new function, but merely eliminated or modified existing features. Any changes found within a species were in the genetic code, or were mutated over time, but mutations have never produced beneficial results... neutral at best... mostly harmful otherwise. Nothing new has "evolved."

The evolution of the horse is cited as an example, but one quickly learns that the evolution displayed is a reduction of complexity, i.e. the horse went from several toes to one. Nothing was added, only removed or reduced.

Nothing has ever been found to support the idea that one species has become another one. There's more than one missing link in this argument.

The idea that life spontaneously started suffers greatly at the table of probability, regardless of how much time is permitted. Time is not the friend of these theories as time also works against their success as based upon the second law of thermodynamics.

The unsolved problems of evolution:

- No explanation for why life contains only left-handed amino acids
- No explanation for how life could start WITH or WITHOUT oxygen
- No explanation for how life could start in the oceans (hydrolysis)
- No explanation for how evolution occurred in harmony with the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics
- No explanation for the origin of information.

Evolutionists can't have it both ways...

- Oxygen in the atmosphere would prevent life from starting...
- No oxygen in the atmosphere would prevent life from starting...
- Water (hydrolysis) would prevent life from starting...

Miller experiment...a failure.

- Miller's experiment produced both right and left handed amino acids
- the mixture of LH and RH amino acids is a poison to life.
- All biological proteins have 100% left-handed amino acids.
- Amino acids are all left-handed in life
- When an organism dies, amino acids revert back to a mix.
- Out of thousands of amino acids, only 20 are suitable for life
- When left alone, a solution of all left-handed amino acids revert back to a mix.

However, the experiment does support the concept of ID, using many controls...

Mutations? A sign of macroevolution?

Can mutations cause macroevolution? Most mutations are harmful, or at best, neutral to an organism, not beneficial.

Random mutations only produce random mistakes. They must be related, beneficial mutations in order to make a new feature such as an arm, a leg, or other function over time.

Can mutations cause macroevolution?

Quotes by a molecular biologist and biomedical engineer -

"But there is no evidence that DNA mutations can provide the sorts of variation needed for evolution... The sorts of variations which can contribute to Darwinian evolution, however, involve things like bone structure or body plan. There is no evidence for beneficial mutations at the level of macroevolution, but there is also no evidence at the level of what is commonly regarded as microevolution."

- Jonathan Wells, Molecular Biologist

How would a species survive with only part of a function? It is illogical to assume that time would help in this case. A defense mechanism that supposedly evolved to help a species survive would have to work the first time. Often these defensive functions are quite complex in their own right. The bombardier beetle is one excellent example of why evolution is illogical. If all that functionality didn't work "out of the box" that little bug wouldn't have made it at all. The probability that all that happened by chance is so far out there that it falls into the area of fairy tales. It's wishful thinking... or ignoring the facts... or simply avoiding the truth.

Big bang - Big bust...

"[the big bang] represents the instantaneous suspension of physical laws, the sudden abrupt flash of lawlessness that allowed something to come out of nothing. It represents a true miracle..."

Paul Davies, The Edge of Infinity

You can't have it both ways... you can't have natural laws AND miracles...
Evolution relies on miracles with no miracle worker...

So, how is evolution "science?"

The four things required for evolution:

1. An open system
2. A source of energy
3. A mechanism to capture energy
4. A mechanism to convert energy into usable energy for doing work.

Points 3 and 4 are generally left out of the text books. If you can't capture energy you can't put it to work.

1. How can a mechanism to capture energy develop?
2. How could lifeless (non-complex) chemicals spontaneously develop into a complex energy capture system?

These can't be explained by evolutionists, presenting a Catch 22...

5-step circular reasoning...

1. Work must be done in order to become more complex.
2. We need energy to perform this work.
3. We have energy all around us (the sun), but we need to capture and store it so we can use it
4. We need to build a mechanism that can capture and store some of this energy so we can perform work and grow more complex.

5. We have no energy to do this work because we have no mechanism to capture and store energy.

What is needed is a definition that fully encompasses the existence of life. It must be affirmed that to draw conclusions from existent data is a good way to proceed with the scientific method. What is done to produce the data is a matter of great concern to the scientific community.

Definitions:

- assume - to take as granted though not proved
- belief - confidence, trust; something believed; conviction, opinion
- bias - prejudice
- evidence - an outward sign; proof, testimony
- facts - the quality of being actual; something that exists or occurs; a piece of information regarded as fact
- idea - a plan for action; imagined or pictured in the mind; concept
- model - structural design; representation; example for imitation
- objective - existing outside and independent of the mind; treating or dealing with fact without distortion by personal feelings or prejudices
- prejudice - an opinion for or against something without adequate basis
- records - written proceedings; recorded facts about something
- subjective - relating to or arising within one's mind, in contrast to what is outside
- theories - the general principles drawn from any body of facts; a plausible or scientifically acceptable general principle offered to explain observed facts

SO WHAT IS EVOLUTION?... nothing more than a strongly held religious faith.

*"Claims about evolution are no less religious than claims about Genesis." (Gish 1973)-
BUT IS IT SCIENCE: The Philosophical Question in the Creation/Evolution Controversy –
Michael Ruse, Prometheus Books (January 8, 2009)*

http://www.amazon.com/Philosophical-Question-Creation-Evolution-Controversy/dp/1591025826/ref=sr_1_3?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1233357863&sr=1-3

The theory of evolution as proposed by Darwin cannot withstand the test for "science" and therefore cannot be given any more credence than creation "science," both of which lack any scientific proof or relevance.

THE THIRD CAMP...

For students interested in further investigating a third theory of existence, purchase a copy of:

**THE CODON KEY: A Third Theory of Existence
Disproving Both Darwinism and Creation Science**

by Linda Camp, MS, NT, Orthomolecular Medicine

via e-mail at: budgetbook@usa.com