

How can all the scientists be wrong?

By Troy Pritchard

Scientists are not wrong.. about their science. It is not a scientist who uses science to support Evolution, it is an evolutionist who uses science to support Evolution.

Although, I do not get into the details of the fossil record in this article, I would like to leave you with a few things to ponder about the fossil record. I want to touch on the fossil record a bit, because the reasoning and logic in this article will be circumvented if you believe there is fossil evidence of ape-to-man. Darwin said that one of the biggest problems with his theory is that the fossil record does not support it. He believed by faith that future fossil evidence would support his theory. Unfortunately, depending on your world view, we now have fewer fossils to support Evolution than we did in Darwin's time. Some of the fossils that were used to support Evolution in his time have been discarded.

In the Origin of Species, Darwin writes the following:

"...innumerable transitional forms must have existed but why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?... why is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain, and this perhaps is the greatest objection which can be urged against my theory". <ORIGIN OF THE SPECIES>.

Richard Dawkins says this with regard to the fossil record:

Richard Dawkins, Cambridge, "And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists.... the only alternative explanation of the sudden appearance of so many complex animal types in the Cambrian era is divine creation...", <THE BLIND WATCHMAKER>, 1986, p229-230.

Does this prove Creation? No, but it shows that living creatures, as displayed in the fossil record, suddenly appeared with no evolutionary history. The fossil record is actually evidence showing evolution has not taken place. Moreover, the very fact there are fossils is evidence that something catastrophic was involved in their burial as we do not get fossils by gradual processes. Have you ever wondered how we get fossils in the first place? Particularly, fossils of fish swallowing another fish. Something catastrophic must have taken place in order to bury all life forms in the way we find them in the fossil record. Millions upon millions of fossils. It is only through years of evolutionary conditioning that we would not agree with Darwin's view of the fossil record. Also, many people have a "bible" vs. "science" mentality which prevents them from considering that the fossil record stands in opposition to Evolution. The irony is that millions of life forms catastrophically buried alive deposited kind upon kind is what you would expect to see if there was a worldwide flood, scientifically speaking. Truth be told, a person cannot confidently use the fossil record to support Evolution, a slow and gradual process. I was shocked to see what Dawkins wrote about the fossil record, since he is a staunch atheist. But he is forced by science to conclude that the fossil record is in favor of Creation. Do you see what the

experts believe about the fossil record? What do you believe and why do you believe it? Who told you what to believe? A school teacher, who was also told what to believe?

Keep in mind, there are no transitional forms between *microscopic organisms* to *invertebrates* and from *invertebrates* to *vertebrates*. There are no half-formed feathers of birds, no evolutionary progression of dinosaurs, no fossils showing what apes evolved from and so forth. We may come across extinct variations of completely formed creatures, such as flying dinosaurs which can be arranged to support Evolution, but that is the extent of it. It is important to understand that the transition from *invertebrates* into *vertebrates* are fundamental transitional times of Evolution. The *links* between *invertebrates* to *vertebrates*, quite frankly are the rule, not the exception. If Evolution is true millions upon millions of transitional forms between invertebrates to vertebrates *would have existed*. This is an undeniable fact. And they would outnumber the creature they evolved from to the creature they evolved into a thousand to one. Maybe you are not aware of this, but we have yet to find just one of these transitional forms in the fossil record. Why is it that we find invertebrate fossils by the millions and vertebrate fossils by the millions, but not one transitional form? These transitional forms is what you would expect to see if the fossils are millions of years old and if they are the result of a slow and gradual evolutionary process. Yet, not one transitional form between invertebrates to vertebrates has been discovered. And it is not because the fossil record is sparse. The sampling of the fossil record is an abundant sampling of the fossil record. We have fossils of completely formed morphological invertebrates and completely formed morphological vertebrates, but no fossils of life forms in between. What we do have is a handful of *vertebrate* fossils of chimps, apes and man on the "species" level which are similar in appearance and in build structure. Incidentally, our DNA is going to be very similar since DNA determines morphology. Chimps, apes and man have one vertebral column, two legs, two arms, two hands, one head, etc. Fossils have been arranged in a way to give the impression that man evolved from apes. Some of the so called links used to support ape-to-man evolution could have very well existed prior to its ancestor! Ironically, putting some of the links in their proper time slot (the time in which they actually lived) would give the impression that man is *de-evolving*. Fossils do not come with labels. Evolutionists use rock layers to date fossils and use fossils to date rock layers. Carbon dating is only useful into thousands of years, not millions and since fossils are not radioactive you cannot use radiometric dating methods on them.

When you see drawings of ape-to-man Evolution keep in mind that artists are told how to draw the fossil finds. Artists are directed to add a little more cartilage here and to draw eyebrows a certain way, to draw hair all of the body or vice versa. Remember Nebraska Man? Nebraska Man was used as evidence to convince school children that their teachers evolved from apes. An artist was told how to draw Nebraska man. Nebraska Man was drawn somewhere in the middle of the well known ape-to-man drawing by using a single *tooth*. Well, had they drawn what the real creature looked like they would have drawn a pig, not an ape. Can you imagine a pig in the middle of the ape-to-man evolutionary drawing? That is how far off it gets. Do a Google search for Nebraska Man and you will find that the tooth that was used to draw the missing link came from a pig. My point in bringing this to your attention is not to poke fun at Evolution. I mention this to show that if evolutionists can be that far off on a drawing in the past how more possible is it that the current drawings are merely embellished? What I am saying is this; Imagine going back in time and seeing these so called links alive. They would not have to be a pig in order for them to be discarded as a missing link. They just need to be an extinct variation of an ape or

chimp. These are not links. You are free to disagree with this, but know that a belief in missing links is not backed by science. Some people believe in missing links by stretching their imagination of certain fossils. Science hasn't proven a particular theory. The tools of science are merely used to support a belief. There is a difference. Furthermore, all of the so called ape-to-man fossils are of creatures that had two complete legs, two complete arms, two complete feet, two complete hands, two complete eyes, one brain, one heart, one liver, two kidneys, etc. Why would we expect to see links between two species that are very closely related morphologically, when we cannot find even one transitional form between invertebrates and vertebrates? Phylum, classes and orders links should outnumber species links a thousand to one, conservatively speaking. To look upon the handful of recklessly construed species fossils and say: "This is why I believe hydrogen gas becomes people" is taking an enormous leap of faith.

You need to take evidence as a whole and use knowledge from other fields of science to determine if what you are observing supports your presupposition. When a person takes evidence out of context and just focuses on that evidence they can make the evidence say pretty much what they want. Cults do that with religion. They take certain writings out of context that appeal to them and justify their actions based on the writings that are favorable to their cause and turn a deaf ear to contradictory writings. Real truth seekers would include contradictory writings in their truth seeking process in order to come to a knowledge of the truth. Why would someone let themselves be influenced by embellished drawings of so called ape-men when there are no transitional forms from invertebrates to vertebrates? These transitional forms would have to have existed in order to give rise to vertebrates.

Let us leave the topic of fossils and now consider the presumptions, semantics and reasoning that is employed to reach a belief in Evolution. But before we move on, know this: There is no fossil evidence for Evolution. What we do find is fossils of variations of created things.

This article addresses more of the logic and reasoning that one uses to reach a belief in Evolution. It reveals things that people unconsciously think but never say. When Galileo discovered that the moon was not perfectly smooth as taught by Aristotle and Ptolemy, he was met with great opposition. To counter Galileo's discovery, they claimed that a smooth invisible layer filled in the canyons and craters, so the moon is essentially smooth (About.com- Inventors). They came up with a rescuing device to maintain their belief that the moon was smooth, but were unable to provide any evidence of this rescuing device.

Co-discoverer of DNA, Sir Francis Crick, came to the conclusion that the formation of DNA by chance, random natural processes was impossible.. on Earth. And so he believes that life formed somewhere in outer space and came to Earth (Crick & Orgel, 1973). We should not scoff at this belief or ridicule it, because if there is evidence for it, then so be it. It is the nature of scientific enquiry to adjust our views in lieu of new information or the re-evaluation of prior observations and data, but the views must be supported by science. What we do know is that it was Crick's scientific research of DNA that brought him to the conclusion that the formation of DNA by chance, random processes was impossible. It was his faith in Evolution that brought him to the conclusion that life formed in an unknown, unseen, unobserved world.

After the discovery of DNA and the impossibility of life forming on Earth, you can imagine how textbooks from grade school to grad school could start the story of Evolution as follows: "Millions of years ago life evolved in outer space and came to Earth." The student, being presented this by their teacher or professor believes this because it is "education", but in reality they just believe it because it is what they have been taught, generation after generation. The school kids then grow up to be teachers and professors and continue this teaching. Upon believing (not discovering) that life formed in outer space and came to Earth, the story of Evolution is re-written as to included this new belief. Evolutionists automatically re-calibrate the way they view and interpret evidence and add new creeds / rescuing devices as to be consistent with Evolution. There would be nothing wrong with this if Evolution was inherently true, because if Evolution was true you wouldn't need evidence to prove it. You would just believe in something that was true. But one cannot teach unverified philosophical beliefs about the unobserved past and call it science. The story of Evolution is re-written not based on scientific evidence or information that supports the theory, but because there are un-explained gaps in the story. You can't start the evolutionary story with: "Science has shown that Evolution is impossible, because the formation of the single cell by chance, natural processes is impossible." And then go on to show circumstantial evidence, such as ape-men fossils that has been construed to fit evolutionary presuppositions. You have one of two options:

1. Say that life evolved in outer space and came to Earth.
2. Go against science and say that life formed on Earth by chance, random processes (on Earth) and proceed with the story as usual.

With option one, evolutionist's are neither intentionally lying or knowingly telling the truth; they are simply making something up. Something that cannot be verified or falsified. There is nothing wrong with believing something to be true, which you have not observed, as long as there is some *evidence to support* it, a logical reason to believe it. We all do it on a daily basis. How so?

Before I explain, first let me give you Webster's definition of presumption.

Presumption: 1. An inference as to the existence of one fact, from the existence of some other fact, founded on a previous experience of their connection.

You may have thought that a presumption is merely something you *assume* to be true, without any evidence to support your assumption. However, in a presumption you believe something to be true using *proven* knowledge from previous experiences (related to what you believe to be true) as a means to bring credibility to your belief.

For example, Imagine you came home from work one day and found that your house was vandalized. Your front door was smashed in as well as the windows. There are holes in the walls, cabinets doors ripped off the hinges, drywall smashed in, graffiti on the walls, etc. You *presume* that someone damaged your house. This is a logical conclusion based on life experiences and what we know from past events and observations; that vandals exist and that they damage property. What is observable and testable is your damaged house. What is unknown, unseen and unobservable is the vandal who damaged your house.

Your study of your house would cause you to conclude that someone damaged it, since it is impossible for your house to have spontaneously damaged itself in this way. A gas leak could have caused an explosion and the consequent damage, but that would not explain the graffiti on the walls and other earmarks of vandalism. You would conclude that someone was responsible for its destruction. This logic can be applied to the opposite scenario. You could leave for a few days and return to find your house completely put back together. Like Crick concluding that it was impossible for life to form by chance, natural processes on Earth, you would conclude that it was impossible for your house to fix itself. Someone must have fixed it. You made a conclusion that there were active agents beyond your observations that are unknown, unseen and unobserved (friends, neighbors, tools, etc.) that contributed to the restoration of your house. You made this conclusion based on presumptuous reasoning. You have observed events in the past, such as drywall finishers, painters, window and door repairmen, etc. as a basis for your conclusion. So what are the active agents that caused the formation of life in outer space, which we have not observed? There is no scientific evidence to support the claim that life formed by chance in outer space. But, I'll tell you why this is a non-issue. One may believe that life formed in outer space using proven knowledge from previous experiences of the supernatural as a means to bring credibility to life forming in outer space.

Prior events of "falsifying" the *supernatural* inadvertently brings credibility to the belief that life must have formed in outer space. If the supernatural has been falsified, the existence of a Creator has been falsified. If there is no Creator, life must have formed by natural processes. If life did not form by natural processes *on Earth* it must have formed in *outer space*. This is an irrevocable logical conclusion if there is no Creator. This is healthy chain of reasoning if all these things are true. But there is an error in the chain of reasoning. The error is the assumption that the existence of a Creator has been disproven. In principle, everything else is true. But here is what is interesting; By deductive reasoning, science has *discredited* the existence of a Creator. I do not believe this was done intentionally. It was inadvertently brought about by conditioning the mind through presumptuous reasoning and misunderstood meanings of Natural Processes, Creation, Supernaturalism and Naturalism. Here is how.

The following is just one example of many things like this. People do not think this out right, it is something more of the sub-conscious, working away in the background of one's reasoning and thinking process over a period of years. I do not believe discrediting the Creator is done intentionally, people just lose heart through experiences like this and succumb to naturalism. Prior to our current tools of science, people naively believed that "processes" in nature, such as lightning & thunder were the result of God (supernaturalism). They were unaware of the natural mechanisms which are implemented to display these things. Upon discovering that lightning was the result of a "*natural*" process, not "*supernaturalism*", the Creator (seemingly) became falsified. (To a mind that has not reasoned through a conglomeration of semantics sewn together by a naturalistic world view). Things that were thought to be the result of the supernatural (such as lightning) were proven by *science* to be the result of natural processes. Evolution is solely the result of natural processes. Creation is the result of a supernatural Creator. The origin of what "pre-scientific, naïve people" believed was the result of a Creator was proven by *science* to be the result of *natural processes*. Through a series of misunderstanding of key word and semantics, continual discoveries of natural processes affirm naturalism (Evolution) and discredit

supernaturalism (Creation). This conditions the mind to accept Evolution as science and to view Creation as a religion, scientifically speaking.

Again, it is never laid out in black in white like this and there are hundreds maybe thousands of presumptions and misunderstood meanings of key words that swirl in the background of one's reasoning and thinking process. So I am certainly not saying that, in the case with life evolving in outer space, Francis Crick said to himself: "Well, we know lightning is not the result of the supernatural; therefore life must have formed in outer space." It is extremely more complicated than that. There are many different layers of misinterpreted evidence, years of evolutionary conditioning, equating naturalism with natural processes. There is making mental "notes to self" about people who naively believed that God cured their loved one of cancer, when the loved one was cured by months of chemo-therapy, which is the result of science. There is a sense of disdain when looking upon those who naively believe in Creation who know nothing about "science." Embellished sketches of ape-to-man have been imposed upon impressionable minds. And probably the biggest thing that governs all of this is the *fear* of being duped into believing in a Creator who does not exist. All these things lure the soul into seeing Evolution as science. Especially when scientists (evolutionists) present Evolution as "science", (which finds its credibility by equating natural processes with naturalism). I could write a book about these things alone, but I think you get my point. When Crick concluded that life formed in outer space, he was merely adhering to the option that seemed more sensible to him based on his years of evolutionary (in his mind scientific) conditioning. There is a reason why he was prevented from concluding life was created. There is a reason why he concluded that life formed in outer space. He believes that the existence of the supernatural (and a Creator) has been disproven by science. He also believes that other fields of science support Evolution, i.e. man evolved from apes, etc. Instead of using his knowledge and discovery of DNA as a means to investigate the credibility of Evolution he goes with the flow and does his part to not disrupt the Evolution world view by *concluding that life formed in outer space*. He assumes other fields of science support Evolution and uses things like ape-to-man Evolution and previous experiences of falsifying the supernatural as a basis for his conclusion.

Here is where things take a turn for logic. Clarity is brought forth by asking this simple, yet profound question and pretty much removes presumptuous arguments. Questions like this should have been asked essentially from the beginning of time as to remain focused on this world view issue: *Are natural processes such as lightning, thunder, mutations, natural selection taking place in a created natural world or an evolved natural world? Are we living in created natural world or an evolved natural world?* A natural world in which we discover and study the complexity of DNA in natural organisms. A natural world in which we observe and study changes to beaks of finches. A natural world in which we treat cancer patients with chemo-therapy. A natural world where we unearth catastrophically deposited fossils and arrange them in a sequence to portray the unobserved past. From there we must use the tools of science to investigate if we are living in a created natural world (where changes take place) or an evolved natural world (where changes take place). It is *science* (not Evolution) that discovered that lightning is a natural process occurring in a created natural world. It is *science* that discovered DNA not Evolution. It is *science* that discovered that the formation of DNA by chance, natural processes is impossible. It is *science* (not Evolution) that discovered that beaks on birds can change in a created natural world. One may argue: "But these changes, spread over a long period of time, are Evolution." If

the changes are taking place in *created natural organisms* in a *created natural world*, they cannot be used to support (the theory of) Evolution. You cannot use the theory of Evolution to prove Evolution. Created natural organisms can change. Why can't they? Evolution means explaining how you get complete, morphological organisms in the first place, not observing changes and variations in complete, morphological organisms that already exist. In order for Evolution to sound convincing, you have to first deny the presupposition that this natural world was created. You can get nowhere with the theory of Evolution without first believing by blind faith in Evolution. You cannot use changes and variations in natural organisms (as to include mutations and natural selection) that already exist as a means to support Evolution, if the changes and variations are taking place in created natural organisms. I am sorry, but that is the logic of it.

If you initially laughed at Crick's belief that life formed in outer space, why? Maybe there was some evidence to support it. Did you think it through logically? Do you fully understand core meanings behind key words? If you initially ridiculed a "created natural world", why? Did you think this through completely? Do you know what this means? We need to continually remind ourselves to really think things through and not respond to important world view issues in a knee jerk way triggered by feelings and emotions.

There is a fine line where a person switches from being a scientist to a philosopher. Crick was a scientist when he discovered and studied the complexities of DNA. He was wearing his evolutionist hat when he believed by faith that life spontaneously formed in outer space. We can't judge him for this because in his eyes, he was simply making a "scientific" conclusion based on his life experiences and what he knew from past experiences and observations. He concluded this because of his understanding of naturalism and supernaturalism and because he equates natural processes with naturalism / Evolution. He is following in Darwin's footsteps. It is extremely important that we understand that there is a difference between *natural processes* and *naturalism*. Naturalism means that nature is all there is. Natural processes are things we observe in this natural world. So it doesn't make sense to say that "naturalism" is taking place in a created natural world. However, believing that "natural processes" are taking place in a created natural world is not in conflict with science nor does it break any laws of logic. Francis Crick believes in an unseen, unobserved former of life and so do I.

Crick's faith in Evolution caused him to do the same thing that Galileo's opponents faith did; he invented a rescuing device to maintain his faith in Evolution. In so doing, he reveals himself to be somewhat of a 20th century opponent to Galileo. Only his obstacle involves the origin of DNA and his rescuing device is an unknown, unseen, unobserved world, not the surface of the moon and an unknown, unseen, unobserved invisible layer that fills in canyons and craters. Crick's belief that DNA and the single cell formed in a distant galaxy is akin to a religion, coming up with rescuing devices to maintain his faith in Evolution. People are free to believe whatever they want, but when someone imposes their belief on science, with no supporting evidence, that is another thing entirely. Ironically, the famous atheist, Richard Dawkins, writes in his book, *The God Delusion*, that anyone who does not believe in Evolution (in part, that DNA and the single cell formed by chance) is ignorant, stupid or insane. Would you not agree this is very disconcerting considering that the world's foremost expert in DNA believes that the formation of DNA by chance, random processes on Earth is impossible? I mean this is not some minor detail. It is a fundamental component of Evolution. Is a person ignorant, stupid or insane if

they do not believe that life formed in outer space and came to Earth? For which there is no evidence. The way that I was programmed to respond to the above questions years ago was like this: "You are not considering Evolution as a whole. There is evidence in other fields of science." I have learned and you may too, that such a response is nullified by the simple understanding that this evolutionary based faith is imposed upon all fields of science (by evolutionists, who are the majority). Every field of science has their Francis Crick's and rescuing devices. Evolutionist's believe what they are taught and they teach what they believe. They think, but only to a point. Beyond that point is the awareness of rescuing devices, assumptions, natural processes taking place in a created natural world, etc. The popularity of a belief will fluctuate, but the errant chain of reasoning that makes Evolution palatable will always be present. The rescuing devices and unproven assumptions will always be implemented to replace the missing evidence. Rescuing devices and unproven assumptions are required in order to change the description of this natural world from "created" to "evolved."

Evolutionary scientists in other fields of science simple do the same thing that Crick did and what Galileo's opponents did when they find evidence that opposes their belief. They invent rescuing devices and resort to unproven assumptions. These things are full of logical fallacies and many of them involve the *presumptuous falsification of the Creator* principle. This is why an astute, intelligent and logically thinking person who is *willing to set aside his emotions and biases*, will not believe in Evolution. Some people are naïve and unaware of science and believe in Creation by faith. So I understand why Dawkins made the comment he did, but reasoning through the evidence in light of presuppositions & semantics will not allow a person to accept the claim that hydrogen gas becomes people.

It is extremely difficult for some people to see that Evolution is a religion. This is so, because Evolution positions itself in the umbrella of science. Also, the term "evolution" is continually switching from a noun (Theory of) to a verb (change) depending on the context in which it is used. If you pursue this issue, you will find that rescuing devices are continually added to the story of Evolution. There is nothing wrong with this if evolutionists were simply *wrong* before and are now *right* about a particular piece of evidence. People make mistakes. The problem is there is no scientific evidence to support the rescuing device, yet they call Evolution science. Imagine removing all the rescuing devices from the theory of Evolution and the idea that the Creator has been disproven and then asking yourself if what you are observing is taking place in a *Created Natural World* or an *Evolved Natural World*. Then follow the evidence where ever it leads.

If it is not Sir Francis Crick coming up with a "life formed in outer space" rescuing device to maintain his faith in Evolution, it is Stephen J. Gould's rescuing device of punctuated equilibria (or equilibrium) regarding the absence of transitional forms in the fossil record. Punctuated equilibria is an evolutionary position that states there are no transitional forms because transitional forms existed in times when fossilization did not occur (Gould & Eldredge, 1977). Well, then why believe in transitional forms when paleontology shows no evidence for it? Why believe DNA formed in outer space when science shows no evidence for it? There is a reason why Stephen J. Gould is prevented from considering life was created. There is a reason why he believes that transitional forms existed in times when fossilization did not occur. He believes that the existence of the supernatural (and a Creator) has essentially been disproven by science. Thus,

his only logical conclusion is that transitional forms existed in times when fossilization did not occur. He is using prior events and observations of the supernatural as a basis for his conclusion. He will not admit this, but this is what is happening.

Know this: For every "But you are not considering.." objection one can think of, a sound, intellectually satisfying and logical response can answer it. Pursue, pursue, and pursue this issue. You will be met with opposition and ridicule. Logical arguments will be eluded by evolutionists. You will be stone walled with "evidence" that appears to support Evolution, but I guarantee this evidence will not be without logical fallacies and will not pass the "Reasoning through the evidence in light of presuppositions & semantics" test. It will not be evidence that disproves a *Created Natural World*. This I can guarantee. Think logically, keep pressing on, persevere and you will be amazed to discover that the only evidence for Evolution is found is the errant chain of reasoning. It took me two years before for this uncertain, foreboding "*What Evolutionary evidence am I not aware of*" feeling was lifted off me. But through research, critical thinking, watching Creation / Evolution debates, identifying the faulty chain of reasoning of evolutionists and time, I was amazed to discover there was absolutely no evidence for Evolution.

Sorting through and identifying the errors in the chain of reasoning of evolutionists is what set me free of the foreboding feeling. Moreover, the *fear* of believing in a Creator who does not exist has been completely removed. There is absolutely no doubt that the One who put my vandalized house back together exists, even though he is unseen and unobserved by many. Francis Crick believes in an unseen, unobserved former of life and so do I. It is very clear that the glue that holds the theory of Evolution together is the faulty chain of reasoning and the falsification of the Creator principle. This is the only "evidence" that discredits this natural world was supernaturally created. Once you realize the evidence for Evolution is found in the simple, faulty chain of reasoning, you will likely be outraged. You will be outraged because you realize the severity of the consequences of believing in Evolution. You will be outraged because (evolutionists in) the scientific community used such sloppy, reckless and dogmatic reasoning to teach you something so serious as a worldview that has your eternal destiny at stake in their reasoning.

Darwin essentially admitted that if it can be shown that DNA and the single cell could not have been formed by chance, random processes, his theory would become nothing more than a nature myth. Darwin stated: "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed, which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." Can you imagine where we would be today if Sir Francis Crick and Charles Darwin lived at the same time? Judging by his ingenuous statement above Darwin would likely have been mortified by Crick's discovery of DNA as he knew where he was going with his theory. He would have been speechless at Crick's leap of faith with regard to life forming in outer space and would not have joined him in his leap of faith. With that said, Darwin would have likely felt compelled to contact everyone he had told about his theory and publicly renounce it.

So, how can all the *scientists* be wrong? scientists are not wrong.. about their science. Francis Crick used science to discover and study the intricate complexity of DNA. Science showed Francis Crick that the formation of DNA by natural processes was impossible. His faith in Evolution told him that the formation of DNA took place in outer space. Stephen J. Gould used science to discover that transitional forms are missing from the fossil record. His faith in Evolution told him the transitional forms existed in times when fossilization did not occur. This kind of philosophical coercion has usurped every single field of science. You have to understand that we all have been biased before we come across evidence, before we get into college and start making observations and discoveries for ourselves. This bias, along with *falsifying the Creator by presumptuous reasoning* guides our thinking and causes us to interpret evidence to be consistent with our evolutionary bias and thereby causing us to employ rescuing devices and unproven assumptions.

So how can all the *evolutionists* be wrong? Ironically, the answer to this question comes from the evolutionist Richard Dawkins himself. In *The God Delusion*, he writes: “When one person suffers from a delusion, it is called insanity. When many people suffer from a delusion it is called Religion.” As revealed in the previous paragraphs, Evolution is a religion, pure and simple. Science is not a religion. Studying changes and variations in things that already exist, such as beaks on birds, is not a religion. Believing that is how we get birds and beaks and scientific observers in the first place is what makes Evolution a religion. Using science to study DNA and concluding life could not have been formed by chance, natural processes, is not a religion. Believing that life formed in an unknown, unseen, unobserved world without any evidence to support it, is what makes Evolution a religion. Using science to study the fossil record is not religion. Believing that transitional forms existed in times when fossilization did not occur is what makes Evolution a religion. Remember to be patient with those who do not see Evolution as a religion. It takes time for a person to differentiate between science and Evolution. They may not be aware of Evolution's rescuing devices and unproven assumptions, let alone know that these things are the glue that holds the theory of Evolution together.

I often wonder what happened to Darwin when he was isolated on the Galapagos Islands. It may be that after months of observing nature in light of a purely naturalistic mindset, there came a time when naturalism completely consumed him. I believe naturalism was imposed upon Darwin's scientific outlook which spurred him on to evaluate his observations solely in light of naturalism. Being incepted with naturalism, he likened natural processes with naturalism, seeing them as one and the same. This unification of his scientific observations (of natural processes) and an anti-God religion (naturalism) conceived and ultimately gave birth to his book, *On the Origin of Species by means of natural selection* and it dwells among us to this day. By faith there are those who believe that through naturalism all things were made. Whatever it was that empowered Darwin on the secluded islands, one thing is certain, it was not science. He had come in contact with a powerful delusion. A delusion that consummated the unification of science and naturalism.

Time. Time changes things. Had Darwin known what science has revealed to us since his time and had he tested his observations in light of the logical fallacies, semantics and circular reasoning of Evolution, he could very well have written *The impossibility of the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* and then felt at liberty to observe how natural selection affects created natural organisms in a created natural world. Which is exactly what he did on the Galapagos Islands, except he was empowered to view his observations in light of naturalism. Darwin had been hoodwinked into believing that natural selection had the ability to create things like finches. One thing we know for certain, natural selection cannot explain how we get birds and beaks and scientific observers in the first place and science has not disproved that natural selection is taking place in a created natural world.

After reading this article you might think: "I never thought about this, good job thinking this through and breaking it out in detail." Then fear of the uncertain sets in (and you will feel this) followed by a serial sense that Creation cannot be true and there must be evidence for Evolution. No, there is no evidence for Evolution. That is why I wrote a book. It is OK to feel this uncertainty, in fact it is normal and there would be something wrong if you did not. Your mind is taking in evidence that conflicts with your world view and it takes time for your soul to be in harmony with what your mind is accepting. In regards to the scientific evidence, I am asking you to think with your mind, not your feelings. Ultimately, it is your soul that needs to accept what you have seen with your eyes and what you have heard with your ears. Like I said, it took me two years for my soul to be in union with what my critical mind was taking in, evaluating, computing and accepting. I wish I could say "Trust me, there is no evidence for Evolution" and save you the two years, but it is something you must undergo yourself. It is a purging process.

References

Crick, F. H. & Orgel, L. E. (1973). Directed Panspermia. *Icarus* 19: 341–348. doi:10.1016/0019-1035(73)90110 + [[http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1979JBIS... 32..419M](http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1979JBIS...32..419M)].

Gould, Stephen Jay, & Eldredge, Niles (1977). "Punctuated equilibria: the tempo and mode of evolution reconsidered." *Paleobiology* 3 (2): 115-151.

About.com Inventors http://inventors.about.com/od/gstartinventors/a/Galileo_Galilei_2.htm.

Scientists are wrong so often because the questions they ask are difficult ones—scientists seek truth, and truth is rare and elusive. Because the root cause of so many false scientific discoveries is widespread statistical confusion, a solution is feasible: statistical education. The science community is, even if slowly, recognizing the necessity of modifying its statistical practices to suit modern scientific research. For decades, most scientists saw climate change as a distant prospect. We now know that thinking was wrong. This summer, for instance, a heat wave in Europe penetrated the Arctic, pushing temperatures into the 80s across much of the Far North and, according to the Belgian climate scientist Xavier Fettweis, melting some 40 billion tons of Greenland’s ice sheet. The evidence in those ice cores would prove pivotal in turning the conventional wisdom. As the science historian Spencer Weart put it: “How abrupt was the discovery of abrupt climate change? Many climate experts would put their finger on one moment: the day they read the 1993 report of the analysis of Greenland ice cores. How can an intelligent Harvard scientist fall for this? He expressed worries about protein because of mTOR stimulation & cancer. This is such a reductionist and overly simplistic way to evaluate mTOR. To this professor’s mind, the piece he is looking at and the pieces of others fit and make a picture. It might be wrong because someone described the connecting edges wrong, he might have misunderstood the description of the other, or there is yet another piece that is between those pieces that someone has yet to fish out of the box. There are many different reasons but I strongly believe that it is fairly unlikely he is doing this out of malice.