THE EVOLUTION OF A THEORY

A polemic against the Theory of Evolution

by **O Y Baddiel**

London, England

Revised and Expanded

5778 — 2018

COPYRIGHT © 2018 — 5778

by

O Y Baddiel

79 Princes Park Avenue
Temple Fortune
LONDON, NW11 0JS
ENGLAND

Typesetting and book design by O Y Baddiel

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

No part of this work may be reproduced,
in any form, photocopy or otherwise,
without the **written** permission of the Copyright holder.

וּשְׁאֵרִית יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא יַעֲשׂוּ עַוְלָה
וְיִשְׂאוּ בְרָכָה מֵאֵת ה׳

For questions, comments or suggestions
— which will be most welcome —
or to be included on our e-mailing list
and receive our Sidra and Haftorah Sheets,
send an e-mail to
oyb@seniors.org.uk

Fifth, expanded edition
Third Printing

Printed by

Scanprint

The Booklet Centre

London, England

Telephone: **07973449275**

zetel@btinternet.com

In the beginning, G·d created the heavens and the earth.

Berayshis / Genesis, 1 : 1

THE EVOLUTION OF A THEORY

A polemic against the Theory of Evolution

by **O Y Baddiel**

FUNDAMENTALS

1. First, a few basic, self-evident truths.

2. Nothing happens by itself. Every effect has a cause. Never has anything been seen or been experienced that happened by itself without it being caused by some effect or without it being arranged. If something exists, if something is here, we know that it has come about by a cause that put it here.

3. We know, too, that when we come upon something, we can judge the cleverness of its maker by the thing's complexity. Four or five coloured building blocks placed one on top of the other, we know, tells us that it was a young child who built this model tower whereas the incredible complexity of a chronograph tells us that much clever thought, inventiveness and planning has gone into this timepiece. The greater an article's complexity, or the more complicated an event, we know, the greater is the cleverness of the maker of the article or of the arranger of the event.

4. Next: nobody, no thinking being, does anything without a reason. Usually, the less clever the being, the less clever is the reason for the action. A cow doesn't have any deep reason for walking towards the clump of grass. It's going to eat it. No great sophistication in that, but it's a reason. The lunatic who tries to climb the wall does it, he'll tell you, because it's Mount Everest and he is Edmund Hilary. Quite crazy, but it's a reason. A clever person, on the other hand, usually has a clever reason for whatever he does, and generally speaking, the cleverer the person, the cleverer is the reason. A clever, thinking person is not going to invest brain-power and effort into doing something for no reason at all. Additionally, from our own experience we know that the more effort that a clever, thinking person expends on a project, the more compelling or the more important is the reason for the effort.

5. The sheer wonder of all creation, its incredible complexity and amazing workings is all evidence of the Supreme Intelligent G-d Who made it all. As just said, nobody does anything for no reason and generally, the cleverer the doer, the cleverer or the more compelling or the more important is the reason for the action. We thus come to the following conclusions: Since nothing happens or comes about by itself, the universe (of which this world is only an infinitesimally small part) must have been brought into existence by its Creator. From its incredible complexity, we deduce that the Creator of this world and the universe and everything is supremely intelligent — besides being all-powerful and capable of creating everything. (For otherwise how come that everything is here?) As just stated, too, the cleverer the doer or the maker, the cleverer or the more important is the reason or purpose for what He does or makes.

6. As sensible, thinking human beings, we are now left with finding out what that reason or purpose is. Knowing, too — even though here we're jumping the gun a bit — that G-d is fair and is not a tyrant or a trickster Who would want to mislead His creatures that they should come to the wrong conclusion about something so important as what is the reason for being created at all, it follows that G-d would not leave us to come to the wrong conclusions (as we are created with biases and inclinations that could lead us astray) so it's only fair that He should communicate with us to let us know why He has created us and what is our purpose in His scheme of things so that we don't need to guess. This communication is what we call "the Torah" (the word means "instruction") and in it is clearly set out what G-d the Creator wants from His creatures.

7. So far, things are pretty straightforward. We have our world, created by G-d for a reason and purpose that is best understood by Him but nevertheless makes sense to us too and we have been informed of our duties to our Creator. In fact, this is the principle of faith which is the basis of Judaism (and all true religion) — there is G-d the Creator and we have a part to play in His Creation. Remarkably, it is estimated that nearly 90% of the world population believes in G-d (Who cannot be seen or experienced in any physical manner) and this, in an odd way, would seem to prove that G-d exists. Nevertheless, it has to be said that this "belief" is rather loose and easy-going. It doesn't seem to make people feel accountable to G-d nor does it halt the hedonistic secular lifestyle that has made so many people's lives so empty and soulless. How did this come about? Modern society is called a broken society, but who, or what, broke it?

TROUBLE LOOMS

8. The trouble started when those who claimed to be the spokesmen of G-d (but were not) began to make a bad name for G-d. The crimes and wrongs that were perpetrated in the name of G-d (and some of the things were very bad indeed and included crusades, inquisitions, torture, public burnings at the stake, mass killings, forcible conversions, abductions of children, mass expulsions, and various other inhuman cruelties — but that's another subject) eventually made people turn against G-d, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, to the extent that they denied that G-d ever created anything and indeed made people deny the existence of G-d. Due primarily to nearly two thousand years of religious fundamentalism and the cruelty

and hypocrisy and the terrible crimes committed in the name of G-d by the followers and propagators of the dominant religion of the Western world, the people didn't trust their priests and clergymen any more. On top of that, they really didn't give a hoot about all their threats of hell and damnation for their non-belief — it was all nothing but old superstitions. Considering the religious bigotry and the silliness of the clergymen and how they responded to all progress and advancement with suspicion and fear, we can well understand why intelligent people of the time turned their backs on their religion and its leaders. (Remember how Galileo Galilei (1564 — 1642) was forced to get down on his knees and swear to the Pope that the earth did not go round the Sun but that the Sun went round the earth? Even that wasn't enough. He was forbidden to teach, he was forbidden to publicise any of his writings and he was under house arrest till the end of his life, too, thanks to the Church's Holy Inquisition.) As the Renaissance came, a sleeping mankind shook off the backwardness which its religion had brought upon it. Religion was declared to be old hat. Now was the age of "science" and "reason." But sadly, when the people rejected their old superstitious religion, they mistakenly rejected also the G-d Who had been desecrated by the priests of that religion. And so it came about that belief in G-d was rejected by the new irreligious intelligentsia as "not scientific" and ever since then, it seems, science and religion have been at loggerheads.

9. To be fair, the rejection of belief in G-d wasn't solely the fault of the clergymen and their horrid desecration of G-d's Name. There is also the natural, built-in independence of the free human spirit (in some individuals it borders on open rebelliousness) which constantly strains at the leash of the control imposed on humans by G-d's instructions to Man and indeed keeps nibbling away at human self-control. This defiant part of the free human spirit usually cowers darkly just below the surface. But it is always ready to assert itself, often showing up as a resentment of G-d's authority and a challenge to the restraints and disciplines that He has imposed. But now that the clergymen and their dark and dismal religion were thrown aside, Man's fear of G-d and obedience to His Law were also swept aside, with questions and resentment about how G-d runs His world used as justification for the rebellion against G-d. After all, seen through human eyes and within the human time span, things sometimes indeed seem to be unfair or downright wrong and it doesn't take too long for questions about G-d's management of His world to become doubts about His will or indeed His ability to control things.

10. G-d's crowning achievement of Creation, the human being, is created "in His Image," that is, with a spirit of independence and free will. Indeed, the hallmark of the human being is his spirit of freedom and his free will to make moral choices. But at the same time, this craving for freedom must be harnessed and controlled or else it would destroy itself in an orgy of dissipation in much the same way that a powerful steam engine would shake and shatter itself to destruction if it were not securely bolted down and firmly harnessed to its rods and pistons. Yes, it is true that looking through human eyes and seeing things at the human scale there are things, events, happenings, which are troubling (to put it mildly). But as human beings, we have to keep in mind that although we want to understand our Creator and come close to Him, He is G-d and we are not and G-d operates on a different

level to us. As the Kotzker Rebbe used to say, "Almighty G-d, the Creator and Master of the Universe, wouldn't be much of a Master of the Universe if I, Mendele Kotzker, could understand everything He does!"

11. But even if I don't understand everything that G-d does, is it sensible to therefore rebel against him or to deny that He exists? Imagine this scene: A young child receives a sharp slap from his mother which stops him from doing something that could be dangerous. At the time, he doesn't know why he got the slap and he angrily turns round to his mother and announces impudently, "I don't believe in you!" Does that make sense? Yet in much the same way, instead of humbly accepting that G-d knows what's best ultimately and accepting His Will and Authority, silly little people arrogantly deny the very existence of G-d at all.

12. Of course, G-d could have asserted Himself quite easily, then and now. But He doesn't want to impose Himself upon people. He wants us to come to acknowledge Him and our duties to Him by our own free will, not through His stupendous power or force. So there were no thunderbolts from heaven (well, not many, anyhow) and people could choose to believe what they wanted and each person was free to go his or her own way.

13. The cancer of disbelief spread further and wider, especially as following the ditching of the dominant religion of the Western world life now seemed to be enjoyable, with cheap thrills and unconstrained physical gratification, even of the most immoral kind. But this did leave the spiritual side of man unhappy and unfulfilled. Human beings are created by G-d (even if some of them vehemently deny this fact, sorry!) with a built-in guilty conscience which usually acts as a brake on their rebelliousness and that's why deep down it was known that there would have to be an accounting to G-d for the wrongs done and for the good that was not done. Some sort of justification was needed for all this empty pleasure-seeking; some excuse had to be found for these excesses. All this helped to ultimately bring about the brazen denial of the existence of G-d Himself. You see, denying the existence of G-d does away with the need to justify bad behaviour and the worry about accountability. (The guilt will be more difficult to deal with but we can try to lose that through time-wasting diversions and silly entertainment.)

14. Because the default position of a human being is to believe in G-d (it's almost hard-wired into the normal human psyche) there will have to be some sort of justification by those people who choose to be traitors to G-d the Creator. The more simple rebels tend to excuse their treachery by complaining about their hard life. Others have a wider perspective than their merely personal hardships and claim that G-d isn't very good at managing human affairs in this world. They think that socialism, or communism or any of a range of other isms will remedy the apparently unfair situation. But first they have to get rid of G-d and then they will be able to implement their grand design of social engineering. Ridiculing belief in G-d and religion as "the opiate of the masses," Karl Marx predicted that once socialism was established, the "need for G-d" would go away. According to Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud & Co., belief in G-d is the drug that people need, they need to trust that all the unfairness and difficulties in their lives do follow some plan and ultimately are under control. Things might not be fair, but G-d is in charge and scores will be

settled, if not here and now, then in some other place later. Atheism, on the other hand, says no! Human beings are themselves the ones who have to make things good, by themselves. Society's behaviour has to be adjusted for the benefit of the majority, fairness in society will be guaranteed by the communist credo, "Every man according to his need, every man according to his ability." (That is, every person will be provided by the State according to his needs and in return every man will work to the fullest of his abilities.) Atheism is the great comforter: no more unfairness in society, reward for good deeds is given by the State and offences are punished by the State, here and now. Nobody needs to think about unfairness or inequalities or hardships. There is no more unfairness or difficulties that need to be put right by anyone's humanity or compassion or goodness or kindness. The State looks after everything. Human beings are reduced to being ants in an anthill with no responsibility to act like a human being. Man has become an ant, a cog in a machine.

15. In his highly commendable book, "Pillars of Faith," (from which we have quoted quite extensively) Pinchas Taylor quotes Czesław Miłosz, a Nobel Prize-winning Polish poet who witnessed Nazism and Stalinism first-hand. Miłosz recalls Marx's infamous comment and eloquently points out its flaw and irony saying, "Marx said that Religion is opium for the masses! For those suffering pain, humiliation, illness and serfdom, yes, religion promised a reward in an afterlife, a settling of scores. It made a difficult life bearable. Looking at things in that light, yes, religion is a soother, a palliative, an opiate, if you wish. But now what have you got? Atheism offers a real transformation! Nothing after death; no Judge and no judgement, no settling of scores. No reward and no punishment. What a comfort! What a solace, that after death there is no accounting for our betrayals, for our greed, our cowardice, even our murders! No punishment for any misdeeds, however cruel! The real opium for the people is a denial of G-d the Creator, that there is nothing after death! The true opiate in modern times is the idea that there is no G-d so that everybody can do exactly as they wish (as long as they can get away with it) because there is no Judge and no judgement. That's what happens when there is denial of G-d and secularism replaces genuine fear of G-d. As Abraham, the first Jew, said to Avimelech, the King of the Philistines: "There is only one thing missing here in Philistia — the fear of G-d, and therefore they would even kill me so as to take my wife!" *(Berayshis / Genesis, 20 : 11)*

16. Things are the same today as they were thirty-three centuries ago because human nature is the same. Thus it comes about that today, despite all the advances in technology and medicine and despite all the inventions that all help to make life so pleasant and convenient and easy, nevertheless, we live in a broken society, helpless, scared and frightened at the increasing violent crime all around us. Sulphuric acid thrown in the face to steal a moped or a mobile phone; drug-crazed youngsters robbing and killing simply to have money for more pleasure. Thanks to the secularists that have banished G-d from our society, our human world is ruined and the deranged, G-dless society tries to forget its misery in inane laughter, in unashamed hedonism, in instant gratification, in drink and drugs and unbridled pleasure-seeking even of the most immoral kind. That is what secularism and "humanism" gives you, that's what you have when you deny G-d the Creator.

Secularism has become the new religion. There is no Creator, everything happened by itself! Science will prove it and woe betide any that would try to teach about G-d the Creator!

17. But to those people who had a brain and who cared to think about these matters (which was quite a lot of people, really, and even included some secularists, too) the denial of G-d did raise a question, as follows: If G-d is not the Creator and Master Controller of the world and the universe and everything (including us humans) then who is? In other words, how did everything come about? (And what's the point of it all?) They'd have to come up with some answer otherwise they're going to have stick with G-d as the Creator and that was something that they really didn't want.

SO, HOW *DID* EVERYTHING COME ABOUT ?

18. In fact, it's an old chestnut, this question. It existed far back in history and was discussed even before the new-age rejection of religion. After all, the true answer to this question carries heavy implications, not all of them so convenient. That's why some people assert, in essence, "O, there's no Creator. The world and the universe and everything just always existed." (Just like the ancient Greeks, in fact. They also didn't like G-d because they wanted to do exactly as they pleased and G-d's commandments to them, the Seven Noachide Laws, were too restrictive for their taste.) You see, that's the crux of the matter: If everything "always existed" or came about by accident and randomly, not created by G-d, then there is no right and wrong, "there is no judgement and there is no Judge" and I can do just as I please. The alternative — that there ***is*** judgement and there ***is*** a Judge — is too difficult for some people to contemplate.

19. This Greek idea of a timeless universe that "always existed" without G-d the Creator, doesn't answer the question at all, of course. All it does is to push the question further back in time. Then, when someone (it's usually a Jew) calls out, "But things don't just happen by themselves — ***everybody*** knows that! Everything that exists has to have a beginning or was made by something or somebody!" they say in reply: "Well, if that's so, then who made G-d? Ha! Ha!" They seem unable to understand, or refuse to accept, that there's a difference between created things (which, by definition, are created and therefore must have a Creator and a beginning somewhere) and G-d, Who by definition, always was, always is and always will be. (That's why in Hebrew, the language of the people who taught humanity about G-d, G-d is called by a name which means "Eternal" but is best described by the English word "G-d.") In any case, their wisecrack is only a boorish put-down and they know this. But it does allow them to carry on doing exactly as they please without any restraint (except what they themselves decide is wrong) and so they sail on breezily.

20. But while outwardly the people who reject G-d seem to be free and easy, really they are still troubled. They still need to answer their question about the origin of the world and the universe and their purpose in life because that's how G-d has made human beings — the human being is a seeker (Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Bava Kamma, 3B) trying to get closer to his Creator. (Except that almost always

they allow themselves to be distracted from this serious quest by silly diversions. Indeed sometimes they themselves invent those silly diversions — witness the vast entertainment industry, for instance — just so as to avoid the serious question and its implications.) So, with all their clever banter, they still don't have a satisfactory answer to firstly, who created the world and the universe and everything? And secondly, what is my purpose for being here? They know that if they can't come up with a good alternative answer they'll have to acknowledge that G-d is the Creator. And that would never do because then, as He is G-d, they'll have to listen to Him and obey Him. What they need is a mechanism whereby the world, the universe — everything — came into existence without any Creator, a mechanism that will explain the wonder of so many diverse creatures, each one with its distinct features — including us human beings — all working together. This won't answer the second part, true, but if there's no G-d, who says there ***is*** any purpose? (What a sad, depressing thought!)

21. So, first of all, for the reason just stated, that is, to avoid any accountability, they have to deny that G-d exists. Thus, they kid themselves that the world, the universe, everything, simply always existed. This is not very satisfactory as five minutes of honest thinking tells you that this is not possible because even something that has "always existed" had to have a beginning before the "always" started, when something or somebody had to start things. There had to be "a day without a yesterday." Well, the current answer to ***that*** is, the "Big Bang" (about which more presently). Now, big bangs might do for the rocks and minerals and inorganic stuff like that. But then they have to answer how did all the wonderful life-forms in all their various species, ranging from plants to intelligent, sentient beings — including humans — all came about and how does all this living stuff work together the way it does? And the latest answer to that is: "Evolution!" So, together with the Big Bang, Evolution is the "sophisticated" answer. In place of G-d, there is now the modern "scientific" denial of the existence of G-d — and so they can fool themselves that they are free from the Authority of G-d. In this way, they have set up "science" as the antithesis of G-d and thus it comes about that the explanation of how everything came about and works in the way it does is how the "scientists" say it came about. The only alternative to that is that G-d is the Author of everything. (Some choice!)

BUT *ARE* SCIENCE AND G-D MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE ?

22. Well, in a word, no. Here's the simple, straightforward logic. Science is observable, verifiable fact. Any thing and every thing that exists is a fact. Next: (and please forgive the pedantic repetition but we've got to get this absolutely clear) nothing has ever been observed to happen by itself and so it is clear that everything that exists has come about by something or somebody that made it come about.

23. Next: nobody was around when everything started. So the beginning of everything can never be proved or demonstrated like most other things can be proved or demonstrated *(see Paragraph 53, below)* and therefore the "beginning of all beginnings" will always have to remain a matter of belief.

24. We are therefore left with the choice of believing one of two things: either G-d is the Creator of everything that exists or — and this is the only alternative — everything came about without G–d the Creator, that is, randomly (and consequently without any design or purpose). Both of these require a leap of faith, that is, they are not conclusions that result from the usual scientific enquiry and experiment. In that respect neither of these is rational. Now, given the evidence of intelligent design in our universe, it would seem to require a smaller leap of faith, that is, it is less irrational, to believe that the stupendously well-designed and cleverly arranged and synchronised universe and everything in it was created by the supremely intelligent and powerful G-d rather than that other much greater leap of faith, namely, the wild irrationality of everything being the result of blind, random chance — which in any case does not answer the question of who or what started everything (and neither does it answer what is the purpose of it all, or whether there is a purpose). So, even though Creation by G-d is not "rational" but is a matter of belief, nevertheless this belief is plainly more sensible than the belief that everything came about without G-d the Creator but only through random chance and non-design, that is, without any supreme intelligence ordering everything in place.

25. Belief in G-d the Creator will also help us to come to realize that there is indeed a purpose to our existence. *(See Paragraphs 5 and 6, above.)* Once we realize that, then we can set about finding out what that purpose is and whether or not G-d has told us what that purpose is. This will lead us to discover that yes, He has indeed communicated His instructions for His sentient creatures through His Torah, that this Torah is His Wisdom as it applies to us and to our universe and to everything that pertains to us. This Torah also tells us about G-d what we need to know about Him. From this Torah we know about G-d that He is not a schizophrenic. He is neither a trickster nor a tyrant, nor does He mislead His creatures. He does not create anything which contradicts what He has written in His Torah and neither does He contradict Himself.

26. So, ***is*** science incompatible with G-d, as some people would have us believe? Well, as said, science is observable, verifiable fact. Any thing and every thing that exists is a fact, called into existence by G-d Almighty. (I'm a rationalist, so I'd rather accept the lesser irrationality that everything is created by G-d rather than the much greater irrationality of everything having come about without G-d — as just explained.) It follows, then, that in answer to the question, "Are science and G-d mutually exclusive?" that since there cannot be a contradiction between ***science***, which is the observable world and universe that G-d created, and G-d the Creator of that observable world and universe, the answer has to be "No." Science and G-d are perfectly compatible. Indeed, they are complimentary, each helping us to understand and appreciate the other. So, a contradiction between science and G-d? No! But between ***scientists*** and G-d? Ah, that's different! Between ***scientists*** and G-d, between ***scientists*** and Torah, between G-d and those who choose to disobey G-d, sadly, there ***can*** be contradiction, there ***can*** be conflict. It is these particular scientists (and they are by no means all scientists, incidentally) who choose to deny G-d the Creator and, truly irrational people that they are, instead believe in big bangs happening by themselves and that every living plant and animal — and

humans — all simply "evolved" — these are the people who are known as Evolutionists.

27. Interestingly, the Evolutionists that we're speaking of here are quite sensible and even clever people, well-educated, scholarly. Yet in their desperation to find a G-dless solution to the question of "How did everything come about?" these otherwise sane and intelligent people are willing to let ordinary good sense and reasoning desert them and they are willing to grasp at hare-brained ideas in an attempt to "solve the riddle of the universe" and salve their troubled minds.

28. For instance, we really can't ignore the off-the-wall ideas of well-known Evolutionists like Hoyle and Wickramasinghe who jointly developed the hypothesis of "Panspermia." (Really, it's not theirs originally; the ancient Greeks invented this one! A 5th-century BCE philosopher chappie by the name of Anaxagoras, if you really want to know! Svante Arrhenius (1859 — 1927) a Swedish chemist, set out that hypothesis in a number of popular books and scientific papers. Hoyle and Wickramasinghe then "developed" it.) The hypothesis of "Panspermia" proposes that cosmic dust in the interstellar medium and in comets is partly organic (no demonstrable proof is offered, of course) and that life on Earth was "seeded" from space. (Fred Hoyle, Chandra Wickramasinghe and John Watson, *Viruses from Space and Related Matters*, University College Cardiff Press, 1986.) It appears that others, too, have now embraced this madness in an attempt to explain how life on this planet came about. Listen to this, with the rather mystifying last few sentences, and note also the pompously confident "we knows" followed, strangely, by the rather less confident "must have beens" which are peppered throughout this piece :

29. > "We know the kind of event that it must have been. We know the sort of event that must have happened for the origin of life . . . It was the origin of the first self-replicating molecule . . . It could come about in the following way. It could be that at some earlier time, somewhere in the universe, a civilization evolved by probably some kind of Darwinian means to a very, very high level of technology and designed a form of life that they seeded on to perhaps this planet. Now that is a possibility and an intriguing possibility and I suppose it's possible that you might find evidence for that if you look at the details of our chemistry molecular biology you might find a signature of some sort of designer . . . and that designer could well be a higher intelligence from elsewhere in the universe . . . That higher intelligence would itself have had to come about by some explicable or ultimately explicable process. It couldn't have just jumped into existence spontaneously. That's the point."
> — *(Richard Dawkins, interview with Ben Stein in the film,*
> "Expelled — No Intelligence Allowed."*)*

30. We'll ignore the outright lies in the first few sentences. "We know" — they know nothing! But let's be charitable and say it's merely a manner of speaking. Dishonest, yes, but not deliberately so. But you notice, do you not, that this idea (put forward, as said, by otherwise quite sane intellectuals) doesn't at all answer the question of the ***origin*** of life. It's the usual trick: it just pushes the question further back in time and further away in space. You see, they've still got to explain where these interstellar "seeders" came from, and who made them, no? (As Dawkins

himself seems to say.) I could go on with this "Panspermia" but let's deal with one kind of insanity at a time! Just now we're dealing with Evolution.

31. But if these people are so clever, how come that they talk such rubbish? Simple! They are still human, with all their foibles and weaknesses, and these influence their thinking, that's how come! Hans Jurgen Eysenck, professor of psychology at the University of London, makes a good point. He says, "When scientists leave the particular field in which they specialized, they are just as ordinary, pig-headed and unreasonable as anybody else and their unusually high intelligence only makes their prejudices all the more dangerous." (*"Sense and Nonsense in Psychology"* (1968) page 108.) A fellow might be a Noble Prize-winning physicist but when it comes to American History he might have all the expertise of a high-school student. Terry Eagleton, in his "Lunging, Flailing, Mispunching: a Review of Richard Dawkins' 'The G-d Delusion'" in the *London Review of Books* of 19 October 2006, is not very complimentary of Dawkins and similarly philosopher Alvin Plantinga, in his essay, "The Dawkins Confusion" says that many of Dawkins' arguments would receive a fail grade in a sophomore philosophy class. Michael Ruse, philosopher of science at Florida State University, is quoted numerous times as describing Dawkins and his writings as something that makes him "embarrassed to be an atheist." Even the atheist philosopher Thomas Nagel calls Dawkins' arguments "amateur." The deniers of G-d might be clever but that doesn't mean they can't be wrong. They just know how to make their mistakes *sound* clever. (That's when we find out the difference between a wise man and a wise guy, right?)

32. We must remember that there's no conflict between science and G-d. It's the ***scientists*** that give science a bad name, pretty much like the clergymen of the scarecrow religions of the world have given G-d a bad name. It's ridiculous to say that a scientist ever became an atheist because of science. Science does not make atheists. Rather than basing their atheism on their science, they simply bring their atheist preconceptions to their science. They might pretend otherwise, but remember, there are other very clever scientists who do believe in G-d, aren't there? Dr John Lennox, renowned professor of mathematics at Oxford, too, explains that atheist scientists are not compelled by science to accept a natural or materialistic explanation of the universe which excludes G-d the Creator. No, sir, it does not! Their commitment to materialism came first and they just backed up their prejudice with their interpretation of science.

33. On the contrary, there are many eminent scientists who are religious and have clearly stated that their studies of the universe have brought them to acknowledge G-d the Creator. (We will be listing some of them shortly.) For instance, Thomas C Emmel, professor of zoology at the University of Florida is noted for saying, "To me, the concept of G-d is a logical outcome of the study of the immense universe that lies around us." (Henry Margenau and Roy Varghese, *"Cosmos, Bios and Theos"* (1992) page 166.)

34. As a matter of fact, Rabbi Elchonon Wasserman *(see Paragraph 209 below)* said very much the same thing as Professor Emmel, only he said it first. In his "Essay on Faith," he questions how a Jewish boy of thirteen years of age or a Jewish girl of twelve (both counted as adults in Jewish law) can be expected to believe in G-d

when even the greatest philosophers have failed. (Belief in G-d is one of the 613 commandments of the Torah that are incumbent upon every Jewish adult.) He also asks how non-Jews can be expected to believe in G-d if they have never been taught Torah, yet they are so expected. But how, he asks, can they be held accountable for not believing in G-d? He answers that the belief that G-d created the world and everything is self-understood by any intelligent being. There is no need for any knowledge of philosophy or the need for formal instruction in order to grasp this idea. Any normal, sane person just needs to open his eyes. What hinders belief in G-d is only a person's drives and passions: these are the "bribes" that can make "even a wise person blind and even a righteous person crooked," that he will not see the obvious.

35. You don't need "religion" to see G-d the Creator! Sadly, it is the poor track record of the dominant narrow-minded, stultifying religion of the Western world that has for the most part led to the outright rejection of G-d. *(See Paragraph 8, above.)* As a result, some people (some of them "scientists") have put it about that G-d and Science are incompatible. (What they really mean — and in this they might very well be correct — is that science and the dominant religion of the West are incompatible, not Science and G-d! The terrible track record of that religion allows these "moderns" and "sophisticates" to proclaim that religion is the antithesis and enemy of Science and Enlightenment. So we have to accept that these people will not tolerate anything "religious" to explain how the universe came into being. In rejecting their religion, of course G-d the Creator has become collateral damage, so, out with Him, too. Being modern and sophisticated, and not religious, the wilfully blind Evolutionists' answer to the great question is going to be "scientific" and free from anything mystical or awesome or G-dly. It will have to be Science and Enlightenment alone that will provide the answer and "solve the riddle of the universe." Very well, so be it! But then, when with simple logic and facts, G-d is indeed revealed as the Creator, they must not let their anti-religion bias obstruct the truth that G-d is the Creator nor make-believe that there is no Creator!

36. If logic and plain sense says that G-d is the Creator of All, they must be honest and accept that truth for when man, the crown of G-d's creation, denies G-d his Creator and refuses to acknowledge His Sovereignty, this leads directly to destruction and ruin.

37. Science and G-d are ***not*** mutually exclusive! On the contrary, science is the observable world that Almighty G-d has created. And science — true science, that is — is the means through which we can come to know G-d the Creator. Louis Pasteur is reputed to have said, "A little science might estrange a man from G-d but a lot of science brings him back to Him." How did Einstein put it? "Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind." (*"Science and Religion,"* 1954) Einstein was a Jew. He was born and raised as a non-practicing Jew. What he meant here by "religion" was not the dark and dismal ceremonial religion of his non-Jewish world; he meant simply an awareness of G-d and the ethos and values that G-d teaches man. Let's quote here just a very few other thinkers and clever people, some of them scientists quite eminent in their own fields, who, even if their science is at variance with the words of the Bible, nevertheless have not allowed an

anti-G-d stance to corrupt their thinking. (In addition, there are today also many websites, secular scientific as well as religious, which competently argue against Evolution, and show with real science the sheer impossibility of Evolution.) The following very small selection of quotes, taken from just recent centuries, is only of those that have written in English. There are many others who have written similarly, in different languages and all over the world, too, and in the course of this essay we will probably be quoting yet others, as well.

38. Sir Isaac Newton (1642 — 1727)

> "Atheism is so senseless! When I look at the solar system, I see the earth at the right distance from the Sun to receive the proper amount of heat and light. This did not happen by chance."

39. James Clerk Maxwell (1831—1879) who discovered electro-magnetic field equations:

> "No theory of evolution can be formed to account for the similarity of molecules for evolution necessarily implies continuous change. The exact equality of each molecule to all others of the same kind gives it the essential character of a manufactured article." (*Discourse on Molecules*, a paper presented to the British Association at Bradford in 1873, as cited in Lamont, A., James Clerk Maxwell, Creation.)

40. Lord Kelvin (1824 — 1907) who formulated the first two Laws of Thermodynamics:

> "Overwhelmingly strong proofs of intelligent design lie around us.
> The atheistic idea is so nonsensical that I cannot put it into words."

41. Those are from some way back. Let's get modern! So how's this for a modern, candid, plain-speaking scientist, an Evolutionist biology professor at Kansas State University? Biologist Scott Todd wrote in 1999:

> "Even if all the data points to an Intelligent Designer, such an idea
> is excluded from science because it is not naturalistic."

42. In other words: "Even though we know that G-d created everything, nevertheless as natural scientists we can't say so!" (And we'll invent some high-sounding whopping fibs instead!)

43. The following quotes are taken from the commentary to the film "Life's Story" which is all about the design and intelligence evident in the great diversity of life on this planet:

44. > "True science proves that only life produces life and that non-living things never produce life. But despite the lessons of the past, Evolutionary scientists ignore these fundamental facts of science to convince the world that life somehow arose from simple chemicals and then evolved into all the varied and complex life around us.

45. "The claims of Evolutionary theory are simply impossible. They present biased and unprovable ideas as facts wrapped up in scientific-sounding explanations. For more than one hundred and fifty years since Charles Darwin's *"Origin of Species"* was first published, leading Evolutionists have pursued a deceptive agenda to discredit the Biblical account of creation. Despite the concrete evidence available shattering Darwin's myth, Evolutionists choose to believe in "naturalism" to numb their consciences to the moral responsibilities logically implied by design — "created" means "Creator." Their primary goal in promoting atheism and "humanism" is dishonestly hidden behind a smoke-screen of pursuing "scientific knowledge." The real story is that only life can bring forth life …"

46. The Theory of Evolution of today (in any of its variant forms) is very, very different from the original theory that was postulated by Charles Darwin in his books, *"On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection"* published in 1859 and *"The Descent of Man"* published in 1871. Put simply, as facts are discovered, they show the theory to be plainly false and it has to be changed all the time to the extent that some wag has said that rather than call this sham science "the Theory of Evolution" it should be called "the Evolution of a Theory." Hence the title of this essay, whose object, gentle reader, is to merely place the facts before you — sometimes quite forcefully, admittedly — so that you can come to your own conclusions. The expectation is that you will clearly see for yourself the fallacy of this "theory." (Some Hebrew-speaking wit has pointed out that even its name seems to echo what it is: "evil *Loshon*." *"Loshon"* means "speech" or "language" in Hebrew.) No apology is made for sometimes poking fun at this theory or scoffing at it. The Talmud (Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Megillah, 25B) says, "All scoffing is forbidden, except scoffing at idolatry, which is permitted." The Theory of Evolution is at least as bad as idolatry in that it, too, like idolatry, seeks to deny the existence of G-d as the Creator and Sovereign of all.

47. Nevertheless, the intention here is not to rely only on ridicule to see off the theory. The Bishop of Oxford, Samuel Wilberforce, is said to have made that mistake in his debate with Thomas Henry Huxley (1825 — 1895) (one of the foremost propagators of the Theory of Evolution and known as "Darwin's bulldog") in the famous debate at the Oxford University Museum on Saturday 30 June 1860, a few months after the publication of Darwin's book. It was quite clear that the churchman had not prepared himself for that debate (there is some doubt whether he ever even looked at the book) and although he was a brilliant orator, in many respects he didn't know what he was talking about. Huxley was witty and cutting and is said to have wiped the floor with him and that debate with the Bishop of Oxford subsequently became almost a landmark in the general acceptance of the theory. So, no, not ridicule for its own sake but plain science — real science, that is — and clear human logic will do the job quite adequately. And questions. Simple, straightforward questions that challenge the Evolutionists and their fantasies. If those questions make the Evolutionists look ridiculous, well, they should let go of their foolishness. Why should I apologize if someone persists in making a fool of himself? Yet despite the disparagement and mocking, there is also a vital, deadly serious reason for this essay, as will become clearer later.

FACT AND THEORY — THE DIFFERENCE

48. Again, a few basics have to be stated.

49. A theory is just that: it's a theory, an idea, not a fact. That a particular species of frog exists is a fact. How this particular species came about, the origins of this species, is a theory. Even if you can show that the facts fit in with your theory about how the frog got here, that doesn't make the theory into a fact. It's just a proof or support for the theory. The more facts you can show that fit in with your theory, the more you can say your theory is probably true. But it's still only a theory and it can never, ever, become a fact.

50. On the other hand, however beautiful and well-structured a theory is, however many models, simulations and computer-generated pictures you make to illustrate your theory, even if they are then printed in glorious full colour on the front cover of *"National Geographic"* magazine (this publication seems to have an unholy obsession to spread Evolution as if it was true) and even if similar picture-essays are published in *"Readers' Digest"* with a claimed readership of millions (this magazine, too, seems to have an obsession with Evolution and runs pretty close to *"National Geographic"*) — nevertheless, if there is even a single tiny little fact that contradicts the theory, that fact then proves that the theory is not true. The theory must fit in with the facts; facts cannot be twisted to fit in with the theory. That would be dishonest. One single fact which contradicts the theory cancels the theory and disproves it. The theory is thrown out. It is not true. Finished. (And how much more so when thousands of facts — and reality itself! — contradicts the theory, no?)

51. Next: "Science" is observable fact. Sir Karl Raimund Popper (1902 — 1994) generally regarded as one of the greatest philosophers of science of the 20th century (*see* Stephen Thornton, *"Karl Popper,"* in The Stanford Encyclopædia of Philosophy (Summer 2009 Edition) Edward N. Zalta *(ed.)* and Horgan, J. (1992) Profile: Karl R. Popper — The Intellectual Warrior, *"Scientific American"* **267**(5), 38 — 44) clearly defined the matter and stated that to prove that a theory is true, to prove that an idea is true, it must be capable of duplication in the laboratory (what he called "falsification") in front of qualified witnesses. (Compare, "The demand for scientific objectivity makes it inevitable that every scientific statement must remain tentative for ever" and other such pronouncements by Sir Karl, *"The Logic of Scientific Discovery,"* 1959.)

52. If a scientist says he has the cure for cancer and has worked it on mice in his laboratory, even if he is the greatest scientist ever, we say to him, "With the greatest respect, sir, can you show us, please, how you did it?" If he says that unfortunately he cannot duplicate the remarkable result where a mouse was cured of cancer, or if he tells you that he has witnesses but his witnesses are far away, or that the event happened far away or long ago we say to him, "Sorry, sir. That's not acceptable. That's not science. Possibly, it's wishful thinking. (More probably, it's plain fraud.) But science it ain't." Even if he swears by all that's holy (or unholy, for that matter) that he's telling the truth, it's still not science. To put things simply,

if something isn't verifiable, isn't observable and can't be tested with any of our senses, it's not science.

53. The question that we are speaking of here is, "How did the world and the universe and everything come about?" Remember, we're not "old-fashioned believers" any more, who rely on established religious tradition passed on from generation to generation. We're "sophisticated," we're talking "science." But whatever scientific answer is put forward, it has to be shown to be true, it has to be duplicated in the laboratory, so to speak, otherwise it's not science. (And if you can't come up with a convincing answer, then we simply ***will*** have to go back to the only other alternative, namely, the received tradition that G-d Almighty is the Creator of all — even if that will make us old-fashioned believers, yep!) Now, you can't duplicate the creation of the world *"ex nihilo"* (meaning, "from nothing"). Well, for a start, you need *"nihilo,"* that is, absolute nothingness, from which to create it all. Since you'll need a place to serve as your laboratory (let's say a 17-kilometre tunnel under the Alps, maybe?) in which to do your creating, again, you're not starting *"ex nihilo,"* are you? It gets worse. You can't have witnesses standing around watching because that's not absolute nothingness and by the same token, you can't have your performing scientist, either. Dear me! It's beginning to look like it's impossible to conduct the experiment. In other words, whatever idea you put forward about how the world and the universe and everything came about — from nothing — is not capable of duplication or repetition, therefore it is going to remain a theory, and a never-proved theory at that. Never a fact. And it doesn't make the blindest bit of a difference if all the scientists in the world voted that the theory should become a fact, either, any more than if they all — without even a single exception — voted that the earth is flat or that the moon is made of cheese. Fact is fact and votes or scientific consensus — and even full-colour picture-essays in the *"National Geographic"* magazine — can never change theory into fact.

A THEORY CHALLENGED

54. Charles Darwin's Theory of Evolution is about the only scientific theory which is still around more than one hundred and sixty years after it was dreamed-up. It is a theory which arguably has had more holes punched in it and more contradictions asked against it than any other scientific theory ever put forward. Despite its demonstrable falsity, the Theory of Evolution is mostly touted as fact and spoken of as if it was proved — done and dusted. *(See, for instance, Paragraph 232, further.)* Almost every science textbook and almost every encyclopædia gives it credence as if it was fact. Whole branches of science are based on the Theory of Evolution. More frightening, the world of medicine of today is largely built upon its "teachings" with various medical problems commonly viewed from the so-called "Evolutionary angle." Who knows how much disease and human suffering could be avoided, how much illness and sickness could be cured, if this fallacy was jettisoned and proper science was to take its place? It's as ridiculous as a doctor today basing his treatment of his patients on the Four Humours! Or imagine a doctor today consulting his tables of the constellations and the signs of the Zodiac to help him decide when to perform urgent surgery! How would we today view a doctor who

recommended a course of blood-letting to cure his patient? Yet all these were considered "science" in their day and were used by doctors to cure (and to kill) — until these various quackeries were thrown out and true science was allowed to progress, to the benefit of all. Today's quackery is Evolution and the medicine based on it by its benighted followers is just as whimsical as any of the superstitious fallacies of old. Yet almost all opposition to Evolution is silenced in the universities and institutions of higher learning and woe betides any "man of science" who dares to question the theory, for he is laughed out of Academe. He is shouted down and ridiculed without much of a chance of fair reply in any of the learned scientific journals.

55. There is a veritable conspiracy of lies and deception to prevent any opposition to the theory gaining any prominence. Those that would dare to speak out and teach against Evolution or — horror! — dare to teach about Creation or Intelligent Design (that is, that the universe itself demonstrates that it is the product of intelligent design and hence an all-powerful, supremely intelligent Designer) are sometimes threatened by legal action in the courts of law and indeed some have been dismissed from their teaching posts. Here's one example: according to Dr Aryeh Gotfryd, Ph.D., writing in Issue Number 759 of "Beis Moshiach" magazine, Dr Gavriel Avital was fired as Chief Scientist for the Israeli Ministry of Education because of his anti-Darwinist views. Here's another: in the United Kingdom, Ofsted ("Office for Standards in Education") the agency charged by the British Government's Department for Education to inspect British schools, regularly fails independent Orthodox Jewish schools if they teach as part of their science curriculum that G-d created the world rather than the Theory of Evolution. In Britain today, "Creationism" is permitted to be taught in schools but only in the Religion classes, not as part of the Science curriculum. (For other examples, see the film, *"Expelled — No Intelligence Allowed."*) This is not science. This is dogma. It has almost become (dare one say it?) religion — but of the most diabolical kind! (The word "diabolical" is used here deliberately.)

56. At the 1969 Alpbach Symposium (an interdisciplinary international conference that takes place in Alpbach, Austria, "to foster knowledge, prosperity and peace in the world") many authorities of world stature critical of Darwin's theory were brought together. Summing up the situation regarding some of the sociological aspects of Darwin's theory and its survival, it was declared that a theory so vague, so insufficiently verifiable and so far from the criteria otherwise applied to "hard science," [and yet accepted as science] shows that it has become a dogma and can only be explained on sociological grounds.

57. Sir Fred Hoyle, too, wrote,

> "If one proceeds directly and straightforwardly in this matter, without being deflected by a fear of incurring the wrath of scientific opinion *(sic!)* one arrives at the conclusion that biomaterials with their amazing measure of order must be the outcome of intelligent design." He concludes that the theory nevertheless survives mainly because it is socially desirable. (*"Evolution from Space,"* pages 27 — 28 and 148)

This is science?

58. But once the Theory became accepted (and accepted mainly so as to depose the religion that ruled supreme before) it was not easy to uproot. Dr Max Whitten, professor of genetics at the University of Melbourne, declares that "biologists are simply naïve when they talk about experiments designed to test the theory of evolution. It is not testable. They may happen to stumble across facts that would seem to conflict with its predictions. These facts will invariably be ignored and their discoverers will undoubtedly be deprived of continuing research grants. It seems that since its inception, Evolution has prevailed as an alternative religion of sorts — a dogma, rather than science." (Max Whitten, "Facts Are Not Everything in Science" *Issues Magazine,* May 2008.) Michael Ruse, a philosopher of science at Florida State University who specializes in the philosophy of biology, says that Evolution is promoted by its practitioners as more than science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology, a secular religion — a full-fledged alternative. This was true of Evolution in the beginning and it is true of Evolution still today." ("Saving Darwinism from the Darwinians," *National Post,* May 13, 2000, page B-3.)

59. Thankfully, this is changing and there are some brave voices against Evolution that are making themselves heard, too. But that this theory has endured so long despite all its scientific shortcomings can itself be said to be — to paraphrase its own famous slogan — a case of "the survival of the shrillest"!

PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN

60. The jargon and very terminology of this modern false religion are deliberately and dishonestly smuggled-in to our everyday s peech — constant, drip-drip propaganda. In little children's picture books, in school books and in university textbooks, in newspaper and magazine articles, in encyclopædia and in the widest range of journals, there is the persistent talk of "primitive" animals and "developed" animals and that "animals have adapted," all with the implication that these "developments" altogether added up to some proof for the coming about of new specie. There is the relentless reference to "vestigial organs" and "our evolutionary heritage" — all deliberately implying a universal and unquestioning acceptance of the Theory of Evolution, as if it was established fact. Little plastic models of different kinds of monsters described simply and as a matter of fact as "prehistoric" are included in boxes of breakfast cereals for children to collect, with the encouragement to save the whole set and with the implication that dinosaurs and other such imagined creatures are as real and true to life as football stars, vintage motor cars and early aircraft.

61. Here is an excerpt adapted from *"Genesis and Genes"* by Yoram Bogacz that portrays the relentless conditioning of our youngsters to accept biological evolution as a fact. You tell me if you think he is exaggerating. He writes *(on pages 14—15)*:

62. Let's briefly follow the career trajectory of an evolutionary biologist — let's call her Cathy — as she approaches the stage when she will make independent contributions to science. As children, scientists are often extremely curious

and read voraciously. Cathy would likely have subscribed to her school library and to the municipal library, devouring books about nature, the climate, geography, early hominids and dinosaurs. Like most children, Cathy would occasionally have been taken by her parents to museums. Natural History museums are among the most-visited attractions in large cities. London's Museum of Natural History and the Smithsonian in Washington are exemplars of the *genre.* Cathy would have seen countless exhibits and dioramas of evolutionary scenes. None would have been critical of the paradigm.

63. How about television? Our young adolescent would have been fascinated by David Attenborough documentaries, with their lavish photography and ample references to evolution. She would also watch the Discovery Channel with ***its*** uncritical presentation of evolutionary dogma.

64. As a teenager, Cathy's interest in nature drives her to subscribe to *National Geographic* and for her birthday, her parents buy her a subscription to *New Scientist.* In all of these media, the evolutionary paradigm is presented as indisputable.

65. In high school, Cathy chooses biology as one of her subjects. Her commitment to the consensus view is nourished by her teacher and her textbooks. In college, Cathy majors in genetics and microbiology. The textbook chosen by her professor is authored by Douglas Futuyma, a prominent evolutionary biologist and textbook writer. In his textbooks, references to evolution are few and typically appear in the beginning and end of the book. The theory will have contributed virtually nothing to Cathy's actual education in the nuts and bolts of microbiology and genetics but in those few references, the author always shows obeisance to the theory, claiming that it is only by looking through the evolutionary lens that one can make sense of anything in biology.

66. Cathy later pursues an honours degree. Besides the lectures, she also attends a weekly seminar given by one of the professors in the department, whose commitment to the consensus view is absolute. When Cathy pursues her master's degree, she starts to attend conferences. The delegates she meets are overwhelmingly committed to the evolutionary viewpoint. Just as important as Cathy's academic training, is the fact that over the years she would be subjected to innumerable cultural cues that consolidate her belief in the paradigm — everything from Microsoft's advertising campaign entitled "The Evolution of the Office" to nutritional fads and their inevitable spin-offs, books like "The New Evolution Diet — What Our Palaeolithic Ancestors Can Teach Us About Weight Loss, Fitness and Ageing." When Cathy eventually becomes post-doc, at thirty, and is ready to make independent contributions to research, it is not as an objective dispassionate researcher that she approaches any issue in biology, including biological evolution. It is as a product of a system that has predisposed her to specific viewpoints over several decades. It would be a miracle if Cathy would be able to critically

assess a concept which has been seared into her mind on countless occasions.

67. Let's take a common phrase, used constantly and unthinkingly, "fossil fuels," and examine it even only superficially to see if it makes sense purely from the geological aspect. (A fossil, incidentally, is something dug out from the ground and "fossil fuel" simply means that it is dug out or mined or otherwise extracted from the ground. Strictly speaking, "fossil" does not even mean a thing of great antiquity although that's what it's come to mean and generally that's the intention.) Coal is a "fossil fuel." They tell us that —

68. "because of the amount of squeezing and water loss that accompanies the compaction of peat after burial, it is estimated that it took ten vertical feet of original peat material to produce one vertical foot of bituminous coal in eastern and western Kentucky. Understandably, the peat-to-coal ratio is variable and dependent on the original type of peat the coal came from …" (Taken from *"How Is Coal Formed?"* Kentucky Geological Survey, from the University of Kentucky website.)

69. And much the same, I dare say, applies to the forming of coal outside of eastern and western Kentucky, too. All very believable and matter-of-fact, to be sure. "Ten vertical feet of original peat material to produce one foot of bituminous coal …" — it sounds feasible enough. But only so long as one doesn't think about it for too long. You see, peat is simply decomposing vegetable matter, like leaves and pine-needles and moss and twigs (and occasional tree trunks) which all together usually form the floor of the forest. And this peat "produced" coal, right? So how is one to explain seams of coal that are ***six hundred feet*** and even ***fifteen hundred feet*** thick? Some forest, no? After all, where on earth (and not only earth — some of these coal-fields are under the sea too, by the way) are you going to find a layer of peat six thousand feet thick or fifteen thousand feet thick, to produce these seams of coal at a rate of "ten vertical feet of peat to produce one foot of coal"? How many trees will it take and for how many centuries or thousands of years are these trees going to be shedding their leaves and their pine needles and for how many centuries more are these leaves going to lie there — undisturbed, mind you! — until there is great heat and huge pressure applied to that peat and suddenly (or is it slowly?) that peat is converted into a seam of coal! Lots of supposition and guesswork. And don't forget that some of these coalfields are huge! Some extend for many, many miles in all directions across the land. All from peat?

70. It took hundreds or thousands of years, you say? Well, what about these so-called "prehistoric" seams of coal, supposedly tens of thousands of years old, in which have been found embedded in the very coal itself miners' tools used a mere two hundred years ago? (See, for example, John Buchanan, *'Discovery of an Iron Instrument Lately Found Imbedded in a Natural Seam of Coal in the Neighbourhood of Glasgow,'* Proceedings of the Society of Antiquarians of Scotland, Vol. 1, Part 2, 1853.) Yet this formation of coal from peat is made to sound very orderly and plausible, especially with convincing illustrations and colour paintings and computer-generated pictures of these strange-looking forests of what has become the stylized "prehistoric" huge ferns and lots of those gigantic weird-looking

trees, complete with a dinosaur or two furtively skulking in the background. (By the way, where did the heat and pressure come from, and why? and when? and who or what made it happen?)

71. Then there's mineral oil, petroleum, another example of a "fossil fuel." How did it come about? Well it's like this, you see. Millions of years ago, Planet Earth was covered by oceans in which there were countless ***zillions*** of tiny little creatures the size of termites. Then these creatures were compressed by a combined great heat and huge pressure and were squashed into nothing but their own liquefied body fluids. Each creature produced a tiny drop of fluid and this fluid changed into petroleum, or what we today call "mineral oil" (as opposed to "plant oil" or "animal oil") though how this organic oil transformed itself into inorganic mineral oil, which is a completely different stuff, is a miracle in itself. This oil is today's "fossil fuel," derived as it is from the fossils of those numberless zillions and zillions of tiny little creatures. (I've tried to make it sound reasonable and I do apologize if it still sounds zany but this, they tell us, is how in effect petroleum came about. No kiddin'!)

72. In contrast to that rather humorous description, there follows now the serious account of how fossil fuels came about, translated from the rather pompous scientific and technical language into words that an educated layman would use. The sources are given so if you want, you can check to see whether I've got anything wrong. (If so, please do let me know.)

73. "Petroleum and natural gas are formed by the anaerobic decomposition of remains of organisms including phytoplankton and zooplankton that settled to the sea (or lake) bottom in large quantities under anoxic conditions, millions of years ago. Over geological time, this organic matter, mixed with mud, got buried under heavy layers of sediment. The resulting high levels of heat and pressure caused the organic matter to chemically alter, first into a waxy material known as kerogen which is found in oil shales, and then with more heat into liquid and gaseous hydrocarbons in a process known as catagenesis." (See Paul Mann, Lisa Gahagan, and Mark B. Gordon, *"Tectonic setting of the world's giant oil and gas fields,"* in Michel T. Halbouty *(ed.) Giant Oil and Gas Fields of the Decade, 1990 — 1999,* Tulsa, Oklahoma: American Association of Petroleum Geologists, page 50.)

74. It goes on but that's enough for now. It's interesting to note, though, that nowhere on earth has such a process of "catagenesis" been observed. In other words, it's a lie, but with a posh name. By the way, the theory that fossil fuels were formed from the fossilized remains of dead plants by exposure to heat and pressure in the Earth's crust over millions of years was first introduced by Georg Agricola 1494 — 1556 (which, incidentally, tells you something surprising about how old this particular theory about the origin of petroleum is). It was later taught by Mikhail Lomonosov in the 18th century (another clever chappie) but again, the fact that this theory about the origin of coal and petroleum is based on the science of the 1700s is about as reassuring about this theory as Galen's writings would be for today's medicine. (Aelius Galenus or Claudius Galenus, better known as Galen of

Pergamum, was the foremost medical authority in his time — but he was born in 129 and died *c.* 216 CE, that is, nearly two thousand years ago.)

75. But I have a few questions about this blarney concerning fossil fuels. Firstly, where did so many creatures come from? I mean, who made them? When? How? Secondly, what did they eat? Presumably, plants, right? So, thirdly, where did those plants come from? Fourthly, what destroyed them all in one fell swoop? If it was a comet, who made the comet? Fifthly, where did the great heat and huge pressure come from that squashed them into oil? Sixthly, has it ever been computed how many creatures would be needed to produce some of these deposits of oil? Don't forget, some oilfields are phenomenally large and despite alarmist projections about the depletion of these oilfields, there seems to be no real shortage at all, with new oilfields being constantly discovered. Then there's the small detail of explaining how all over the world all these creatures suddenly all together were transformed into oil deposits. Next, has anyone ever seen even a single drop of mineral oil or petroleum all by itself come about from any organic creature? How come that there has never ever been found anywhere on this planet a lake or even a little pond of fish oil, or termite oil, or plankton oil, or any animal or plant at all, that is in the process of changing into petroleum or into any kind of mineral oil. Not even the tiniest little puddle! Not even the smallest smidgeon! Not a smudge of the stuff! Yet the world blithely calls this stuff "fossil fuel"! Does that make sense? So, not a bad piece of "scientific" propaganda, eh?

76. The Martian Theory about the origin of the world's oceans (that billions of little green men from Mars one day landed on planet Earth and they all emptied their bladders and then sped away back to Mars in their flying saucers) makes about as much sense as this talk of "fossil fuels." (Mind you, maybe this crackpot Martian Theory isn't so unscientific after all! Do we not hear in it an echo of Hoyle and Wickramasinghe's "Panspermia" of which we have already spoken? *(See Paragraphs 28 — 29, above.)* You know, it's becoming quite a challenge to think of some scenario that is crazier than some of the things that revered scientists are proposing! And all this madness — just so as to deny the Creator! Wow!)

77. Moving away for a moment from "fossil fuels" to another favourite: stalagmites and stalactites. Stalagmites are columns of minerals which are deposited on the floor of (usually subterranean) caves. They are formed from the tiny amounts of minerals deposited by the slow drip, drip, drip of water from the roof of these caves. Sheltered from the weather and the elements, they are an undisturbed record of prehistoric time. They can grow to huge heights at a very slow rate, supposedly about one inch per thousand years, and are often cited as proof of the great age of this world. Stalactites are the icicle-shaped columns hanging from the ceilings of the aforesaid caves — and ditto. The experts tell us that they take thousands and millions of years to grow. (Because we can watch the drops of water and we can measure the rate of increase of the minerals, can't we?) But nip along to the Lincoln Memorial in Washington DC, built in 1922 (CE, that is) and you will find there stalagmites. In fact, they were photographed in the 1960s, that is, within forty years of its construction, and measured about five feet long. And there are many other instances of stalactites, stalagmites and flow cones forming quite rapidly

under buildings quite recently erected. One example: located in Chattanooga, Alabama, are the Sequoya Caverns, complete with stalagmites and stalactites. To study the rate of growth, the then director of those Caverns, a Mr Clark Byers, in April 1977, fixed a clear plastic panel in front of some stalactites and in less than ten years he found that the stalactites had grown about ten inches (or about one inch per year). So the measurements of time are not what they tell us, are they? But I digress.

YES, BUT WHAT ABOUT FOSSILS ?

78. Ah, yes! The fossils. Well, what about fossils? A quote from "Strange Stories, Amazing Facts" (*The Reader's Digest,* 1975) (page 105):

79. In 1938, fishermen in the Indian Ocean brought up a strange, metallic-blue fish almost six feet long, with large, thick scales and strong fleshy fins. When their catch was landed, the curious fish was spotted by Dr Marjorie Courtenay-Latimer, then curator of the East London Museum. Although she didn't know what it was, she realized that it was quite exceptional. So she sent a rough sketch of the creature to Professor J L B Smith, an organic chemist at Rhodes University, but also an eminent amateur fish expert.

    From that sketch alone, he was able to identify it. It was a coelacanth …

80. Professor Smith commented: "My surprise would have been only a little greater if I had seen a dinosaur walking down the street." And indeed he was understating the case for until then the fish had been known only as a fossil in rocks 400 million years old — 200 million years older than the dinosaurs.

    Since then, several others have been caught …

81. So there you have it. Here's a creature that the scientists have said is "a fossil" and which they have decreed to be extinct for 400 million years — and the untutored and uneducated natives have been eating it with their chips for years without batting an eyelid! Makes you wonder, doesn't it? Not about how careless and irresponsible these natives are about eating a priceless fossil, but about how reliable are the scientists and their timelines and their "classifications" about what is extinct and what is not extinct, no?

82. At this point it is perhaps relevant to actually explain about fossils and how fossils fit into the discussion about Evolution and then to expand a little to show how fossils, instead of being any kind of support or proof for the Theory of Evolution as is usually made out, are in fact one of the powerful proofs ***against*** the Theory of Evolution. (If proof was needed, that is.) "In some cases, "the fossil record" actually makes it easier to *disprove* Evolution than to prove it!" (Stebbins in *"Variation and Evolution in Plants,"* pages 517 — 518.) World-famous paleontologist Dr Niles Eldridge stated that "the pattern that we were told to find for the last one hundred and twenty years does not exist."

83. First of all, what is a fossil and how does it come about? Much of the following is taken from the scientific accounts, except for an explanatory comment here and there and occasionally translating the posh-sounding words into plain English. (It seems to be a habit of Evolutionists to use scientific-sounding words when simple, ordinary words will do. Almost — perish the thought! — as if they set out to deliberately mislead people. How does the saying go? "Blind 'em with science!") Fossils are touted as a support or proof for the Theory of Evolution because fossils show that different species to what we are used to seeing today existed in the past. But at this point we have to watch out for the smoke-and-mirrors bit. You see, the fact that different species of creatures or plants existed long ago and which don't exist today in no way proves that new species come about. This is important to remember and we will come back to it later.

84. Fossils (meaning, "having been dug up") are the preserved remains or traces of animals, plants and other organisms from the remote past. The totality of fossils, both discovered and not-yet-discovered, and their placement in fossil-containing rock formations and sedimentary layers ("strata") is known as "the fossil record." ("The fossil record" is an outright myth. If anything, the "fossil record" is really the *lack* of any "fossil record." It is one of the most serious challenges to the theory of evolution, as will become clear.)

85. The study of fossils across geological time, how they were formed, and the (supposedly) evolutionary relationships between taxa (all together this is called the phylogeny, or the hypothesis of the evolutionary history of taxonomic groups) are some of the most important functions of the science of palæontology.

86. (Sorry! We have to digress, simply to translate and to briefly explain: Palæontology is the study of extinct ancient life forms. A taxon (plural: taxa) is a group of one (or more) populations of organism(s) which a taxonomist adjudges to be a unit, or a taxon. Defining what belongs or does not belong to such a taxonomic group is done by a taxonomist with the science of taxonomy. (Well, yes, that's hardly surprising.) However, it is not uncommon for one taxonomist to disagree with another on what exactly belongs to a taxon, or even on what exact criteria should be used for inclusion. (So it's not really an exact science, is it?) Nevertheless, as said, together with the study of fossils, taxonomy is an important part of the science of palæontology.)

87. A preserved specimen is called a "fossil" if it is older than some specified minimum age, most often the arbitrary date of 10,000 years. (The arbitrariness is noteworthy, as is the splendidly confident start-date of 10,000 years.) Hence, fossils range in age from the youngest fossils, said to be from the start of the Holocene Epoch, claimed to be as recent as 1.6 million years ago, to the oldest fossils from the Archaean Eon, which is asserted to be up to 3.4 billion years old. (Just to remind you, since a "billion years" is a thousand times a million years, this will be written as 3,400,000,000 years.) The observation that certain fossils were associated with certain rock strata led early geologists in the 19th century to recognize a geological timescale. (Invariably, in these discussions it is the word "observed" that is used, implying, as is intended, an on-going process which can be seen today, now, this minute, which of course is absurd. Really the correct word is "surmised" or

"imagined" or, to be more truthful, "guessed" or "invented." As to how they "observed" this association of certain fossils with certain strata of rock and how they came to this conclusion, there was a certain beautiful circular logic which we will explain a little later. (We'll come to it, gentle reader — you'll just have to be patient!)

ENTER RADIO-CARBON DATING

88. This part is going to be pretty boring so if you want to skip it out, nobody will blame you. Still, the stuff has to be introduced even if it's to show that this radio-carbon dating "science" is merely another lie supposedly proving the truth of Evolution. It doesn't. So here goes. The development of radiometric dating techniques (also known as "radiocarbon dating") in the early twentieth century was supposed to get rid of the guesswork and would instead allow geologists to determine with more certainty the age of the various strata, including also the fossils. This dating method is not exactly a miracle of precision (as we shall see very soon) because it does depend quite a bit on the (supposed) half-life of the particular radioactive isotope involved. And they don't tell you something else about this radiometric dating technique and that is that there is an admitted very wide margin of error, depending on which particular one of the radiocarbon dating schemes are used. For instance, there is a margin of error in dates of some rocks of "less than two million years in two-and-a-half billion years." (Not bad, eh? A margin of error of less than two million years.) Carbon-14 has (supposedly) a half-life of 5,730 years and as far as this particular carbon-14 dating technique is concerned, it has to be remembered that after an organism has been dead for 60,000 years, so little carbon-14 is left that accurate dating is going to be rather difficult to establish.

89. If you are using the samarium-neodymium dating method, accuracy levels of less than twenty million years in two-and-a-half billion years are achievable (although to use the word "accuracy" for any dating technique with a margin of error of twenty million years seems somewhat incongruous, one would have thought).

90. If you are using the rubidium-strontium dating method, this is based on the beta decay of rubidium-87 to strontium-87, with a (supposedly) half-life of 50 billion years. This method is used to date old igneous and metamorphic rocks, and has also been used to date lunar samples. Although closure temperatures are so high that they are not a concern (in any case, "closing temperature" is really only another bit of guesswork: they vary broadly among different minerals and also differ depending on the parent and daughter atoms being considered — but let's not get bogged down in technicalities) nevertheless rubidium-strontium dating is not as precise as the uranium-lead method, with errors of 30 to 50 million years for a 3-billion-year-old sample.

91. There is the potassium-argon dating method. This involves electron capture or positron decay of potassium-40 to argon-40. Potassium-40 has a (supposedly) half-life of 1.3 billion years, and so this method is applicable to the "oldest" rocks. Radioactive potassium-40 is common in micas, feldspars, and hornblendes. (These are types of rocks.)

92. So, how does it work? Well, an organism acquires carbon during its lifetime. Plants acquire it through photosynthesis and animals acquire it from consumption of plants and other animals. When an organism dies, it ceases to take in new carbon-14 and the existing isotope decays with a characteristic half-life (in the case of carbon-14, this is supposed to be 5,730 years, as mentioned above). The proportion of carbon-14 left when the remains of the organism are examined provides an indication of the time elapsed since its death. The carbon-14 dating limit lies around 58,000 to 62,000 years.

93. So there you have it: The mystical, almost revered "radiocarbon dating technique" allows a margin of error of anything between two million years to fifty million years. And now, a gentle reminder: all these radiometric dating techniques are based on assumption, and this assumption is based completely on an imagined rate of constancy which has not been proved to exist and is indeed the very question that is being debated! And this is the science which is supposed to prove the Theory of Evolution, yes?

94. A few more words of explanation of some of the terms mentioned above:

> "Phylogenetics" derives from the Greek terms "phylé" (φυλή) and "phylon" (φῦλον) denoting "tribe," "clan," "race" and the adjectival form, "genetikós" (γενετικός) of the word "genesis" (γένεσις) meaning, "origin," "source," "birth" (that's where the words "gene" and "generation" come from, too). The result of phylogenetic studies is a hypothesis about the evolutionary history of taxonomic groups: their "phylogeny."

95. "Palæontology" is the scientific study of prehistoric life. It includes the study of fossils to determine organisms' evolution and interactions with each other and their environments (their "palæoecology"). As a "historical science" it attempts to explain causes rather than conduct experiments to observe effects. The term itself originates from the Greek: παλαιός ("palaios") meaning "old, ancient," ὄν, ὀντ- (on, ont-) meaning "being, creature" and λόγος (logos), meaning "speech," "thought," "study." Palæontology lies on the border between biology and geology, and shares with archaeology a border that is difficult to define. (Really!)

(End of digression. Back to fossils.)

96. Like existing life forms, fossils vary in size from the gigantic (such as dinosaurs and trees) many metres long and weighing many tons to the microscopic (even single bacterial cells one micrometre in diameter). It must be hard to study the fragile fossil — a fossil is at least 10,000 years old, remember — of a single bacterial cell one micrometre in diameter. (A micrometre, also commonly known as a micron, is one millionth of a metre, or one thousandth of a millimetre or about 0.000039 of an inch.) To then declare that you have discovered the origin of the universe based on the results of such study is rather presumptuous, no? A fossil normally preserves only a portion of the dead organism, usually that portion that was partially mineralized during life, such as the bones and teeth of vertebrates, or the chitinous or calcareous exoskeletons of invertebrates. (But bacteria don't have teeth or skeletons.) The word "fossil" may also refer to the marks left behind by the

organism while it was alive, such as the footprint of an animal, but these types of fossil are more correctly called “trace fossils,” the other, usual, kind are called “body fossils.” Some past lives leave some markers that cannot be seen but can be detected in the form of biochemical signals and these are known as “chemofossils” or “biomarkers.”

97. “Permineralization” is a process of fossilization that occurs when an organism is buried. The empty spaces within an organism (spaces filled with liquid or gas during life) become filled with mineral-rich groundwater, that is, minerals precipitate from the groundwater, and occupy the empty spaces. This process can occur in very small spaces, such as within the cell wall of a plant cell. Small scale permineralization can produce very detailed fossils. For permineralization to occur, the organism must become covered by sediment soon after death or soon after the initial decay process. The degree to which the remains are decayed when covered determines the later details of the fossil. Some fossils consist only of skeletal remains or teeth; other fossils contain traces of skin, feathers or even soft tissues.

98. In some cases the original remains of the organism completely dissolve or are otherwise destroyed. The remaining organism-shaped hole in the rock is called an external mould. If this hole is later filled with other minerals, it is a cast. An “endocast,” or “internal mould,” is formed when sediments or minerals fill the internal cavity of an organism, such as the inside of a bivalve or snail or the hollow of a skull.

99. There is a special form of cast and mould formation called “authigenic mineralization” and it works like this (or so they tell us): If the chemistry is right, the organism (or the fragment of the organism) can act as a nucleus for the precipitation of minerals such as siderite (iron carbonate) resulting in a nodule forming around it. If this happens rapidly before significant decay to the organic tissue, very fine three-dimensional morphological detail can be preserved. Nodules from the Carboniferous Mazon Creek fossil beds of Illinois, USA, are said to be among the best documented examples of such mineralisation.

100. Replacement occurs when the shell, bone or other tissue is replaced with another mineral. In some cases, they tell us, mineral replacement of the original shell occurs so gradually and at such fine scales that microstructural features are preserved despite the total loss of original material. A shell is said to be “recrystallized” when the original skeletal compounds are still present but in a different crystal form, as from aragonite to calcite (both of these are carbonate minerals).

101. Compression fossils, such as those of fossil ferns, are the result of chemical reduction of the complex organic molecules composing the organism’s tissues. In this case the fossil consists of original material, albeit in a geochemically altered state. This chemical change is an expression of diagenesis. (In geology and oceanography, diagenesis is any chemical, physical, or biological change undergone by a sediment after its initial deposition and during and after its lithification, exclusive of surface alteration (weathering) and metamorphism. These changes happen at relatively low temperatures and pressures and result in changes to the

rock's original mineralogy and texture.) Often what remains is a carbonaceous film known as a phytoleim, in which case the fossil is known as a compression. Often, however, the phytoleim is lost and all that remains is an impression of the organism in the rock — called an impression fossil. In some cases, however, compressions and impressions occur together. For instance, when the rock is broken open, the phytoleim will often be attached to one part (compression) whereas the counterpart will just be an impression. For this reason, one term covers the two modes of preservation: adpression.

102. Okay, all that should help us to understand where fossils fit it and we can soon resume our discussion. But before continuing, one other point needs to be made and it is this. Seeing that this study of fossils is so exact, it's so minute, I mean, we're talking about incredibly tiny little amounts of trace elements, and seeing, too, that we must take into consideration the extreme fragility of things that are at least 10,000 years old (otherwise it's not a fossil, remember?) and sometimes said to be millions of years old, we must be absolutely certain — must we not? — that there has been no contamination of this fossil, neither by coming into contact with anything else or indeed by atmospheric contamination of any sort or of any amount. After all, depending on this tiny fossil of a bacterium that is 10,000 years old, we are going to build the whole edifice of the definitive beginning of the world and we're going to declare with absolute certainty how everything came about, right up to how we humans have arrived. So you'd better be sure that everything is absolutely right. I thought that we should make that clear. Let's continue.

103. Evolution teaches that different species of creatures randomly evolved from one another. (I do wonder, though, whether anyone would have given this crazy idea of Evolution even a moment's serious consideration if Darwin had simply declared, "everything happened by itself randomly, from nothing." But because this madness is dressed-up in posh talk, that "primitive life" "developed" and "various species evolved" and such pretentious scientific-sounding expressions, that's why it is spoken of in respectful terms instead of being laughed out of existence. Try it yourself: next time you come across something in a modern science textbook that speaks of "evolution" and suchlike. Substitute the expression "from nothing by itself randomly" and see if you don't laugh! Just a thought. Sorry for the interruption. As I was saying:) Evolution teaches that different species of creatures randomly evolved from one another. The creatures that somehow and quite randomly acquired characteristics that were of benefit to their survival did just that — they survived. They then produced more of their own "improved" kind. Those unfortunate creatures that did not acquire these beneficial characteristics sadly died out. So, the giraffe, to take one of the better-known examples, survived because its long neck allowed it to live off the leaves of the high acacia trees whereas those poor little giraffes that didn't grow long necks died out. Gradually, over the millions of years, the story goes, those giraffes whose necks were longer survived and the silly little giraffes who didn't have long necks died out till now we have the "successful" giraffe that we all know and love.

104. So let's imagine the following scenario. One Sunday morning, millions of years ago, Dobbin the Donkey decides that he's sick and tired of having to compete for food

where all the other animals feed. He gazes wistfully up at the leaves high up on the acacia tree and decides there and then that he's going to grow his neck longer. He's going to become a giraffe. Of course, he doesn't know what a giraffe is, yet, because the giraffe will only come into existence after it has evolved from the donkey, but you get the drift. Dobbin is determined to become something other than a donkey and he's aiming high. It takes time, a few hundred thousand years and numberless attempts, but eventually, his descendent many, many thousands of generations later, has become a giraffe.

105. Leaving aside all the other questions that spring to mind, let us concentrate on those questions that have got to do with fossils: Where are all the other giraffes that didn't yet have the long necks? There were thousands and thousands of generations of failed giraffes that had necks that were only a bit longer than the previous model and which could not yet reach those luscious leaves at the top of the acacia tree. Presumably, they died. (Let's hope that they didn't die of starvation but that meantime, till they were able to realize their goal of the three-metre neck, they found some potatoes or carrots to eat.) But where are their fossils? Where are the fossils of the not-yet-successful giraffes? There must have been millions of them! And yet not one single sample has been found? Not one! Nowhere!

106. Charles Darwin said that evidence of these "hopeful monsters" (that's the term that is used to describe such creatures) would be found in their thousands and hundreds of thousands. And of course, so there should. Because every single creature that exists today, says Charlie Darwin, was not designed by the Creator but evolved from some previous creature. Every single species. Every mouse, every fish, every horse, every butterfly, every hedgehog — every single specimen evolved. So there must have been millions of creatures all in a frantic melee of changing and transforming, from shrews into elephants and dolphins into whales and lizards into crocodiles. So there should be millions of skeletons and heaps and heaps of these fossils of bones of all these in-between creatures. And so Darwin claimed that the fossils would prove his theory right. But "the fossil record" (as it's called) is a dismal failure and "a great disappointment." No fossils of any intermediary creatures have been found anywhere. (There have been quite a few hoaxes and some sad fakes by desperate Evolutionists, but no true fossils. See, for instance, the news article, "History of modern man unravels as German scholar is exposed as fraud" by Luke Harding in *"The Guardian"* of Saturday 19 February 2005 which tells of the recent unmasking of just one such swindler, the German "scholar and anthropologist," Professor Reiner Protsch [**von**] Zieten, and his falsification of "key discoveries.") And don't forget, we're not looking only for fossils of Dobbin the Donkey becoming Gerald Giraffe. As said, according to the Theory of Evolution, every single species, every single creature, has evolved from the amoeba. Every single creature comes from its previous model. So, where are all these fossils? Where's the evidence? Where are the millions upon millions of fossils all in the process of changing into elephants and whales and lizards and bees and monkeys and porcupines — and humans? And how come we don't see any creature today in the process of developing into a different species? Not even one out of the millions of creatures! In fact, it's beginning to look rather like someone's telling porkers, isn't it?

107. By the way, when they saw how successful life had become for Dobbin the Donkey since he became Gerald Giraffe, why didn't all donkeys do the same? Why did Dobbin's brothers and sisters choose to stay donkeys? (They must have, otherwise there wouldn't be any donkeys today, would there?) And why didn't the antelope and the boar learn a lesson and become giraffes, too?

108. Come to think of it, while he was at it, why didn't Dobbin think of combining the long neck of the giraffe with the quills of the porcupine, and try for some sharp claws and a vicious sting thrown in? That would have made him really successful, no? Absolutely invincible, in fact! If he could become a giraffe, why not go all the way? Ah, well! Maybe that's what makes him a stupid donkey! But Charles Darwin said that the fossils will prove his theory right, that evidence of creatures changing into other creatures would be found in their thousands and hundreds of thousands. Evolutionists still bang on today about "the fossil record." Yet no fossils of any intermediary creatures, not even one, have been found anywhere. So, if anything, "the fossil record" is glaring proof that Evolution is a lie. Furthermore, how come that there are no creatures anywhere that are busy randomly and all by themselves evolving into super creatures, let's say an alligator changing into a flying dragon? How come that every single one of the millions of species of plants and animals seem to be quite happy to stay as they are. Not even one of any of the living creatures of today can be seen to be changing into anything else or modifying itself to become a better crab or a better hedgehog or a better sheep. What gives these animals (and fishes and birds and plants) the idea that they have reached the pinnacle of crabhood or the peak of hedgehogdom or the best that can be in sheepkind? Why has evolution stopped? It's been going on randomly, without anyone directing it at all for millions and millions of years, giving rise to all these different life forms and now it's stopped. Who told it to stop? Funny, no?

THE MOTHERS' REVOLUTION

109. The whale is a mammal. That is, even though it lives in the sea, it breathes air. When it is born, the calf is born, unusually, not head first, as is the case with all other mammals, but tail first. This is because the instant the baby mammal is out of its mother, it doesn't get its oxygen from its mother any more through the umbilical cord but it must breathe for itself. So the baby whale must have access to air straightaway, as soon as the birthing begins, otherwise it'll die before it's out! That's why the whale calf is born tail first. The equivalent in us humans would be a feet-first birth and is called a breech birth. A normal birth is dangerous enough but a breech birth can bring with it additional complications. If the head, coming out last, should be trapped inside the mother it can lead to the baby being strangled at birth, or asphyxiation, or terrible harm because of oxygen deprivation. Yet with the whale, the breech birth is the usual. Not only that — it's the only way. Why? And how come?

110. Let us consider. The birth of a baby whale (in the water, obviously) takes some time: anything up to about a couple of hours. Consequently, if the baby whale was to be born head first, it would drown at birth. So the baby whale is born tail first, with the head the last to emerge. Straight after the birth, the mother whale pushes

her baby up through the water to the surface of the sea where the calf can, within seconds of being born and being physically parted from its mother, take its first gulp of air. And survive.

111. Now, how did this come about? Evolution? Let's imagine the Annual Convention of the International Union of Mother Whales is in full plenary session. The Mother Whale Leader is speaking. "Mother whales of the world!" she says. "Our children are dying at birth, choked and drowned the moment they are born. It is obvious that things cannot continue as they are. As usual, it is we mothers who will have to take the initiative. To this end, I propose a revolutionary change — No! An ***evo*** lutionary change! Something that has never been tried before by us mammals, whether we live in the sea or on dry land. I propose that as from today, all of us, without exception, shall all give birth to our young — tail first!" Surprise and general hubbub and discussion. The motion is seconded and carried . . . and the rest is history.

112. A couple of problems with this scenario. As just said, a human breech birth is a dangerous event. Nowadays, when it looks likely that a human mother is going to have a breech birth, if the baby is still small and there is room to do so, the doctors will often try to turn the baby round in the womb — something that the mother, even though she has hands, cannot do for herself. It is not without risks, though. The umbilical cord can become twisted or it can tie itself round the unborn baby's neck and therefore many mothers don't agree to the turning around. Not only that, but it often happens that after the doctors have manipulated the baby to be correctly positioned, the baby turns itself back! It therefore seems to be most unlikely that whales are born tail first because of anything the mother whales decided to do, for the simple reason that they couldn't do it themselves. They don't have hands; they only have small flippers which don't reach! So what could they have done? Decided to wobble themselves till their as-yet-unborn babies are turned round so as to be born tail first? But the biggest problem of all is, how were these mother whales at that meeting and how was there a Mother Whale Leader to make the proposal at all? Until that evolutionary change, all whales died at birth, no? So, this business of being born tail first can't be something that "evolved" because before that "evolution" how could whales have ever survived being born? Or? Or whales, unlike all other mammals, ***always*** gave birth to their young tail first. That is, from the time that whales first existed, giving birth tail first has always been part of being a whale and whales and their kinds, unlike all other mammals, were designed to be born like that.

THE ROCKS SPEAK

113. Another subject, again presented as straightforward fact but clearly a fiction, is the business of the strata of rocks of this planet, each stratum with its exotic "scientific" name and with each stratum's duration carefully described. But it's all just so much hogwash! First of all, who has decreed that any particular rock mass should be counted as one kind or two or three separate kinds of rock, with different dates, ranging in the millions of years, for each? Has anybody ever ***proved*** any such timescale at all? ***Can*** anyone ever prove any such timescale? Secondly, who is to

say that a given layer of rock is older than any other? And here we have that beautifully circular logic to which we alluded before. *(See Paragraph 87.)* "Ah!" they tell you sagely, "we know that this stratum of rock is forty-two million years old because the fossils of the creatures found in that stratum of rock are forty-two million years old!" Yes, quite so! But, ahem, excuse me, sir, how do you know that the skeletons of those creatures are forty-two million years old, please? "Well, that's obvious! Because those skeletons were found in a stratum of rock that is forty-two million years old!" And how, pray, do you know that that stratum of rock is forty-two million years old? "Because in that stratum of rock there were fossils which are forty-two million years old!" I kid you not! Yet this is the kind of circular thinking used by Evolutionists and unquestioningly accepted by the unthinking public. It transpires that the fossils are used to date the rocks and the rocks are used to date the fossils and all without the slightest sliver of evidence that the date of either is true.

114. These different strata of rock are portrayed as an orderly arrangement of rocks, with each different colour-coded stratum labelled with impressive names and sub-divided into "eras" and "systems" and "periods" and "epochs." The Pre-Cambrian (570 million years ago — not 568 million years ago, please note, nor 572 million, but exactly 570 million years ago — the self-confidence is impressive) is followed (unsurprisingly) by the Cambrian, which marks the beginning of the Palaeozoic (meaning, "ancient life") Era. ("If you can use a simple name and you can use a posh name, use a posh name. Blind 'em with science!") Following the Cambrian is the Ordovician, then the Silurian (which lasted from 430 million years ago to 395 million years ago precisely) and the Devonian, followed by the Carboniferous and then the Permian. These bring us up to the beginning of the Mesozoic Era which kicks off with the Triassic (225 million years ago) and the Jurassic, leading to the Cretaceous (65 million years ago). The book from which I am copying all this balderdash at this point changes from different shades of yellow to brown and then to light brown; the aforementioned Triassic is rose-coloured and the Jurassic after that is light-red. The Cretaceous (coloured deep red) leads us to the Cainozoic Era (we're back to browns now) which is made up of two periods, the Tertiary and the Quaternary. The Tertiary is broken down into no less than five epochs, namely, the Palaeocene and Eocene, the Oligocene, the Miocene and the Pliocene. These are followed by the period called the Quaternary, just mentioned, which consists of only the two epochs, namely, the Pleistocene age and the Recent age, or Holocene which, they would have us believe, started 1.6 million years ago. Phew!

115. Picture books and scientific textbooks and even some serious encyclopædia show each kind of rock in its own thickness and its own colour (but they don't all follow the pretty colour-scheme of my particular book) each one clearly progressing from the "primitive" to the "modern," with the purportedly sterile and lifeless rock supposedly gradually giving way to those kinds of rock that can support plant and animal life, all nicely arranged in these pictures as if this was the universal arrangement of rocks all over the world. The men of truth and integrity will not tell you that in fact there is not a single instance anywhere on this whole planet of such a "tower" of strata of rocks such as they would have you believe followed on one from the other. In fact, there are numerous places where the strata of rocks that

are seen today are in the diametrically wrong order — in some instances the rock strata are exactly in the reverse order to what it should be! The scientists, men of truth and integrity, answer this particular difficulty by explaining that there ("obviously") was an upheaval which turned the whole tower neatly on its head so that the "newer" rock is now below the much more "ancient" rock which is now on top. Yet the whole contrived "geological record" is nothing more than a silly pretence cobbled together — and without a single shred of evidence to support the fantastic timescale that is given.

VESTIGIAL ORGANS

116. Then there's the rubbish-talk of the so-called "vestigial" organs. These are supposed to be organs or structures (or processes, or anything, really) in living bodies for which there is no known use or function. Since the main plank of the Theory of Evolution is that only things that are needed ever evolved and these particular things are not needed (as far as they can make out, that is) these organs are of course a blatant contradiction to the Theory of Evolution. By way of an answer, these organs are therefore explained away as having had a use once upon a time, but that that particular organ or structure is no longer needed in today's creature. It is a remnant of previous times, a vestige, as it were, in this creature from way back then in the huge distant past, when it indeed had a function.

117. Let's see if we can think of an example that doesn't sound stark staring mad. Try this: Human beings have some muscles which can move their outer ears. (Although most people can't use them, there are some who can waggle their ears a bit and they usually like to show off this ability as a party trick.) Now, as human beings, there is not much use in being able to move your ears. But Evolutionists will tell you that for your great-grandfather, as a monkey in the jungle who had to be alert to the threat of lions silently slinking up and killing him, ears that could focus on the slightest sound were an absolute life-saver. That human beings should have retained this unnecessary ability poses a contradiction to the Theory of Evolution because Evolution preaches that only useful things evolve and only useful things survive. So how do you explain the ear-waggling human? A human doesn't need to waggle his ears! And they answer: You're quite right! Evolution usually does mean that only useful things evolve and survive and that when something is no longer required it disappears, that is, subsequent descendants don't have this unneeded organ / ability / thing. If they insist on holding on to it, they will find it cumbersome and a liability so Evolution decrees that they die out, to make way for the streamlined, modern version which doesn't have this particular organ / ability / thing. So what then about those organs / abilities / things that did survive, despite being quite useless and which against all the rules, hung on? Doesn't this show that your assertion about Evolution getting rid of the unnecessary is simply not true? Not a bit of it! Instead of being a problem which contradicts the rules and challenges the very foundations of Evolution, they are given the high-sounding title "vestigial organs" and are roped-in to the make-believe! Clear? The ability to waggle ears in humans is a hangover from when humans were apes. Our ear-

waggling is a vestigial thingy, it's a "vestige" of the past. And so, through a deft bit of gobbledegook, the contradiction is transformed into part of the charade.

118. The truth of the matter is very different, of course, and is that throughout the physical world, if you look for them, you will find the "Creator's fingerprints." Everywhere, you will find characteristics and various tell-tale signs which show that all these diverse creatures come from the same Craftsman. In the same way that the physical laws of nature (gravity, light, sound, etc.) operate more or less consistently and uniformly throughout the universe (as far as we can make out) so, too, are fingernails / claws, hair / wool, teeth / fangs, respiratory systems, digestive systems, eyes, ears — and yes, even muscles for waggling ears — all to be found working broadly similarly in all these different creatures. Even if they are not so pronounced or as useful in some creatures as they are in others, they all operate similarly and all together they declare that all these creatures, and the whole of creation, is all the workmanship of the One Creator.

119. Evolutionists used to tell you that vestigial organs and structures typically are "degenerate," "atrophied," or only "rudimentary," that they "may have lost some or all of the functional rôles that they had played in ancestral organisms," and that "they retain lesser functions or may have become adapted to new rôles in extant populations."

120. But in the face of new knowledge, you don't hear quite so much about vestigial organs nowadays. On the contrary, there are quite a few Evolutionists who squirm with embarrassment about this rubbish. For instance, in an article by Maggie Koerth-Baker for the National Geographic News (Hear ye! Hear ye!) headlined "Vestigial Organs Not So Useless After All, Studies Find" dated July 30, 2009, she writes as follows:

121. "Appendix, tonsils, various redundant veins — they're all vestigial body parts once considered expendable, if not downright useless.

122. "But as technology has advanced, researchers have found that, more often than not, some of these "junk parts" are actually hard at work."

123. The article goes on to explain that the spleen and the appendix (both usually cited as typical vestigial organs) are in fact very useful, even today.

124. A hundred years ago, Evolutionists listed 180 organs in the human body that they considered as junk. But instead of being acknowledged as contradictions to the Theory of Evolution, they were simply renamed "vestigial organs" and were then cited as proof of Evolution, or at least as part of the scheme of Evolution. *(See Paragraph 117, above.)* This "surplus junk" included such important organs as the tonsils, thymus, pineal gland, and pituitary gland.

125. Let's elaborate a little on this last one, this pituitary gland, to better appreciate what those knowledgeable so-respected men of science who taught Evolution were claiming was a "vestigial organ" and of no use. The pituitary gland is a small pea-sized gland that, it turns out, plays a major role in regulating vital body functions and general wellbeing. It is today referred to as the body's "master gland" because

it controls the activity of most other hormone-secreting glands and the hormones it produces control so many different processes in the body. It senses the body's needs and sends signals to different organs and glands throughout the body to regulate their function and maintain an appropriate environment. It secretes a variety of hormones into the bloodstream which act as messengers to transmit information from the pituitary gland to distant cells, regulating their activity. For example, the pituitary gland produces prolactin to induce milk production. The pituitary gland also secretes hormones that act on the adrenal glands, thyroid gland, ovaries and testes, which in turn produce other hormones. Through production of its hormones, the pituitary gland controls metabolism, growth, maturation, reproduction, blood pressure and many and various other vital physical functions and processes. Some "vestigial organ," no?

126. As a matter of fact, ***every one*** of those organs on that list of 180 "vestigial organs" today has known functions. There are no "vestigial organs." So Evolutionists today try to save their argument of vestigial organs by "restating" it slightly. ("The Evolution of a Theory," remember?) They try to redefine "vestigial" from meaning "left over for no purpose" to meaning "left over and smaller, or less important, today" than in an evolutionary ancestor. A moment's thought will show that as an argument for Evolution and against Creation, this is worthless. First of all, don't forget that we are just at the threshold of finding out the purpose of many parts and processes of the body, so it's a bit presumptuous to classify anything as "of less importance." Secondly, even if it should indeed turn out that an organ is not of vital importance (that is, without it, the creature will not die) so what? For example, a person can live a long life with only one lung. Does that mean that a lung is a "vestigial organ" (in its new meaning, that is, less important) ? And which lung is the vestigial organ? Obviously, in some creatures the legs are more important than in others. A deer running away from a leopard will tell you that every one of its legs is terribly important whereas a sloth can indeed make do with one leg less. So what? Why shouldn't you find the same organ in two creatures and being more important or more useful to one than to the other?

127. To again quote from "Strange Stories, Amazing Facts" (*The Reader's Digest,* p. 49) :

> Until recently the thymus was thought to be a useless vestigial organ, but now doctors have found that it in fact masterminds the body's whole defence system, dispatching cells to fight invading germs. It is further thought that diseases like multiple sclerosis, where the victim produces unruly antibodies which attack healthy cells, may be caused by a thymus disorder. Tonsils and adenoids were also considered superfluous, but in fact protect the throat and nose against germs. The well-known useless organ, the appendix, may after all be part of the infection-fighting lymphatic system. And bodily hair, hitherto thought to have been made redundant by our wearing of clothes, actually adds to the skin's sensitivity. That no definite rôle has yet been discovered for the brain's pineal gland or for the muscles of the outer ear does not necessarily mean that they have no part to play.

In other words, it's simply a lie to speak of anything as "vestigial." It's time to file away "Vestigial" in the "Ether & Phlogiston" Department!

SOME FAKES AND FRAUDS

128. As Darwin's theory gained popularity, there seemed to be quite a frenzy of scientists all trying to show their complete acceptance of it, some of them slavishly struggling to outdo others in their obsession, coming up with all kinds of quackery in the new craze of "scientific" denial of G-d. Using obscure language to describe even more obscure ideas, these people fell over themselves in trying to prove that they were modern, progressive academicians, bang up to the minute.

129. For instance, there is the Theory of Recapitulation, also called the "Biogenetic Law" or the "Embryological Parallelism," often expressed as "ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny." (See what I mean by "obscure language"?) The Theory of Recapitulation is a biological hypothesis that states that in developing from embryo to adult, animals go through stages resembling or representing successive stages in the evolution of their remote ancestors. In other words, they're telling you that unproven, fictitious, non-existent evolution can be seen in embryos and the developing young. (One is tempted to ask, "Why? Of what "evolutionary use" is this?" And why is this useless feature not itself a contradiction to the Theory of Evolution, which teaches that useless things will die out? But hold it! There's more!) With different formulations, such hare-brained ideas have been applied and extended to several fields and areas, including (believe it or not) the origin of language, biology, cognition and mental activities, anthropology, education theory and developmental psychology. To be fair, Evolutionists nowadays have begun to distance themselves from this particular "Theory of Recapitulation" fantasy. Now they say that "even though examples of embryonic stages show that molecular features of ancestral organisms exist," (this is a blatant lie, by the way: they do not exist) nevertheless the Theory of Recapitulation should not be taken too seriously. It is to be viewed "within the field of developmental biology more as a historical side-note than as fact." (In other words, take no notice of it.) And then, they quickly add, there is no consensus against its validity outside of biology (Aha! but *within* biology it *is* wrong, yes?) and that Recapitulation Theory is still considered plausible and "applied" by some researchers in other fields!

130. Recapitulation Theory was dreamed-up by the German zoologist Ernst Haeckel who originally formulated his theory as "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny." (It was only later that it became known simply as the Recapitulation Theory. But doesn't "Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny" sound impressive and so scientific and so *true*!) "Ontogeny" is the growth (size change) and development (shape change) of an individual organism; "phylogeny" is the evolutionary history of a species. Haeckel's Recapitulation Theory states that the development of advanced species passes through stages represented by adult organisms of more primitive species. Otherwise put, successive stages in the development of an individual represent the adult forms that appeared in its evolutionary history. The aim was to defend Evolution with the argument that creatures replay their evolutionary past when developing in the womb. (Again, why? and of what benefit is this to the creature? And therefore surely a blatant contradiction to the Theory of Evolution itself!)

131. For example, Haeckel proposed that the pharyngeal grooves between the pharyngeal arches in the neck of the human embryo resembled gill slits of fish, thus representing an adult "fishlike" developmental stage as well as signifying a fishlike ancestor. (Human beings came from fish, which evolved from the amoeba, remember.) Embryonic pharyngeal slits, which form in many animals when the thin bronchial plates separating pharyngeal pouches and pharyngeal grooves perforate, open the pharynx to the outside. Pharyngeal arches appear in all tetrapod embryos: in mammals, the first pharyngeal arch develops into the lower jaw (Meckel's cartilage) the malleus and the stapes. Although obviously none of these embryonic pharyngeal arches, grooves, pouches, and slits in human embryos could at any stage carry out the same function as the gills of an adult fish, nevertheless since Darwin's time, biology textbooks — ***even to this day!*** — reiterate that early embryos of many vertebrates, including humans, have tiny pouches that reflect an evolutionary fish stage.

132. More recently, however, embryologists have thoroughly refuted that concept and others have shown that Haeckel's drawings were partially faked. (Oh, how shocking!) And a new online video taken from 3-D scans of a developing baby's face should bury Haeckel's old and uninformed argument. (Remember this, gentle reader: "When Evolutionists start arguing amongst themselves, you want to be listening because each one really knows what rubbish the other fellow is saying.") For instance, embryologist and Evolutionist Michael Richardson and colleagues dropped a bomb on Haeckel's long-held concept of "embryonic recapitulation" when they compared Haeckel's old drawings with actual photographs of the same embryos in a 1997 technical paper. The comparison showed that Haeckel's drawings were frauds. (See *"New Scientist,"* 6 September 1997, page 23.) Richardson's report revealed that in order to make animal embryos look more similar at a certain early stage of development, Haeckel had omitted limb buds and heart bulges and resized and selected certain creature's embryos. Haeckel had manipulated data to conform it to his Evolutionary notions. The rogue had faked his drawings. Embryos — including human — do not rehearse "their evolutionary past" after all. (Tut tut! Dear me! How ***could*** he?) Even though Haeckel later confessed to "drawing from memory" and he was convicted of fraud at the University of Jena, his drawings are still printed in biology textbooks today! (See what Jonathan Wells, Ph.D., has got to say about this lie in his *"Icons of Evolution — Science or Myth? Why much of what we teach about evolution is wrong."*)

THEORIES, HYPOTHESES AND LAWS

133. Evolutionists claim to be "scientific" so they often make a big fuss about being precise in their language. They will lecture you on the distinctly different meanings of, for instance, "hypothesis," "theory" and "law." A "hypothesis," they'll explain to you patiently and condescendingly, "consists either of a suggested explanation for an observable phenomenon or of a reasoned proposal predicting a possible causal correlation among multiple phenomena" (their words, not mine) whereas a "theory" is "a well-substantiated, unifying explanation for a set of verified, proven hypotheses." (Ditto.) Both have to be well-substantiated, but a hypothesis in

addition has to be testable and falsifiable. But a theory is "a well-substantiated, unifying explanation for a set of verified, proven hypotheses" which means, does it not, that a theory, too, has to be proven, if only because the hypotheses that it explains are well-substantiated because they are verified and proven, no? "So," I hear you ask, "what's the difference between theory and hypothesis?" Well, I suppose you pays yer money and takes yer choice! But it's interesting to note that despite all this meticulous care and precision with "definitions," the "Theory of Recapitulation" (which, according to the above definitions, is really a hypothesis and not a theory, is it not?) was upgraded and called the "Biogenetic ***Law***." (But not any more, it ain't. Today the Theory of Recapitulation teaches very little other than to be an example of what passes for science in the Evolutionists' camp, pretty much like Piltdown Man and ***his*** various friends.)

SO WHY?

134. So why? Why this absurdly obsessive support for a theory which, had it been in any other branch of science and so battered and repeatedly revised beyond recognition, would have long ago been dumped on the rubbish-tip together with phlogiston and the "Philosopher's Stone" and other retarded "science" of the primitive alchemists of old? Why, please, the desperate tactics by almost the whole of the scientific establishment of the secular Western world to silence any questioning of the discredited Theory of Evolution? Simply because the true answer to the question, "Who made the world, the universe, everything?" is, "G-d!" and the consequences that follow from this mean that we are all responsible for all our actions and we are accountable to G-d for everything we do. This can be most uncomfortable to a lot of people who want to live their lives only according to their own definition of what is allowed and is not allowed, of what is right and wrong, free of any G-d-imposed morality. For such people, the truth is too awful to contemplate and so they would rather say that they believe in fairy tales and fantastic "theories." To give this rubbish-talk some kind of respectability, they resort to weird scientific-sounding terminology and pretentious vocabulary that, once they're translated into plain language, are just laughable. As the late Chief Rabbi Dr J H Hertz quotes in another context, not unrelated: "Theories are vast soap-bubbles with which the grown-up children of Learning amuse themselves, while the ignorant public stand gazing in stupid admiration and dignify these vagaries by the name of Science."

135. The preachers of Evolution hate anyone who tries to tell them the truth (like the Jews) because the truth shows them up to be liars and libertarians. So they heap abuse upon anyone who teaches about G-d, all the while trying to justify their denial of G-d's existence as "science." But there is a growing number of websites that show, with good scientific proofs, the utter lie that Evolution is. Much of the material really can hardly be faulted for being in any way unscientific and makes for very compelling evidence to expose Evolution for the farce that it is. (You would expect me to say that, wouldn't you?) What is interesting, however, is to see the comments of those who come to the rescue of the Theory of Evolution. They are most unusual. Invariably they are abusive and insulting. There's seldom any real

scientific argument: it's just plain hate, often quite vulgarly expressed. It's almost as if they feel threatened that their anti-religion stance is being exposed for the hedonistic libertarianism that it is. Indeed, in the Halls of Academe there is a steady campaign to belittle and discredit ***any***one, even eminent scientists, who dare to speak of G-d the Creator; they try to besmirch their reputation by calling them "Creationists," as if this was some sort of an insult, with the implication that anyone who speaks of Creation by G-d is backward or retarded. "He is religious!" — as if this is impossibly incompatible with modern science. But really it is these bigots who give true science a bad name as something irrational and even nonsensical.

136. Richard Dawkins, arguably one of today's best-known Evolutionists, criticizes those who believe in G-d the Creator as people who don't think for themselves. His words: "[Religious] faith is the great cop-out, the great excuse, to evade the need to think and evaluate evidence." But the same Richard Dawkins admits that we can't see Evolution happening: "We are condemned to live only for a few decades and that's too slow, too small a time scale, to see evolution going on." So it seems, then, that Evolution is — a matter of faith! (Well, as just said, observable science it's not.) Indeed, the very talk used by Evolutionists shows that even they themselves consider Evolution a matter of faith, don't they? For you will have noticed, gentle reader, how it's passed into ordinary conversation: "Do you believe in Evolution?" We hear people state firmly, "O, ***I*** believe in Evolution! Why, don't ***you*** believe in Evolution?" Isn't that rather odd! After all, you never hear anyone say, "I believe in gravity" or, "I believe in electricity!" So, Evolution ***is*** a matter of faith, isn't it? And, just like Richard Dawkins himself says, "A cop-out"!

137. Here are the words of Associate Professor of Anthropology, UCLA, Gail E Kennedy, Ph.D., when she was questioned about the lack of evidence for Evolution: "You know, the problem with those who are unable to see Evolution, I think, is they don't have imaginations." So there we have it: even though Evolution is not true science — it can't be proved or demonstrated and it is so manifestly false — it has nevertheless become an article of faith and belief — and now, even acknowledged as a product of the imagination! In fact, it is Evolutionists who are preaching religion, the new religion of Evolution.

138. The god "Evolution" is credited with all the wisdom and superlative abilities of G-d the Creator — "Evolution has ensured . . ." or "Evolution provides . . ." and so on. One thing the god Evolution does not do is to set standards of right and wrong, of morality or justice, and neither is there any accountability to the god Evolution. After all, Evolution teaches that ultimately, "every human being is only three buckets of water and one bucket of salts kept going by instinct and heredity"; that through the rule of "the survival of the fittest, the strong overcomes the weak" and there is no purpose or destiny to existence.

139. But the claims made for Evolution are not only ridiculous and false — they are also dangerous. Evolution has become the religion of the secular world that seeks to be rid of G-d the Creator and Sovereign of all. It is the old idolatry reincarnated and it does the same harm as crude idolatry did in its time. Idol-worshippers ascribed to their gods all the foibles and weaknesses of human beings (only writ large) and thereby gave their worshippers license to do the same — "If the gods can rob and

fight and pillage and commit all kinds of the worst immorality, so can we!" Likewise, the god Evolution does not teach right and wrong nor good and bad. It teaches only that it is "Nature's Law" that the strong shall overcome the weak and proclaims that this is the imperative of the natural world. Therefore it is perfectly alright for the strong to overcome the weak, for the physically better to be rid of the physically not perfect, to eliminate (= kill) anyone who is crippled or ill or mentally deficient or old and infirm (through "euthanasia," the word that is used instead of "kill them out") before these ill or infirm individuals contaminate the gene pool of humanity. Through "Evolution," certain people are pronounced as superior ("the fittest") over everyone else; they proclaim themselves as the "master race" with the "right" ("it's the law of nature") to kill out whoever they see as inferior races. They can then appoint themselves to be the rescuers of the human race from being contaminated by racially inferior specimens and, using their greater strength, can eliminate those that they consider a threat to them, to enact "the final solution of the problem of the contaminators of the human race." So Evolution isn't just silly or ridiculous or bad science. It's also deadly serious and, as said, positively dangerous. (We will return to this later.)

FANTASY SCIENCE *versus* TRADITION

140. Meanwhile, the charade continues. There is the much-acclaimed CERN Experiment, to date one of the most spectacular flops. (Fortunately, most of Europe's taxpayers are unaware what this farce is costing so they merely laugh at the extravagant joke.) As is known, for quite a few years "scientists" were busy building a 17-mile long circular tunnel under the Alps, part of what is known as the Large Hadron Collider, a machine costing a mere £4.4 billion (that's the price given in *The Daily Telegraph* of 30 August 2000) in which they planned to fire two atoms at each other from opposite directions. These two atoms will be made to accelerate to unbelievable speeds and then will be made to collide with each other. (That's probably why it's called the Collider, gerrit?) The resulting smash is supposed to be a smaller version of the Big Bang ("Big Bang" is the current theory about the beginning of the universe — *see below, Paragraph 240 and onward)* and will prove that … what? That two specks of matter can be made to smash into each other at great force! Bravo! That this will result in an explosion? Great! What does this expensive farce show? Even if, by the remotest fluke, anything constructive should result, what does this prove? That something constructive can result from a completely random explosion? Oh yea? "Completely random"?! Who built the tunnel, who built the machinery and the devices which accelerate the two atoms and fire them at each other? This is a duplication of the collision of the two specks which, it is claimed, started the Big Bang? And this fantasy passes as science? Yes! When desperate liars are quite frantic in denying the existence of G-d, they will try anything. (By the way, if this collision experiment is successful, does that mean that there'll be another Big Bang and that another universe will come about and start expanding? A new universe under the Alps? A bit cramped, no? Hmm!)

141. So, let's get things straight: This rubbish is given credence and respectability and is called "science" but doesn't prove anything at all, except, perhaps, the gullibility of

some people and how far some other people will go to deceive themselves. Yet the received wisdom and clearly substantiated solid tradition handed down, generation after generation, which tells of the Creation of heaven and earth by G-d Almighty, is not accepted and is branded as "not scientific"! Makes you wonder, no?

LET'S EXAMINE THE FACTS

142. For the sake of those honest people who have been bamboozled into believing in Evolution as if it was true, let's now examine some of the background and some more of the facts that are taken for granted as true.

143. Well, to start off with, Charles Robert Darwin, the man who wrote *"The Origin of Species,"* wasn't even a trained biologist. He was a botanist.

144. "What's the difference?" you ask. "He was a scientist, a man of honour. A genuine and earnest seeker of the truth!"

145. Well, let's take each of these one at a time. Firstly, a biologist is someone who has studied biology, that is, the physical life of animals and plants, including their morphology, meaning the forms of animals and plants. He has studied the physiology, meaning the science of normal functions and the phenomena of living animals and plants. A botanist, on the other hand, is a person who has studied the science of plants. (Plants, not animals, not fishes, not birds — neither finches nor any other kind, neither on the Galapagos Islands nor anywhere else).

146. The difference is like asking an expert gardener who knows all about potatoes and beans (plant life) for his opinion on brain surgery (animal and human life). Even assuming he was an expert gardener, it still doesn't make sense to ask him his opinion about brain surgery. Additionally, as it's not his field of expertise, for him to offer his opinion is a tad conceited, one would have thought. And even if the differentiation between various areas of science wasn't so clearly separated a hundred and sixty years ago as they are today and there was considerable overlap, it still seems a bit presumptuous for a botanist to set out to explain the origin of all the myriads of species — approximately one hundred and thirty million at the last estimation — of plants and living animals and all life, one would have thought, no?

147. Secondly, one hundred and sixty years ago, nobody had any idea of microbiology. What is known today about the physical world wasn't even dreamed of in those days. Charles Darwin had no electron microscope. It's difficult to make Darwin's conclusions of a hundred and sixty years ago sound sensible or even relevant to the facts that we know today and didn't know then. To be kind, one could perhaps compare Darwin to somebody peering through a ten-penny plastic magnifying glass, saying that he can't see anything when we, with our powerful microscope, see countless numbers of bacteria. Let's be charitable and say that he wasn't a deliberate liar but that with a ten-penny magnifying glass he simply couldn't see. Maybe. But how does that excuse today's Evolutionists?

148. For example, only an ignoramus or someone who has no inkling of the vastly different structures of the scales of a crocodile and the feathers of a bird would be

crazy enough to suggest that the feathers on the wings of birds came about by lizards beating their scales till they became feathers. Again, I kid you not! See, for instance, *"Evolution in Crisis"* by Michael Denton. Here's just a sample quote, this one is from page 204: "By the friction of the air, the outer edges of the scales become frayed, the frayings gradually changing into still longer horny processes, which in the course of time become more and more featherlike, until the perfect feather is produced. From wings, tail and flanks, the feathering spreads to the whole body ..." Yet this is the kind of balderdash that is the thinking behind Charles Darwin's *"Origin of Species"* — and is given credence by "the men of science" today! They should be rolling around with laughter but instead they nod seriously, solemnly accepting these "findings" as truth, merely suggesting an amendment here and there.

149. And now read the facts, not the fantasy:

> Feathers differ from scales not only in structural terms, but in their developmental paths also. Feather development is an exceedingly complex process. In contrast to scales, feathers grow out of tiny sacs called follicles, just like hairs do. Yet a hair has a much simpler structure than that of a feather. The growing feather is protected by a sheath and forms around a cone-shaped nucleus. The cells that will constitute the feather also develop through highly complex physiological processes. Once the cells have formed, they migrate away from one another so as to form the complex sequences in the hooks and barbs at the feather's edge.

150. Moreover, scales and feathers each grow out of different epidermal (outer) layers. Feathers, with their basically protein structure, are made of keratin, a strong, hard substance that forms when old cells in the subdermal layers die and are replaced by younger cells. However, feather proteins (β-keratins) are biochemically different from skin and scale proteins (α-keratins). *(A. C. Lucas, P. R. Slettenhein, Avian Anatomy: Integument, GPO, Washington, D.C., 1972.)*

151. Feathers from scales? And what about the poor lizard with the bedraggled, badly-beaten scales-not-yet-changed-into-feathers, and the poor little bird with its feathers still only frayed-and-broken scales — how did they manage to swim or fly? Don't forget that these first partly-beaten-up-scales of the first generation of lizards that had decided to become birds had to pass on their partly-beaten-up and partly-frayed-scales to the next generation of lizards (but remember: such "passing-on" has never been seen to happen anywhere in the world in any of the millions of species of living creatures) who then decided to continue to beat-up their scales and again passed-on their more-beaten-up and more-frayed scales to the next generation of lizards-aspiring-to-become-birds who again decided to continue to beat-up their scales ... and so on — for countless generations! But meantime, how did the lizard function? At some stage it isn't going to be able to swim any more but neither can it fly yet and this situation would have to continue for aeons of time! During this time, how did the lizard-becoming-a-bird creature function at all? But it ***had*** to function; otherwise we wouldn't have birds today, would we? And by the way, how come we have lizards today at all? Remember, too, that if only one lizard-becoming-a-bird did not pass on its partly-frayed scales to the next

generation, this whole process of Evolution came to an end. It would have to start all over again from another first, aspiring lizard-wanting-to-become-a-bird. And this is the process that happened, by accident, completely randomly, without any forward planning, without any design, millions and millions and millions of times, for every single change in every species of the estimated one hundred and thirty million species that we have today! Yet of all the supposed millions and millions of intermediate stages between all the species there's not even one single example of any of these changes happening anywhere in the whole world! Not a shred of evidence — anywhere! So it's plainly a lie ***and*** it's sheer nonsense. And this they call a scientific theory?

152. Another thing: if becoming a bird was so successful (but, seeing that there was no such thing as a bird before this, how did the lizard dream of becoming a successful bird — did the lizard have prophecy?) why didn't the other lizards become birds, too? Didn't they trust the prophecy of the lizards-who-became-birds? (It would have had to be prophecy because otherwise why did the first unhappy lizard aspire to fly like a bird? Don't forget, Evolutionists will not admit of any Director, there's no Designer, there's no Planner. It's all random!) And this is called science?

153. Maybe one hundred and fifty years ago, when so many things that we know today were not yet known (the germ theory was still new and was accepted as true only slowly, by the way) one could be forgiven for fantasizing about scales becoming feathers and suchlike. But then, with so many new facts from the real world being discovered each day, with so many of them openly and glaringly contradicting any Theory of Evolution, there had to be some pretty drastic revisions of the theory, and here are a few. We'll have to explain them as we go along. So, here goes:

VARIATIONS ON A THEME OF MADNESS

154. There is the theory of "punctuated equilibrium."

This says that instead of slow, continuous movement, Evolution tends to be characterized by long periods of virtual standstill ("equilibrium") "punctuated" by episodes of very fast development of forms. The "punctuated equilibrium" theory was put forward by Niles Eldredge and Stephen Jay Gould and was proposed as a criticism of the "traditional" Darwinian Theory of Evolution. Any variations in creatures typically tend to be small. Therefore, Darwin saw Evolution as a slow, continuous process, without sudden jumps. Eldredge and Gould "observed" (did you spot the fib?) that evolution tends to happen in fits and starts, sometimes moving very fast, sometimes moving very slowly or not at all — "Punctuated equilibrium" — gerrit?

155. There is "Lamarckism" and there is "Anti-Lamarckism."

"Lamarckism:" The idea that an organism can pass on to its offspring characteristics that it acquired during its lifetime (also known as "heritability of acquired characteristics" or "soft inheritance"). It is named after the French biologist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck (1744 — 1829) who incorporated "soft inheritance" into his evolutionary theories. (Sorry, I should have made it clearer

that Darwin wasn't the first.) "Soft inheritance" proposes that "individual efforts during the lifetime of the organisms were the main mechanism driving species to adaptation, as they supposedly would acquire adaptive changes and pass them on to their offspring." The usual example that is given is the knees of the ostrich. This creature tends to rest on its knees a lot and it has calloused knees and when young ostriches hatch-out they come with calloused knees. This is hailed as a proof that the calloused knees of the parent ostriches are passed down as a "soft inheritance" to their chicks. This is an important part of Evolutionary theory because, it is asserted, by extension (an extension, admittedly, of millions of changes through millions of generations taking millions of years) an elephant can become a mouse (or is it the other way round?) and indeed so has every single different species on this planet come about through millions of changes and mutations, all passed on by parents and inherited by succeeding generations, that is, each different species has come about (over the millions of years of mutations) through this "soft inheritance." It's as ridiculous as saying that fishes (all by themselves and quite randomly) "developed" fins and scales as a result of living in water ("But Evolutionists ***do*** say that!" "Oh dear me! Sorry!") rather than that each of the hundreds of thousands of species of fish with their fins and scales are wondrously made by the supremely intelligent Creator Who designed them that way precisely ***because*** they are to live in water. The Creator has equipped the heavy ostrich with callouses on its knees so that it can rest on its knees without discomfiture and little ostrich chicks are equipped with the same. What's "inheritance" got to do with it? But it ***is*** rather wonderfully ironic that the clearest proof against this theory — which, as said, is itself a component part of the whole edifice of denial of G-d — is G-d's Chosen People itself. You see, they've been circumcising their male infant children for over three thousand years and yet the incidence of Jewish children who are "born circumcised" (that is, without a foreskin) is exactly the same as for any others! Some "soft inheritance"!)

156. "Anti-Lamarckism" is, well the opposite. To quote from an article by Brian Hayes in the *"American Scientist"* of November — December, 1999:

> A curious young elephant got its nose stretched by a crocodile, with the result that elephants everywhere now carry a trunk. What this story tells us is that Rudyard Kipling was a thoroughgoing Lamarckian — a believer in the inheritance of acquired characteristics. As it happens, Lamarckian ideas were already in disrepute when Kipling wrote his "Just So" stories. The German biologist August Weismann, in a remarkably Kiplingesque experiment, had shown that chopping off a rat's tail did not lead to the birth of tailless ratlets. Experimental protocols have gotten more sophisticated since then, but the verdict is the same: There's no sign of Lamarckian inheritance anywhere in the kingdoms of life (what did I tell you?) and this opinion is called Anti-Lamarckism.

157. There is "String Theory" (There's really no point in my rewriting all this and explaining these things — it's all been done already by other much more capable people. So instead, here is the account of "String Theory" taken from Wikipedia, the free encyclopædia. I haven't changed a word — I wouldn't dare!)

158. String theory is an active research framework in particle physics that attempts to reconcile quantum mechanics and general relativity. It is a contender for a theory of everything ("TOE"), a self-contained mathematical model that describes all fundamental forces and forms of matter. String theory posits that the elementary particles (*i.e.*, electrons and quarks) within an atom are not 0-dimensional objects, but rather 1-dimensional oscillating lines ("strings").

159. The earliest string model, the bosonic string, incorporated only bosons, although this view developed to the superstring theory, which posits that a connection (a "super symmetry") exists between bosons and fermions. String theories also require the existence of several extra dimensions to the universe that have been compactified (now *there's* a beautiful new word for you!) into extremely small scales, in addition to the four known space-time dimensions.

160. The theory has its origins in an effort to understand the strong force, the dual resonance model (1969). Subsequent to this, five superstring theories were developed that incorporated fermions and possessed other properties necessary for a theory of everything. Since the mid-1990s, in particular due to insights from dualities shown to relate the five theories, an eleven-dimensional theory called M-theory is believed to encompass all of the previously distinct superstring theories.

161. Many theoretical physicists (*e.g.*, Stephen Hawking, Edward Witten, Juan Maldacena and Leonard Susskind) believe that string theory is a step towards the correct fundamental description of nature. This is because string theory allows for the consistent combination of quantum field theory and general relativity, agrees with general insights in quantum gravity (such as the holographic principle and black hole thermodynamics) and because it has passed many non-trivial checks of its internal consistency. According to Hawking in particular, "M-theory is the only candidate for a complete theory of the universe." Nevertheless, other physicists, such as Feynman and Glashow, have criticized string theory for not providing novel experimental predictions at accessible energy scales.

162. There is "SUSY Theory" (SUper SYmmetry — gerrit?) This, too, is taken from Wikipedia and again I haven't changed a word.

163. In particle physics, supersymmetry (often abbreviated to SUSY) is a symmetry that relates elementary particles of one spin to other particles that differ by half a unit of spin and are known as superpartner. In a theory with unbroken super-symmetry, for every type of boson there exists a corresponding type of fermion with the same mass and internal quantum numbers (other than spin), and *vice-versa*.

164. There is no direct evidence for the existence of supersymmetry. (Do you hear this, everybody?) It is motivated by possible solutions to several theoretical problems. (Quite so!) Since the superpartners of the Standard Model particles have not been observed (because, non-believers would suggest, they don't exist — and it's very hard to observe something that ain't there!) supersymmetry must

be a broken symmetry if it is a true symmetry of nature. This would allow the superparticles to be heavier than the corresponding Standard Model particles.

165. To all of which we ordinary simple folk can only gawp in wonder and say: "Anything, absolutely anything, rather than to acknowledge the truth, that G-d created the world."

166. There is the "Cladist Theory" of Evolution. This one is really wacky. This claims that creatures should be classified as having evolved one from the other according to what they look like, like the elephant evolved from the mouse, regardless of any other similarities or dissimilarities. Proof? Well, they look the same don't they? Of course, this makes about as much sense as to say that the Eiffel Tower evolved from the electricity pylon and the proof is that they have the same shape. ("You hang about for ten million years or so and you'll see how this electricity pylon grows into the Eiffel Tower! And if it doesn't happen, you come back to me and I'll give you your money back! I promise!") And this, too, is science?!

167. Again, the quotes are reproduced from elsewhere with hardly any changes at all.

> Cladistics — also called "Phylogenetics Systematics" or "Phylogenetic Taxonomy," is a method of classifying organisms by common ancestry, based on the branching of the evolutionary family tree. (For your information, gentle reader, there is no such thing as the "evolutionary family tree." It's a myth, a complete fiction.) Cladistics is currently the most popular paradigm of phylogenetic classification in biological taxonomy. (Doesn't that last sentence sound so splendidly ***scientific***!) Based strictly on determining branching points in the ancestry of organisms, it establishes groups based on their shared, derived features (synapomorphies), while ignoring primitive features (plesiomorphies) inherited from ancestors. Organisms that share common ancestors (and therefore have similar features) are grouped into taxonomic groups called clades. Like Evolutionary Systematics (which it has currently supplanted) Cladism is a method of classification based on the evolutionary history of organisms, dividing organisms into meaningful groups and subgroups. It was developed by Willi Hennig, an entomologist (an entomologist is someone who studies insects) in 1950, but was not really accepted until the 1980s …

168. According to this theory, organisms should be ranked and classified on the basis of "recency of common descent." One of the weaknesses of the cladistic system is its disregard of the sequence of fossils in the stratigraphic record. (Oh really? How shocking of cladists to disregard the fossil record! Almost heresy!) This is based on the fact that cladists seem to assume it is enough simply to know all the characteristics of the representative members of a group in order to work out their precise phylogenetic relationships. If the resulting cladogram agrees with the fossil record for the group (the "basal" [= primitive] taxa appearing first, the most "derived" [= advanced] taxa last) well and good. If it doesn't, the fossil sequence is rejected. The reasoning seems to be that since the fossil record is so incomplete in any case, the missing taxa simply weren't preserved, but lived elsewhere. The result is a series of hidden or "ghost" lineages that are based on

absolutely no evidence other than assumptions drawn from (possibly unreliable) cladograms.

'Nuff said.

NEW NAMES FOR OLD ! NEW NAMES FOR OLD !

169. Each contradiction, of course, calls for another correction. Then another. Then a review. Then, to take into account further "new discoveries" and "new theories," a "completely new" version of the same old rubbish is solemnly rolled out. They try to hoodwink people with new timescales, grander scenarios, multi-universes (now given the new-science name of "multiverse") and the related "string theory" *(see above, Paragraphs 157 — 164)* and all kinds of convoluted thinking dressed up in respectable-sounding ologies. The Sukkos 5772 issue of the *Hamodia "Kolmus"* magazine makes interesting reading. To quote: "The theory of the multiverse (multi- meaning many, and -verse, shortened from universe, hence "multiverse," meaning "many universes") was only on the fringes of scientific conjecture for at least twenty years. Lately, however, scientists have begun speaking about it, but now, using words like "hypothesis" and even "theory," the "multiverse" has acquired scientific respectability!" Yet all this empty talk and high-powered speculation — all of it nothing more than a desperate attempt to avoid the truth, namely, that G-d created everything and rules everything!

170. This "multiverse" idea is worth explaining for two reasons. Number One, it's a good laugh. And Number Two, it shows how those trying to deny the Creator are willing to come to terms with the most bizarre inconsistency and contradiction. So, here goes: A fine-tuned universe, where everything is precisely how it needs to be for life to be sustainable, proclaims that there's a plan and a design. Plan and design means Planner and Designer. In order to prevent such a thought (that the universe was planned and created for life) some "scientists" have come up with the idea that, No! Only *this* universe happens to have turned out, quite randomly and by accident, without design, without plan, to be fit for life. But there are other universes where things just didn't work out so luckily! This proves, does it not, that everything is random after all! This universe happens to have worked out for life, but others didn't. *This* universe happens to be the one that has the proper configurations necessary for life to exist (quite randomly and by chance and without plan or design or purpose) but there are other universes where things didn't work out so lucky. And, these people will tell you, there are any number of such failed universes out there, in fact, there are multiverses. No life, no nuffink. Failed universes. Lots of 'em! Gerrit?

171. Dr Alan Lightman, professor of physics at MIT, writes that this theory of multiverses undermines the very premise of science as a description of reality. "Scientists" are now saying that out of the infinite number of failed universes out there, this one happened to be lucky and life happened to develop into what we have today. Of course, these other universes cannot be traced, cannot be detected, cannot be measured and there is no conceivable way of proving that they exist at all. Their entire existence, in fact, is no more than in the imagination of these (well-paid)

professors and are said to be "there" (where?) simply because these "scientists" believe them to be there somewhere. This is quite ironic because these "scientists" want everybody to believe in the existence of infinite, untraceable, unprovable, undetectable universes but they refuse to accept the perfectly purposeful, planned and designed universe created by G-d the Creator because, they say, that's not science! How perverse can you get?

172. Richard G. Swinburne, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford, in his *"The Existence of G-d"* (page 165) puts it simply:

> "Multiple universe theory represents the height of irrationality."

173. As Edward Robert Harrison (1919 — 2007) the English cosmologist, Senior Research Associate at the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center in Maryland and Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, writes in *"Masks of the Universe"* (page 252) :

> "The fine tuning of the universe provides *prima facie* evidence of Deistic design. Take your choice: blind chance that requires multitudes of universes, or design, that requires only one.

174. And further, (on page 263) :

> "Many scientists, when they admit their views, incline toward the teleological or design argument."

175. Or, as one wag put it: The Bible teaches, "In the beginning, G-d created the heavens and the earth . . . and everything." Whereas Atheism teaches that in the beginning there was nothing — which then exploded, and all by itself became everything. As Professor Harrison says: "Take your choice!"

176. It's interesting how it's not called "Darwinism" any more, but "neo-Darwinism," meaning, "new-style Darwinism." And "Why?" I hear you ask. Because the old, original theory put out by Darwin is so discredited and is acknowledged as being so silly that they had to completely re-vamp it and they've given it a different name. But that doesn't mean it's anything other than the same old balderdash. Patch on top of patch, tinkered around-with so much that it's hardly recognizable any more except in one fundamental tenet: the denial of G-d the Creator. New theories and fanciful fables abound, but it's still the same old rubbish. Have you ever heard the story of the Emperor's New Clothes? Well, a lot of otherwise clever people are going to look pretty foolish standing there quite naked when the little boy calls out loud and clear, "But he hasn't got any clothes on!" Or, as Søren Løvtrup, the Swedish embryologist (1922 — 2002) put it in his book *"Darwinism: The Refutation of a Myth"* (the quote is reproduced here in bold because it's one of the main points of this whole essay) —

> **"I believe that one day the Darwinian myth will be ranked as the greatest deceit in the history of science. When this happens, many people will pose the question, 'How did this ever happen?'"**

RANDOM

177. The Theory of Evolution teaches that there is only randomness and chance, no G-d, no Creator. So let's look at the "randomness" of our own planet Earth simply in relation to our solar system. Our solar system is at the edge of the system of stars (that is, suns) and planets and suchlike called the Milky Way galaxy. The Milky Way is our own local neighbourhood in the nearby, visible universe. (Later, we'll try to describe how big it is.) The universe is much, much bigger and, to all intents and purposes, simply goes on and on and on and on, in all directions. Let's leave things at that for now, before we blow a fuse.

178. As is known, our home world, Earth, is the third "rock" from the Sun and is unique in our solar system. Earth is the only planet known to support life as we know it and there are good reasons for this. Its location is just near enough to the Sun to give it a stable, temperate climate — neither too hot nor too cold. Also, strong gravity means that planet Earth can hold on to a protective atmosphere which shields it from the incredible heat and dangerous radiation of the Sun. Crucially, Earth is the only planet with plentiful liquid surface water and an atmosphere rich in oxygen and nitrogen. This combination allows an estimated one hundred and thirty million different species of life to thrive.

179. Earth's orbit round the Sun puts it right in the middle of our Solar System's "habitable zone" where liquid water can exist on the surface of a suitable planet. The presence of large amounts of water on the surface makes life on Earth possible and shapes many of the planet's surface features. Temperature is also an important factor. Whereas Mercury is far too hot and Neptune is far too cold, our planet Earth has the perfect temperature for life to thrive.

180. Although Earth lies in the habitable zone, life here would still be impossible if it weren't for the atmosphere and the oceans. These hold on to heat, keeping the planet cool in daytime and warm at night. They also circulate heat from the warm Equator, which receives the most sunlight, to the poles, which receive the least. Earth's atmosphere and oceans ensure that temperatures vary by no more than about 100° C (180° F) anywhere on the planet (as compared with the airless Moon, where temperatures can vary by an extreme 300° C (540° F).

181. Earth's atmosphere is made up of nitrogen and oxygen, with a small but vital amount of carbon dioxide. Humans and animals breathe oxygen. Oxygen also forms an ozone layer that protects us against radiation from space. Carbon dioxide allows plants to survive and generate oxygen. Water from the oceans evaporates into the atmosphere where the vapour forms clouds. This moisture falls back to Earth as rain and snow. The balance between all these gases is incredibly delicate.

182. Before we contemplate the universe as a whole, let's focus on our own locality, namely, our world, the better to then appreciate our own place in this world, and let's see exactly how "random" all these things are.

183. How about this? "Almost all environments in the universe are terrible for life [as we know it]. It's only 'Garden of Eden' places like Earth where it can exist." (Donald C.

Brownlee, Astronomer, Chief Scientist, NASA's Stardust program, quoted in "Maybe we ***Are*** Alone in the Universe, After All," *"New York Times,"* 8 February, 2000, page D1.)

184. Let us elaborate a little on this last quote. Far from being merely "the third stone in orbit round a small sun …" our planet is unlike every other "stone" we know in the cosmos. It is a climate-controlled spaceship, racing through the vacuum of space at thousands of miles per hour. If Earth was slightly closer or slightly further from the Sun, humans could not live here — we would either freeze or burn. Yet we not only live — we live well and even thrive. Consider some of our planet's many extraordinary features, some of them listed above and only briefly summed-up here. Remember that these are all supposed to be random. Pure accident. No Designer, no Planner … and this is before evolution is supposed to have started!

- ❖ Perfect chemical elements for life.
  (See *"Nature's Destiny,"* by Michael Denton, for further elaboration of this point and of some others of these points.)
- ❖ Abundant natural resources.
- ❖ A convenient blanket of air to breathe and to keep our temperatures mild.
- ❖ An ozone layer in the atmosphere to keep out cosmic radiation.
- ❖ Geological conditions that particularly favour human life (almost as if the whole planet and everything on it was designed for the benefit of humans!)
- ❖ Killer comets and asteroids kept to a minimum due to the influence of nearby Jupiter which attracts these dangerous missiles away from this planet.
- ❖ It is just the optimum distance from the centre of the galaxy for heavy elements but minimal cosmic radiation.
- ❖ The orbit round the Sun is perfect to keep water liquid.
- ❖ There's a large moon at just the right distance to stabilize the tilt of the earth's axis.

185. The list could go on and on. So, could another planet with such a delicate balance of circumstances as ours exist in the universe, or are we alone? Well, the cosmos is unimaginably enormous. Yet despite the vastness, the Earth's extraordinary features have led some scientists to conclude that it is most unlikely that any other planet with complex life as we know it exists anywhere else in the universe. So, random?

186. And then life (in the shape of the amoeba) suddenly arose and started to "evolve" into the millions of different species — all completely randomly!

THE CASE OF THE UNUSED BRAIN

187. The Theory of Evolution preaches there is no Designer, no Planner, no Creator, no G-d — only "randomness." Everything developed randomly — "evolved" — in living creatures as they were needed: feathers in a creature wanting to become a bird; or a long snout for a creature that aspired to becoming an ant-eater; or a long neck if the donkey woke up one day and decided it was going to become a giraffe, for instance. Those lucky creatures that developed these extras, bred and proliferated, the others did not, and died out. But never did an organ develop in any creature which it did not need. Thus spake Evolution. Well then, the human brain poses one of the clearest contradictions to the Theory of Evolution. Listen to this:

188. The human brain is way beyond anything needed by anyone on earth. It contains around 100 billion neurons, each neuron with about a thousand connexions to other neurons. (Sorry, let's explain very briefly: A neuron, also known as a neurone or nerve cell, is an electrically excitable cell that processes and transmits information through electrical and chemical signals. These signals between neurons occur via synapses, specialized connections with other cells. Neurons are the core components of the brain and, as said, there are about 100 billion neurons in an average human brain.) It is estimated that even the greatest genius that has ever lived has used only about seven percent of the full capacity of the prodigious computational and memory capacity of the brain and the average person uses approximately three percent of the full capacity of his brain throughout his whole life. So, why, or how come, this sheer extravagance of over-capacity, at considerable cost to the rest of the body in its use of the body's resources? The human brain's very existence shouts out against this lie of organs developing only strictly according the needs of the species!

189. In recent years, there has been much agitation in the Halls of Academe about this "capacity of the brain" discussion. Recognizing what a blatant contradiction such a super-power of a brain is to the teachings of Darwin & Company, Evolutionists now try to play down this huge unused capacity of the human brain that is such a blatant contradiction to their theory. Most of the refutations are nothing more than a deft play of words. For instance, they point out that experiments and research show that at no time is ninety percent of the brain inactive or that there is no area in the brain that is completely "silent," the implication being that it's not true that only three percent (or seven percent or ten percent) of the brain is used. But nobody is saying that ninety percent of the brain is completely unused! Of course every part of the brain is used, it's just not used all the time. That is, when it is used, it's all used, yes, but way below full capacity, more than about ninety percent below capacity, in fact. The other refutations are the usual devious and quite nonsensical logic of the Evolutionists which goes something like this: Since a powerful brain (that is, with a capacity approximately ninety percent more than is needed) is such a useless consumer of physical resources and would contradict the teachings of Evolution, therefore, it cannot be that ninety percent of the full capacity of the brain is unused! That is, because the question disturbs the theory, the answer is that there must be no question. Good answer, no? And this, too, is

called science!? But whether the proportion of the capacity of the brain that is used is three percent, or seven percent, or ten percent, common experience shows that with proper exercise and training, brain power can be improved immeasurably and this does show that the capacity of the brain is way beyond what is necessary and thus contradicts a basic tenet of the Theory of Evolution.

190. But there are lots of other things that are wonderfully complicated which are not needed for the survival of the species and yet are present in human beings! In evolutionary terms they make no sense, yet they are there. Talk to an artist who has studied and practised his craft for years and who painstakingly produces exquisite paintings, a talent and skill that really serves no purpose in the survival of the species — talk to him about randomness!

191. Or music. Randomness? Talk to anyone who understands the genius of Mozart's music or Tchaikovsky's wonderfully talented orchestration and tell them that it all just came about by chance! Evolution preaches that everything just happened completely randomly (as to who started it all, see further) that if something accidentally turned out to be useful to the survival of the species then this lucky creature survived and bred and gave birth to more of its kind with the fortunate, random new change, and the other ones died out — "Survival of the fittest!" But if so, how come the wonder of music? Of what use is music, this extraordinarily complex and incredibly intricate, multi-faceted talent, to the survival of the human race? (Intriguing thought: According to Evolutionist dogma, everything evolved over millions of years from the amoeba. The greatest genius of a musical composer, the most talented and amazing musicians — all of them ultimately evolved (via monkeys, lungfish, worms, etc.) from that amoeba. So next time when you are at a concert and are enthusiastically applauding that thrilling performance of, let's say, Beethoven's Great Choral Symphony, look round for those dismal Evolutionists in the audience who, instead of applauding this example of Man's sublime, almost G-d-given great genius should, according to their theory, be standing there quite unmoved, thinking to themselves, "Not a bad performance by the random offspring of an amoeba!")

THE EYES HAVE IT

192. Let's move now from a talent or skill which is the result of in-born capability (or even inherent genius) but which must be developed and perfected through training and discipline and hard work. Let's move to a physical phenomenon that is perfect without any need for training or hard work and which flies in the face of the "randomness" of Evolution and is one of its most glaring contradictions: the human eye. You see, for the front part (the pupil, etc.) of the human eye to function at all, there has to be a retina. (That's the back of the eye on which the image falls. This image is then sent to the brain for instantaneous processing and interpretation.) If there's no retina, there's no point in having the pupil. On the other hand, without the pupil, there's not much point in having a retina with its two hundred million rods and cones (in each eye, that is). It's a bit like having one factory producing photographic film and another producing cameras. If there is no such thing as photographic film, there's no point in producing complicated cameras and if there is

no such thing as a camera, there's no point in manufacturing photographic film. (If you don't understand this, you might have to ask your grandfather to explain what things were like before digital cameras or mobile phones.) Now, these remarkable constructions, the eye and the retina, each of them a completely independent mechanism but only of any use if they work together, obviously shows that there's a Great Designer at work, Who knows exactly the workings of the front part of the eye and the workings at the back of the eye and that each component of the eye is to function in tandem with all the others. This is only one of the instances which shows the direct opposite of the randomness preached by the Theory of Evolution and shouts out in refutation, "Design!" Not only that, but these clearly designed components are repeated in other creatures, too. In other words, the mechanism of the front of the eye and the retina quite "randomly evolved" not only with human beings, which is wondrous enough, but this same arrangement of the front of the eye and the back of the eye all "just happened" again and again in various animals — all of these creatures just "randomly developed" their eye components separately which then happily "randomly" arranged themselves into one working arrangement. Individually, the front of the eye and the retina are quite useless, yet quite by chance, randomly and completely fortuitously, they came about by themselves and they happen to work together to an exactitude that is breathtaking. We won't speak here of the other kinds of eyes that exist in other creatures, like the compound eye of the fly, with approximately four hundred little windows per eye all working in tandem, all working in microseconds, allowing the instantaneous processing of information that the fly can use while in flight.

193. No wonder that Darwin said,

> "I remember well the time when the thought of the eye made me cold all over, but I have got over this stage of complaint and now small trifling particulars of structure often make me very uncomfortable. The sight of a feather in a peacock's tail, whenever I gaze at it, makes me sick!" (R. Lewin, *"Evolutionary Theory Under Fire," Science,* vol. 210, 21 November, 1980, page 883.)

194. And Thomas Henry Huxley chimed in, "A beautiful theory, killed by a nasty, ugly, little fact!" Or, as he put it (in his presidential address at the British Association, "Biogenesis and Abiogenesis" (1870) later published in *Collected Essays*, Vol. 8, page 229) — "The great tragedy of Science — the slaying of a beautiful hypothesis by an ugly fact!"

195. In his *"Origins,"* Chapter VI, Darwin has a section entitled "Organs of Extreme Perfection," which begins, "To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus for different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree."

He then goes on to state a few pages later that nevertheless this absurdity in the highest degree happened!

196. We, who recognize the great goodness of G-d Who grants us the gift of sight, we recite a blessing to Almighty G-d every morning on waking up, thanking Him for

the gift of sight. Any person with even an ounce of gratitude in his heart recognizes the great gift of sight and gives thanks for the ability to see. But Charles Darwin says, "The thought of the eye made me cold all over." Ugh! What an ugly mind! And I dare you to ask a man made blind by disease whether he thinks that the gift of eyesight is "an ugly fact"! As William Blake put it: "The tree that moves some to tears of joy is in the eyes of others only a green thing that stands in the way." (From a letter to the Rev. Dr. Trusler, 23 August 1799, quoted in Duncan Wu (*ed.*) in *Anthology of Romanticism* (Second Edition) Blackwell, Oxford (1998) page 114.)

ANY NEW SPECIES ?

197. Never has even a single new species been observed to evolve from another species. Never. Fact. The nearest hope that the preachers of Evolution can point to is that poor, overworked peppered moth. This little creature, the Evolutionists would have you believe, is the proof positive for the whole edifice of "Evolution." Why they don't press-gang the arctic fox and the snow leopard into their Evolution myth as well is anybody's guess. After all, these creatures, too, change the colour of their coats to fit in with the territory and weather conditions just as much as the peppered moth is supposed to have changed its colouration from matching with trees to blending-in with lamp-posts! That's how these creatures were created by the all-knowing G-d Who intended that they shall inhabit their particular habitats. He designed them that way! And He created the peppered moth to be able to change its colouration as the need arose. But instead of utilizing the beautiful and marvellous phenomena of G-d's creation to see everything as the Hand of G-d and to praise Him for His wonders, the ungrateful boors say, "Designer? What designer?" (In any case, please do read the above-mentioned *"Icons of Evolution"* by Jonathan Wells. He shows that the photographs of these differently-coloured peppered moths on their lamp posts — which are still being printed in university textbooks today! — are in fact carefully staged and arranged and not at all the natural photographs they are purported to be — the moths are dead and glued-on. Once again, Evolutionists are shown up to be shameless, blatant liars.)

NOT SO HONEST

198. Sad to say, Charles Darwin wasn't quite the honest-to-goodness scientist either. He pinched a lot of his ideas from a Welshman called Alfred Russell Wallace (1823 — 1913) who lived for a time in Australia and whose ideas were just as wacky as Darwin's. When Darwin saw that Wallace was about to publish his theory (the naîve fool had sent him a copy of his manuscript, asking him for his comments!) Darwin quickly sent his own manuscript round to the printer and neatly pipped him at the post. (See Desmond & Moore, Darwin (1991) page 438; Browne, Charles Darwin: Voyaging pages 537–46.) That's how it comes about that the picture on the British £10 note was of Charles Darwin and not of Alfred Russell Wallace. Not very nice, but what do you expect of a liar who tells you the biggest whopper of 'em all, that there's no Creator, that the world just happened all by itself and that different species all just happened by chance mutation, completely randomly?

199. According to Darwin, the giraffe got its long neck by stretching. But if so, there should be loads and loads of bones of intermediate-length-necked giraffes! In answer, Darwin said that in due course they would find the fossils which showed all the intermediate stages. (Since Darwin claimed that every single specimen of every single species all came about through Evolution and ***not*** through any Creation by G-d, we have to presume he meant ***all*** the intermediate stages not only of the giraffe but of each and every species that has "emerged.") But in a hundred and fifty years of scrabbling around in far-off lands looking for "evidence," there has not been found a single specimen which can prove any of these crazy ideas. Not one! The "fossil record" has been a "great disappointment." Ah yes, Evolutionists tell you, there ***were*** many but it would seem that they did not survive the ravages of time! O yea? Even if they can't be honest they should at least be consistent! Because if the skeleton of "Lucy," (what they call "half-ape half-woman" and which they point to as "evidence" for Evolution) can survive in the blistering heat of Africa for more than three million years (as they tell us it did) then at least ***some*** of the bones of the intermediate-length-necked giraffes should be found lying around, too. (From the entry in Wikipedia: "Lucy" is the common name of … several hundred pieces of bone representing about 40% of the skeleton of an individual *Australopithecus afarensis*. (As a matter of fact, they're the very old bones of a three-foot-high monkey.) The "Lucy" specimen was discovered in 1974 at Hadar in the Awash Valley of Ethiopia's Afar Depression. "Lucy" is estimated to have lived 3.2 million years ago. (End of quote.) And there must have been millions of these hopeful giraffes till this version "became the norm" yet not a single one of these giraffes-in-the-making has ever been seen. Nor any of the millions and millions of intermediate creatures between the shrew and the horse and the mouse and the elephant and the lizard and the bird and every single other species. Odd, no? Well, not really. There never were any short-necked giraffes — except in the wild imaginations of Wallace, Darwin & Co., that is. To paraphrase Winston Churchill, "Some theory, some neck!"

200. John Reader, the writer and photojournalist and author of a number of books including, *"Missing Links: the Hunt for Earliest Man"* (1981, Penguin 1988) in an article titled, *"Whatever Happened to Zinjanthropus?"* in *"New Scientist,"* (March 26, 1981, page 802) quite unpretentiously put it like this:

> "The entire hominid collection known today (sez I: he means all the "evidence" gathered from all over the world!) would barely cover a billiard table. Moreover, such fossils as are found are usually so fragmentary ("Lucy" is a rare exception) and in such ambiguous surroundings that many interpretations are possible."

End of quote. Well, thanks for being so candid!

TIME IN PERSPECTIVE

201. Let's consider the timescale that the Evolutionists say is needed for evolution to happen and for the world as we know it to have developed all by itself and completely by chance, that is, randomly. Since the Theory of Evolution was originally published, more and more complex wonders of the world have been

revealed and discovered and so the imagined timescale in which the myriads of species and all their wondrous phenomena all "developed" has had to be stretched to incredulous limits. Of course, nothing happens by itself and if something can't happen by itself then it can't happen by itself however long you wait. So stretching the timescale has got nothing to do with reality or fact. It's just so that Evolution (again: "everything happening by itself, by accident, by chance, randomly, from nothing") should sound less ridiculous and hopefully somewhat more plausible, that's why they stretch the timescale. That's why today they don't speak any more only of "millions of years." Now it's "billions of years," too. And there ***is*** a way that the insanity of Evolution can become the truth: "If you tell a lie often enough and loud enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it and you will even come to believe it yourself." (Now which Minister in charge of Information and Propaganda said that?)

202. As for evidence of these unimaginable, vast timescales, we have to bear in mind that nowhere in the world has there ever been found even a single artefact, not a single bone or fossil, not a tooth, not a cave painting, which can be dated and can be shown to be more than about five or six thousand years old — and there never will be. To be sure, there are cave paintings, said to be hundreds of thousands of years old and there are artefacts which are claimed to be tens of thousands of years old. But anyone can pluck a number out of the thin air and claim that a cave-painting is 40,000 years old. Or 140,000 years old for that matter. But to ***prove*** that anything dates back to any date beyond the five thousand and seven hundred years of the Torah — ***that*** nobody will ever be able to do. And it's not for lack of trying!

203. In any case, do these people realize what a million years ***is***? One million years is one hundred and sixty-six times six thousand. And yet they talk blithely of 140 million years, or 165 million years, or 180 million years — as if the sheer length of time can be a proof for what they claim. Remember the Rambam's warning: "He who wishes to tell you a lie will tell you that his witnesses are far away or that it all happened a long time ago!" (Rabbeinu Osher ben Yechiel, ["the Rosh"] (1250 — 1327) in Note 13 in his Commentary to the Sixth Chapter of Tractate Shevu'os of the Babylonian Talmud, quoted in the name of the Rambam ["Maimonides"] (1135 — 1204).)

204. So, "millions of years ago" are not enough. Now it needs ***billions*** of years! Again we have ask, do these people have any idea of what a billion years ***is***? Even assuming the American usage of the word, that is, a thousand times a million, do any of these people have any inkling of what these stretches of time mean? Take it slowly, let it register properly. One million years is a thousand times a thousand years, and a billion years is a thousand times that. (The English meaning of "a billion" is a million times a million.) To put things in perspective, please remember that all the recorded history of the world till today that can be dated and verified (we are not speaking here of silly pretend numbers just taken from the thin air) — all the verifiable, dated history from every corner of the globe, everything that has ever happened on this planet, has all happened within the last six thousand years. Search out and consider the whole panorama of all of the world's history stretching

way back till the mists of antiquity, scrutinize the events, dissect all the ages that have passed, all the happenings, all the discoveries and inventions, all the dynasties of kings and emperors, all the empires, all the towns and civilizations, all the wars and catastrophes, all the development and progress of the human race, and you will find that not even a single item, not a single event, can be clearly dated to beyond six thousand years. Despite the best efforts of the palæontologists and the archaeologists world-wide ***there never has been found and there never will be found*** anything that can be shown to go back more than approximately five thousand, seven hundred years! And yet they talk of millions and billions of years!? Cummon! Be normal!

205. ("Palæontology" is the study of extinct organized beings. "Archaeology" is the study of antiquities. It is up to the palæontologist and archaeologist to find out all about what has been dug out from the ground, to date it, to place it in its historical context and this, of course, is invariably going to be a matter of interpretation. Things dug out from the ground are facts; the date when they were made or used or the circumstances of their use, these are interpretation. Things dug out from the ground rarely have a date on them and it goes without saying that there are often very sharp differences of opinion between the experts about things excavated.)

THE MONKEYS AND THE TYPEWRITERS

206. The study of mathematics has advanced greatly in recent years. Today we have powerful computers that can do phenomenal number-crunching that in the past would have taken years. This all has helped to dispel some silly fables. For instance, that famous fiction that, given enough years, hundreds of monkeys, pounding away on typewriters "would produce the complete works of Shakespeare" has been shown to be utter rubbish. Of course, it's only a parable and they mean to say that given enough time anything can happen randomly. But if so, it's simply a lie. Even the imagery itself, besides being ridiculous, is false. You want to prove that if thousands of mindless monkeys (or mad Evolutionists, for that matter) can produce the works of Shakespeare by randomly bashing around on typewriters, then the world with all its wonderful and amazing design and function can also come about randomly. "Randomly," you say? O, yea? Leaving aside for a moment the questions of where these monkeys come from and how are they going to be supplied with all their needs and how are they going to be kept at their posts and where the typewriters come from and how are they going to be serviced and where is the supply of paper going to come from — how random is any of this? — it's now been shown that even ***millions*** of years wouldn't be enough time to randomly produce a few sonnets, never mind the full works of Shakespeare. So they did the sums again and had to extend the fiction to many more millions (monkeys or years — it's not clear) but even then, the arithmetic doesn't hold true. And this is supposed to answer how the world and the universe and everything came into existence rather than that G-d created it. Do me a favour!

207. There are hundreds of examples of wondrous and amazing phenomena that shout out, "Design!" And where there's design there's a designer — fact. On the other hand, the main plank of Evolution is that there is no G-d, there is no Creator, there

is no Designer, that everything has come about randomly, by chance, without any input by G-d. As soon as you admit that G-d had even a tiny little bit of a hand in creation, then logically you might as well accept that He created everything, too. If they invent a Theory of Evolution to deny the existence of G-d, because, they tell us, G-d the Creator "is not scientific," then it just doesn't make sense to concede that, yes, G-d started everything but He then let everything "evolve" randomly and by chance. There cannot be a little bit of G-d being the Creator, just to start the ball rolling, so to speak, and then everything is by accident, random, chance (like some confused people want to say *(see Paragraph 212 below)* because this is as self-contradictory and as silly as speaking of "Jewish atheism" or "Jewish paganism." (G-d starting things is the Jewish bit; Evolution is the atheism / paganism bit.) You see, it's either that everything came about through design and Designer, that is, G-d did it, or that everything — from the very beginning and right through to every single little teeny-weeny bit till today — came about completely by chance and in utter randomness — ***and*** with the question of how did it all start still unanswered. There's no two ways about it.

208. One of the problems encountered in debunking the so-called Theory of Evolution is that it is extremely difficult to think of anything ridiculous enough to compare it to. (As Lord Kelvin, quoted above *(Paragraph 40)* expressed it: "The atheistic idea is so nonsensical that I cannot put it into words.") There is simply nothing that one can think of which is so crazy and untrue that one should be able to say, "Would you believe such-and-such? Well, the Theory of Evolution is even more impossible!" But it becomes especially exasperating when the madness is dressed up as science and is given a veneer of respectability and scholarship. With constant and persistent propaganda and with the help of high-fallutin' language, the madness is made to sound sane till it is accepted as if it was true — for it is spoken by "scientists." In the face of the relentless barrage of lies, normal, sensible people find it difficult to hold on to their sanity. But it was always thus and people would do well to recall those memorable words by the Roman orator and philosopher ("philosopher" of those times is the equivalent of today's "scientist") Marcus Tullius Cicero (106 — 43 BCE) in his *"De Divinatione"* (Book II, Chapter LVIII, sec. 119): "nihil absurde dici potest quod non dicatur ab aliquot philosophorum." (For those not so at home with Latin: "There is nothing so absurd that it has not been said by some of the philosophers.") Yet it is precisely because of the noisy liars that it is so important to persistently proclaim the truth and return the world to sanity. At the same time as restating the truth, it will also reassure rational, normal people that no, the world is not populated only by certified, university-educated lunatics.

THE CLASSIC RESPONSE

209. There is the famous story of the non-believer who came before Rabbi Akiva and said to him: "Who created the world?" Rabbi Akiva told him: "G-d created the world!" Said the non-believer, "Prove it to me!" Said Rabbi Akiva to him, "And who made your robe?" Said he, "The weaver!" Said Rabbi Akiva, "Did you see him make it? Prove it!" Said the non-believer, "No, I did not see him make it. But the robe itself proves that the weaver made it!" Said Rabbi Akiva, "Exactly! And in the

same way that your robe proves that there is a weaver and the house proves that there is a builder, so, too, does the world prove that there is a Creator!" (Quoted in "Essay on Faith," by Rabbi Elchonnon Wasserman (born in Birz, Belarus in 1875 and murdered in Kovno by the Germans in 1941) in his *"Collected Essays,"* from the Midrash Temurah in Midrash Aggaddos Berayshis and see also the *"Book of Aggaddah,"* (Hebrew) pages 6 — 7.) (Incidentally, as Rabbi Akiva lived over two thousand years ago, this goes to show again that non-belief in G-d the Creator is an old disease and we have mentioned the ancient Greeks and their materialistic philosophy. "Darwinism" or "Evolution" is the same materialistic philosophy, only masquerading as science. In fact, Richard Dawkins, one of today's high priests of Evolution, says, "Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist." Exactly! and thank you, Mr Dawkins! I couldn't have put it better myself! But atheism is not science, is it?

210. Then there's the story of the non-believer who claimed that the world made itself. (A variation on the same theme of non-belief in G-d the Creator.) To which the Rabbi countered that that made about as much sense as someone declaring that he spilled a bottle of ink by mistake over some parchment and the result was the beautifully-penned poem. And so on and so forth. (See Chapter 6 of the *"Shaar HaYichud"* of *"Duties of the Heart"* by Rabbi Bachya ibn Pakuda (*c.* 1080).) (This story has been plagiarised by various clergymen too, so remember that you heard it here first!)

211. "People are now intimidated into silence, with a single perspective of thought being brutally enforced and no dissension or disagreement being allowed." So said Matthew Gagnon, the Chief Executive Officer of the Maine Heritage Policy Center, on 9 August 2017. Today's liberal anti-religion propaganda juggernaut has steamrollered itself into all spheres of modern life so that all kinds of abominations and disgusting lifestyles are encouraged and protected by new laws and are even promoted by the media and perverted political "leaders" and churchmen who should know better, with any criticism and opposition reserved almost exclusively for lambasting religion and those moral values which have their basis in the Bible and in the sacred wisdom of the ages. The idolatry of Evolution is the main plank of the secular anti-G-d society of today who scream and holler against anyone who dares to say that G-d created the universe.

212. The madness of Evolution has taken such a hold on the whole of the Western world that even self-respecting and otherwise sane people, and sometimes even Torah-observant Jewish scientists (but who are themselves products of the modern Western education system, *see Paragraphs 61 — 66 above*) try to squeeze this current "science" to fit-in with the very verses of the Torah itself. Some excuse this silliness, saying that these scientists are frightened to reject Evolution out of hand because that will lead to their being ostracized by the scientific community to the extent that they will be out of a job (sadly, this is true) and that's why they try to synthesize the two, G-d and Evolution. They pretend that Evolution is the method that G-d used to bring the myriads of species into existence; that Evolution is the "G-d said, 'Let there be …'" They claim that G-d created the universe and the world and everything in it, yes, but the way He made all the estimated one hundred and

thirty million different species of plants and animals — including us humans — was by means of Evolution. "A valiant attempt to avoid a head-on collision with the scientific spirit of the day" trying "to preserve their connexion to the academic world." Perhaps. But I say to these "religious" scientists, "Where is the courage of your convictions?"

213. Thomas Huxley, the great supporter of Darwin (we've mentioned him before) revealed his detestation for the Bible (and his Jew-hatred) when he wrote: "The myths of paganism [he means the Hebrew Bible] are as dead as Zeus and the man who should revive them in opposition to the knowledge of our time would be justly laughed to scorn . . . In the 19th century, the cosmogony (he means, "the theory of the creation of the universe") of the semi-barbarous Hebrew is the opprobrium of the orthodox . . . The doctrine of special creation [of each species] owes its existence very largely to the supposed necessity of making science accord with the Hebrew cosmogony." (As we've said before *(Paragraphs 22 — 26)* it's not science that contradicts the Bible, it's ***scientists***. Clearly, it is the hateful Huxleys of this world who have made out as if there has to be conflict between the Bible and science.) So it is rather silly to try to reconcile the irreconcilable and squeeze into the Bible the fables of the Big Bang, of Evolution, of the End of the Dinosaurs and various other fairy tales, just so as to keep in with the scientific community. Methinks that Eliyahu HaNovvi would have something to say to these vacillators, wouldn't he? "How long will you go limping, resting first on one foot and then on the other, following the one opinion and then following the other?"

214. It's even more serious than that. Besides the absurdity of trying to bring together the two clashing dichotomies, this kind of botching means that the elevating and powerful truths that are taught in the Torah are reduced to nothing more than fanciful interpretations and a pretence, a veneer of moral teachings merely imposed on the cold "fact" that all things happened all by themselves, without G-d being the moral force Who made it all with the intention to teach His sentient creatures His values. As the Evolutionists portray things, G-d is out of it. So even if you recognize G-d as the Creator and you just mean to accommodate Evolution into your religion without accepting it as fact, this makes no sense! How can you speak of human beings being created in the Image of G-d if at the same time you say that man is descended from apes and this came about by itself, randomly, by accident?

215. Three questions: Number one: The Bible says that everything came into existence when "G-d said …", that is, that Creation was a direct act of G-d. (Or utterance of G-d, if you wish.) Why swap this direct creation by G-d for some vague, nonsensical never-seen fantasy of things happening by themselves just so as to fit-in with this madness?

216. Second question: The mechanics of Evolution are simply not true. No species has ever been seen to evolve into a different species; it never happened in the past and has never been seen to happen at any time or in any place since then. So why reduce the words of the Bible to silly and unverifiable myth with the knock-on effect that the rest of the Bible as a whole is likewise reduced to a myth?

217. And the third question: What sense is there in trying to squeeze the Theory of Evolution, which denies G-d as the Creator, into G-d's Bible? It's so stupid to even talk of a reconciliation between the two! The Torah teaches that G-d created the world and everything and that we are to acknowledge Him and serve Him. The Theory of Evolution (though, as said, Darwin wasn't the first) was originally promulgated with the sole intention to deny the existence of G-d the Creator. It teaches that everything came about by itself, randomly, without G-d. No Creator, no purpose, no accounting, no reward or punishment. So where's the sense in squeezing this denial of G-d into the very Torah that teaches that G-d created everything and that everything and everybody is accountable to Him? Can't these well-meaning vacillators see that it doesn't make sense to try to accommodate in the Torah itself the denial of the primary teaching of the Torah, namely that G-d is the Creator?

218. As said, maybe it's because these people don't want to appear out-of-step with the scientific establishment or maybe because they don't want to be branded as "unscientific" that they don't reject Evolution outright and instead play around with the words of the Torah. (Or maybe they just want to hold on to their jobs.) Some of them suggest, for instance, that the "Days of Creation" in the Torah don't mean twenty-four-hour-long days but "ages" or "aeons" and that these might well be millions of years each! Or, they say, Why shouldn't the Big Bang (about which there will be more shortly) be the "In the beginning G-d created the heavens and the earth"?

219. (By the way, it is often these very same people who also "explain" the nine-hundred-odd years' lifespan of the first generations of Man as being "shorter periods of time, something like a month or two" because they cannot believe that the first generations lived such long lives. This, of course, leads to the ridiculous dichotomy: "Days" means millions of years yet just a few columns later, "years" means months! But they can't be so cavalier with the Word of G-d! Just because their little minds can't grasp what it says in the Torah or because the words of the Torah tell them something that is outside their limited experience, or just because of this week's scientific theory, they want to chop and change the word of G-d! They claim that they want to make G-d's Torah acceptable and up-to-date but — on the contrary! — with their acrobatics and silly antics, they bring the Torah into ridicule! Tell 'em, "Don't do G-d no favours!") What is so sad is that they don't have the courage of their innermost convictions to proclaim clearly that the Torah is true and that Evolution is a travesty!

220. Those people who "reinterpret" the words of the Torah explain that as the Sun was not placed in its position in the sky till the fourth day, therefore during the Six Days of Creation of the first chapter of the Torah, the words, "And it was evening and it was morning, . . ." — at least referring to the first three days — cannot mean an ordinary evening and morning. These first days of Creation, therefore, they say, might very well mean ages or eons, each of which could be millions of years. (Or billions of years, depending, I suppose, on what scientists are saying this week.)

221. But this is so wrong! The Torah is not intended to be a science text book. The Torah is addressed to us as "earthlings" and such natural phenomena as are

described in the Torah are generally described from the viewpoint of us for whom the Torah is intended, and we are inhabitants of Planet Earth. For instance, Scripture speaks of the Sun rising and the Sun setting when we know full well that the un does nothing of the sort — it's a manner of speaking that is appropriate to us. As the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Brochos, 31B puts it: "The Torah speaks in the language of man." In this instance, where the literal meaning poses logistical difficulties (that is, if there's no sun in place, how can there be day and night?) we nevertheless understand that often the Torah describes natural phenomena for the moral or religious lessons they teach, not for the scientific reality *per se*. In this instance, the description is to teach us that G-d created the heavens and the earth and all the universe within Six Days of Creation and that we are to commemorate this and testify to this fact by keeping Shabbos as commanded by G-d in His Torah. To explain some of the Six Days of Creation as varying and indeterminate periods of millions of years just so as not to appear to the scientific fraternity as "unscientific" would tear apart the connexion of the account of Creation with the weekly Shabbos and would help to negate the lessons of Shabbos.

222. Another thing: Those people who slavishly follow the latest fads of the scientific fraternity and, so as to please the academicians of the day are prepared to twist the meaning of the Scriptures so that they can fit-in with the latest theories — what are they going to do with those verses of the Torah when those theories are thrown out? Will those verses of Scripture also have to be thrown out as wrong because they were so stubbornly and misguidedly identified with those theories that are now acknowledged as wrong? How stupid will those people look then! Far from doing anyone any favours for bringing the Torah up-to-date with the current scientific thinking, these people have made the Torah look transient and fickle, or ambiguous and pretty much whatever you want it to mean.

223. The Torah of G-d Almighty, even though it speaks using the language and idioms of man (as just said) nevertheless is the Word of G-d and G-d speaks in His Own style. Any sensible person understands that a poet who waxes lyrical about a beautiful sunset or about the waves of the sea will describe what he sees differently to how a meteorologist sees the weather or a fisherman sees the sea and will respect that difference. I would have thought that the Word of G-d deserves at least as much respect and understanding and should not be twisted just so as to fit-in with the scientific theory or the materialistic philosophy of the day.

224. No, sir! Leave the Torah in its great aloofness. It is the Word of G-d. In its moral teachings and in its laws, as well as in the way the Torah describes natural phenomena, it is way above the petty little theories and small thinking of any human and it is silly and puerile to twist the words of Holy Writ to fit-in with the theories of the passing moment — especially as those theories set out to deny G-d the Creator.

225. In any case, it has to be remembered that not only is the Theory of Evolution only a theory, but it is a theory with which a great many people, all over the world and of great diverse backgrounds and cultures, vehemently disagree. There have indeed been attempts by people from the scientific community itself to question the Theory of Evolution. Some of them question the theory on religious grounds, that is, they

recognize that the theory denies G-d the Creator, but some of the challenges are by scientists who even claim to be atheists who object to the Theory of Evolution simply on the grounds that it's plain nonsensical and that there's no proof. (Spare a pitying thought for those people: they can't bring themselves to believe in G-d the Creator but nor do they believe that everything just popped into existence by itself. Yet the universe and the world and we ourselves are all here! Poor fellows! They don't know ***what*** to believe!) Nevertheless, generally these challengers who rise up against Charlie's theory are all marginalized by the mainstream "intellectuals" of today's scientific community. Anyone who challenges the classical Darwinist thinking is out in the dog-house. Nevertheless, with all that, the challengers are gaining ground. They write books and — horror of horrors! — these books are published! (You see, text-books are the backbone of most established academic publishing houses but not all publishing houses publish science text-books. So these publishing houses can't be threatened by the universities or their professors that their text books will be taken off the "required reading" lists of their students. That's how it comes about that some publishing houses are not scared to offend the scientific establishment.)

226. A small selection of such books would include the following: *"Darwin's Black Box"* by Michael Behe; *"Evolution in Crisis"* by Michael Denton and another by the same writer called *"Nature's Destiny."* (Interesting title, that! The self-contradiction in the title seems in fact to be the burden of the writer's message, even though he says it's not.) There is *"The Neck of the Giraffe or Where Darwin Went Wrong"* by Francis Hitching and there are lots more, too. One of the best-written books that is a good deal more recent than those is, *"Icons of Evolution — Science or Myth? Why much of what we teach about evolution is wrong"* by Jonathan Wells, Ph.D., which has been mentioned already. We won't include in this list the overtly religious books because we mean to arrive at the truth not so much through religious argument as by simple, sensible, scientific methods of enquiry and debate. The result of this honest investigation will of course be that everything is designed and created by G-d, the Supreme Almighty, purely because there can be no other true answer to the question, "How did everything come about?" Obviously that answer has religious consequences for humanity, as is briefly set out at the beginning of this essay, but we are trying to keep overt religion out of it. Nevertheless, besides the books by secular scientists, we would recommend also the books by Rabbi Avigdor Miller, despite his being a Rabbi. This is simply because they're very good books and well-argued and his logic is backed up by sensible science — real science, that is. Anyone who wants to know the truth is earnestly recommended to read his books and listen to his tapes and then make up their own mind. Also useful are those books written by Evolutionists of one kind who bash against Evolutionists of another kind. You see, generally they know the truth about the opposite fellow's theory really well. So when these people lock horns, you'd better be around to hear each side explaining the lies of the other! They know what they're talking about! And of course the Internet has become a lively marketplace of ideas which the scientific establishment cannot control and where you can find some very good and knowledgeable refutations of Darwin's theory and related myths.

AND NOW — THE INQUISITION IN REVERSE !

227. Yet with all that, the lie of Darwinism (as mentioned before, now often called "neo-Darwinism") is brazenly taught as science, with Evolution proclaimed as a fact. Here's part of a news item titled, "Ban teaching creationism, say academics" in *"The Daily Mail"* of 19 September 2012 by Fiona MacRae, Science Correspondent:

228. The teaching of creationism should be outlawed in school science lessons, Sir David Attenborough and other leading scientists have said.

229. And the curriculum should be changed to ensure evolution is taught from when children start school.

230. The group behind the call for "evolution not creationism" which also includes Professor Richard Dawkins, say teaching that G-d created the world is dangerous and must be prevented by law.

231. Drives by creationist groups at schools mean there is a sense of urgency, they add.

232. Professor Dawkins, a geneticist and author of *"The G-d Delusion,"* said last night: "We need to stop calling evolution a theory. It is as solidly demonstrated as any fact."

233. O, my! These people must be really desperate if they start calling for a law to stop teaching about G-d the Creator! Looks like they know that they've lost the argument, no? Would they advocate that a teacher who insists on teaching Creation should not only be dismissed from his post (this has happened) or, if he persisted, even sent to prison? Wow! The Inquisition in reverse! Before threatening to outlaw (and punish?) people for teaching that G-d is the Creator, Richard Dawkins and David Attenborough should remember that Confucius, him say: "He who raises his fist first has lost the argument." The trouble is that the secular tail is now wagging the whole dog: as mentioned before *(see Paragraph 55, above)* the Office of Standards in Education (appointed by the United Kingdom government to oversee standards in all schools) now insists that Evolution must be taught even in faith schools — despite that these schools were set up by these faith communities — at great expense and effort — precisely to shield their children from the G-dlessness that is rampant in the wider broken secular society.

234. (The recently arrived television gardener Carol Klein presents a very informative programme all about the world's plants but she spoils it all by her irritating and unnatural enthusiasm for Evolution. In this, she is like Attenborough, who has put together some wonderful films about the natural world from lots of film footage shot by others and then skilfully edited them but who then goes on to spoil these top-class films by his silly obsession with Evolution. Klein, who seems to have taken it upon herself to be the ageing Attenborough's heir and successor, with her mimicking Attenborough's trademark waving of hands and rolling of shoulders, also insists on spoiling her otherwise very interesting films with her quite gratuitous preaching of Evolution. Of course, the television companies play a vital part in brainwashing their viewers with the secular religion of Evolution and that's why the Attenboroughs and Kleins are promoted so heavily.)

ABOUT FORWARD EXTRAPOLATION AND BACKWARD EXTRAPOLATION

235. Whenever new holes are punched in their theory, Evolutionists use various tricks and tactics to shore it up. One tactic is to just change the timescale of the theory. For example, when they do the sums and realize (or other realists point out for them) that for evolution to produce the estimated one hundred and thirty million different species of plant and animal life it would need a much longer time than anything put forward before because the world and its species couldn't arrive at their present state within the original timescale (as mentioned above) the high priests of the religion of Evolution simply expand the timescales backwards so that there is more time in which evolution can have happened. (It doesn't prove that Evolution is true, of course, but it just pretends that there is more time in which it can have happened.)

236. Working things out forwards is pretty straightforward. For example, on the first line on a sheet of paper there is a line of numbers which reads, "2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18." The rest of the page is blank except that at the bottom right hand corner you've got the number, "2000." There is enough blank space on the page for the numbers to continue from that first line of all the way down till that "2000." There's no actual proof that that's how the number 2000 came about, but it's a reasonable assumption. This is called "extrapolation" and this is simple "forward extrapolation."

237. Imagine, however, you've just got the number "6000" at the end of a sheet of paper. There's no way of knowing how that number was arrived at. There's no first line starting "1, 2, 3, 4," or "2, 4, 6, 8, 10," or anything. In fact, there's no real indication whether or not this is the first page of a series or the only page. You now try to work out from what you have on the page, the "6000," the sequence of numbers that produced the 6000. This, too, is extrapolation but this is called "backward extrapolation." In our example, you try to work out retrospectively how something (the 6000) happened from what you have here in front of you (a blank page). You have "6000" but what went before? Well, you ***could*** assume that the beginning of the sequence started with "2, 4, 6, 8, 10" because you fancy that you've seen that kind of sequence somewhere before. But it's still only a guess and you haven't even considered adding and then subtracting, or multiplication, or any other possibilities, all of which are

238. just as valid. To assert that it must have started with "2, 4, 6, 8, 10" and so on, and to assert further that there must have been many pages before this one, and to say confidently how many pages — this is not merely extrapolation. It's "backward extrapolation," a rather posh term for what is plain guesswork. To add millions, and hundreds of millions, and even billions of years to the timescale to explain how the world that we know and its millions of different species of plants and living creatures all came about is likewise backward extrapolation. Not science.

239. We are here. That's the "6000" at the bottom of the page. Science — sorry, not "science" but those ***scientists*** who don't want to accept that G-d is the Creator — tell us how we got here, with these scientists claiming that they can work it out backwards. As said, that's backward extrapolation. And it's not science.

AND NOW FOR THE "BIG BANG"

240. Today, the "great debate" is not so much about Evolution. Owing to the aggressive propaganda of the secular world of today and its materialistic philosophy, Evolution is a given! The debate is rather about the timescale within which Evolution is supposed to have occurred — ***that*** is the question. You see, it started to dawn on some of these people that if something can be measured, in its entirety or in part, physically or in duration, then there must be a beginning somewhere. (Rabbi Bachya ibn Pakuda, in his *"Duties of the Heart"* said exactly this almost a thousand years ago but these people wake up slow.) So now, in answer to the really big question, "But how did it all start?" came the new answer: "With the Big Bang!" And ***when*** did it all start? Well, pretty much whenever you want! You say you need a billion years for Evolution to have brought us to here? Okay! The Big Bang happened a billion years ago. You say you need two billion years? No problem! The Big Bang happened two billion years ago. No, make that ten billion! Fourteen billion! If you need more, just come back and we'll see what we can do for you. You can make it that the Big Bang happens whenever you want! So let's try to understand this Big Bang farce, currently one of the foundation stones on which Evolution is based. I'll try to keep it simple but it goes something like this.

241. Fourteen billion years ago (I think that's this week's number — it keeps on changing but that's the most recent revision I've heard although I'm sure I've seen a figure of sixty-five billion years somewhere) anyway, fourteen billion years ago, the story goes, (remember the Rambam: "He who wants to tell you a lie will tell you that it happened a long time ago or that his witnesses are far away . . ." *(see Paragraph 203, above)* two teeny-weeny cute little specks of matter, ***each one smaller than an atom***, were floating happily in space, each one minding its own business when suddenly — ***WHAM!*** — they crashed into each other with a stupendous smash. This collision released an incredible amount of matter and energy in an unbelievably short fraction of time and from that collision, the whole universe exploded into existence and started to expand. That is, the universe and all its billions and billions of galaxies of stars and all those stars' planets and all those planets' moons (including, obviously, our own solar system which revolves round our own Sun — and our Sun is only a medium-sized star, by the way — and our own planet Earth — ***everything!*** — suddenly exploded into existence. After this initial Big Bang, all the humungous clumps of stuff and matter (which they tell us was also incredibly hot, incidentally) started to arrange themselves into the aforementioned galaxies of stars and planets and moons. Each of these galaxies simply decided to go and find its own place in the universe. (After the Big Bang, things were rather cramped, it would seem, and they thought that the suburbs are more pleasant than the town centre.) So they all — without exception, mind! and quite unanimously — started to expand away towards the outer regions of space, some spinning this-a-way and some (quite mischievously and in complete disregard for the laws of nature!) spinning that-a-way. Please don't ask at what speed this expansion happened because you won't believe it! *(Paragraphs 246 and 247, below.)* Hence, "the expanding universe." Let's leave this expanding universe for a moment and focus on our own little neighbourhood in our galaxy called the Milky Way. The Milky Way, too, started to expand from where the Big Bang dumped it

till it found itself where it is today. And it's all still expanding, they tell us. Vast distances do play tricks on observable light and that is probably what prompts some scientists to speak of an expanding universe and so on. But it's a weird kind of stable, non-observable expansion that doesn't seem to affect us too much because no-one has really noticed any major changes in our Milky Way or in our own solar system which would show any expansion happening. As far as our own solar system is concerned, all we can see is that our planet Earth and all the other relatively local planets sort of locked on to our Sun and became our solar system and this solar system seems pretty stable and remarkably predictable.

242. Anyhow, that event, this collision of the two specks, is called "the Big Bang" and they ***know*** that this is what happened because they can do the arithmetic. (Alright, it's only extrapolation, and backward extrapolation at that, but they can do the sums with a fair degree of accuracy, they tell us. Don't argue!) In any case, from this whole caboodle came the universe, the world, everything. All from that tremendous collision of those cute little specks, remember, and all by itself, you understand. Got all that? Good! You now know the Big Bang, which is Part One. We will pause a moment before we go on to Part Two.

243. Question: Why should this make more sense and be considered more "scientific" than the received wisdom that G-d Almighty created everything in one instant, *ex nihilo* (meaning, "from nothing") and that He then ordered everything into place and this all makes up our completed universe and our world and everything? I mean, two little sub-atomic specks is as near as you can get to nothing, I would have thought. So if you're talking science and rationality, there's precious little difference between the account of creation *ex nihilo* by G-d Almighty on the one hand and the Fable of the Two Specks, on the other, no? They're both unbelievable so why believe the fable rather than the received tradition? Answer: True, they are both not rational and they're both not really science (that is, nobody saw either Creation or the Big Bang and nobody can duplicate either Creation or the Big Bang) but the Fable of the Two Specks is better because it doesn't acknowledge that G-d is the Creator — and that G-d is the Creator must be avoided at any cost!

244. Come to think of it, if I was trying to describe Creation *ex nihilo* in scientific terms but painstakingly avoiding any mention of G-d the Creator, you tell me if I could come up with something better than the following three paragraphs. These are taken from *"The Way the Universe Works"* published by Dorling Kindersley (who else?) written by eminent science writers Robin Kerrod and Giles Sparrow. Robin Kerrod was a former winner of the COPUS (Committee on the Public Understanding of Science) Junior Science Book Prize and was a major contributor to the Dorling Kindersley "Science Encyclopedia." Giles Sparrow has been a professional writer since graduating from Imperial College, London. He has written extensively for adults and children on topics ranging from astrophysics to palæontology and was a major contributor to Dorling Kindersley's "Space Encyclopedia." (This is the stuff that our youngsters are brought up on to make them happy and stable-minded members of our modern secular society.) Anyhow, here are the excerpts — they're on page 142. I haven't changed a single word.

245. The moment when the universe began is known as the Big Bang. About 14 billion years ago, space and time were born in a tiny, condensed speck, which was smaller than an atom and almost infinitely hot and dense. A few trillionths of a second later, the infant Universe exploded with unimaginable violence and began to expand in a fireball of such concentrated energy that matter spontaneously started to appear. It's meaningless to ask where the Big Bang happened, or what came before it. There was no "where", because space did not exist. There was no "before" because time had not begun to flow.

246. Fuelled by the release of the fundamental forces, the Universe suddenly inflated. It doubled in size every ten quadrillion quintillionths of a second.

247. IN THE BEGINNING Scientists cannot answer the question of what triggered the Big Bang in the first place. That may always remain a mystery. We can use the laws of physics to trace the history of the Universe back to a fraction of a second after the Big Bang, but these laws do not apply in the extreme conditions that existed at the very instant of creation. Trillionths of a second after the first moment, the temperature dropped to about 10,000 trillion trillion degrees and energy transformed into particles of matter. This became the future building material of stars, planets, and galaxies.

That's it. End of quote.

248. (A quadrillion is a million trillionths; and a quintillion is a million quadrillionths. A trillionth, of course, is a million billionths — but you knew that one already, didn't you? These are parts of a second, you understand. By the way, is there anybody out there who can tell me if there's the slightest difference between ten quadrillion quintillionths of a second and nine quadrillion quintillionths of a second? What kind of baloney is this?)

249. This is science? I ask you, can you keep a straight face when reading this? And now listen to this: The Big Bang idea began with Georges Henri Joseph Édouard Lemaître (1894 — 1966) a Belgian priest, astronomer and professor of physics at the Catholic University of Leuven. He it was who proposed the theory of the expansion of the universe which is widely misattributed to Edwin Hubble and he it was who also proposed what became known as the Big Bang theory of the origin of the Universe. (He called it his "hypothesis of the primeval atom" or the "Cosmic Egg.") Lemaître originally thought that the mass from which the whole universe exploded was "no more than a few light years in diameter." ("A few" at the very least would have to be two light years, which is about twelve trillion miles across.) By 1965, that figure was reduced to 275 million miles across. By 1972, it had reduced to 71 million miles across. By 1974, to 54,000 miles. By 1983, to a trillionth of the diameter of a proton. And then to nothing at all … This singularity, this marvel, was supposed to have exploded in the Big Bang … *(See Paragraph 246, above.)* Multiple billions of years later it had produced everything in the universe, including Lewis Carroll's famous "shoes and ships and sealing wax and cabbages and kings." (Compare Isaac Asimov, *"The Universe"* (second edition, Walker, (1971) page 211.)

250. In comparison to this utter drivel, I maintain that the majestically simple opening words of the Bible, "In the beginning, G-d created the heavens and the earth" are the most rational and sensible narrative! (Besides being the truth.) But oh, no! They must not admit of G-d the Creator! (Mind you, they come pretty close to it. Did you notice the word "creation" in that lot? (It was in Paragraph 247.) Admittedly with a small "c" — so, not "Creation," true — but it's there!)

251. Okay, lets continue: Part Two: As said, a few billion years after that Big Bang, one fine afternoon, life suddenly and randomly appeared on this planet (later called Earth) in the form of a single-celled live creature called an amoeba. (It looks posher when it's written "amœba.") How did this happen? Well, they're still scrabbling around for an answer to that. After all, never, ever have any kind of life-forms been observed to come from inorganic materials like gases and rocks, even when those gases are shot through with constant electric shocks to simulate lightning (as was done in a contrived "experiment" some time ago). (Random? Hardly!) (And see *"Icons of Evolution"* for the truth about that "experiment," by the way!) But don't let that puzzle you. Especially when you hear what is supposed to have happened next! Which was this: From this single-celled creature, all the forms of living creatures, ranging from the smallest maggot to the 100-ton whale: all fishes, all insects, all mammals, all birds, and — very important, this — all human beings, all evolved from that little amoeba — and all completely randomly. So, to cut a very, ***very*** long story short, through the Big Bang and the following evolution, here we are today. Thus spake the Evolutionist scientists. Clear?

252. But hey! Hang in there a moment! I have a question! Where did those two sweet little specks of matter come from? You remember, the ones that smashed into each other and made a big bang and expanded into our universe and our world and everything, with seas and mountains and trees and fishes and insects and animals and humans — ? Where did those two specks come from? (Or, if it was simply the one speck that suddenly exploded, as Robin Kerrod and Giles Sparrow now tell us, where did that speck come from?) And the answer? "That's not a scientific question!"

253. So there we have it! When we tell people the sensible and rational (but perhaps not so comfortable) truth that G-d Almighty created the world, the universe and everything, including you and me, the Evolutionist men of science in their white coats (or, more likely, in their sweaters and jeans) look disapprovingly at you down their noses and over their half-glasses and scoff and say, "Who created G-d?" But when I ask them, "Where did your two cute little specks come from?" they say, "That's not a scientific question!" Neat, eh?

254. As we said before, if something isn't verifiable, isn't observable and can't be tested with any of our senses, it's not science, right? Well, then, is an explosion of nothing caused by nothing, billions of years ago — is that something that is verifiable, observable or capable of being tested with our senses? Or, as Richard Feynman (in *"Focus, Science and Technology,"* Issue 254, May 2013) puts it: "If it disagrees with experiment, then it's wrong," and the same applies to observations as well as experiments.

255. Another thing that seems to have escaped the notice of the trusting masses who believe the Evolutionist scientists: In museums and in picture books, they portray all these fearsome dragons and humongous monsters and they tell us that these species lived in the past. Two questions, please. Firstly, could you please tell us exactly how much of the skeleton of "Brontosaurus" was actually found? (Brontosaurus himself, poor chap, is going through a bit of an identity crisis just now. He doesn't quite know what his name is because various palaeontologists have taken to calling him "Apatosaurus," or "Camarasaurus," or "Diplodocus." But never mind, you know who I mean. He used to be in the entrance hall of the Natural History Museum in London.) They just show you the huge plaster cast, the overwhelming majority of it a product of the fertile imagination of Andrew Carnegie and his friends, with various bits and pieces added from other creatures, real or imagined, to fill in the gaps. So, my first question, as stated above, is: how much of these creatures are real and how much is imagined, please? Don't you think it would be more honest if instead of pretending that these creatures ever existed as you show them, you would colour-in in red those bones that were actually found and then we'd all be able to make our own judgement whether they are real or not? And the second (and more important) question — wait a minute! What are these skeletons of imagined gigantic creatures supposed to show? That other, strange-looking animals lived in the past, yes? Well, I know that. I could even suggest what these creatures were and how they came about and how they disappeared. So what? It's well-known and well-documented that species become extinct. That species die out and disappear is not in dispute! What the Evolutionists say is that new species come about. ***That*** has never been seen. So, please don't be so gullible! (This is the smoke-and-mirrors bit that we spoke about before. *See Paragraph 83.*) Remember this simple truth: the fact that species die out is no proof that new species come about!

256. If I throw a computer out of the tenth-floor window of an office block and it finishes up on the ground as a mangled mess of metal and plastic, does that prove that if I were to take a mangled mess of metal and plastic and throw it up from the street through the tenth-floor window in the office block that it will turn into a computer? Yet that's what is implied in portraying those extinct fearsome creatures that are supposed to have existed aeons ago.

257. Still with the Big Bang, here's a longish set of quotes (with some comments of my own inserted here and there) from *"The Art of Amazement"* by Alexander Seinfeld. (Jeremy P Tarcher / Penguin, New York, [2005]). I'm not quoting this here because of what he says about the Big Bang itself. But he does tell an illuminating story about this scientific discovery of the supposed origin of the universe which perhaps should sound a warning about relying on scientists and their "discoveries." He writes:

258. The story begins in 1915, when Albert Einstein circulated a draft of the Theory of General Relativity, also known as the Theory of Gravity.

259. A colleague noticed that these new equations indicated that ours was an expanding universe. Einstein found an expanding universe an unacceptable implication of Relativity. After all, astronomers at the time overwhelmingly

believed what their eyes saw: that we live in a static universe, infinite in time. An expanding universe, on the other hand, implied change and implied too that there must be a beginning somewhere where the expansion started. Consequently, in order to reconcile his new equations with "objective" reality, Einstein "fudged" his equations to avoid the implied expansion.

260. The following decade, American astronomer Edwin Hubble began to revolutionize astronomy with his unparalleled 100-inch telescope, seeing further and clearer than anyone had ever before. Hubble discovered a sort of Doppler-effect phenomenon called stellar red shift that proved beyond doubt (to him, that is) that the universe is expanding. He published his findings in 1929.

261. That discovery got Einstein's attention. In 1930, the great mathematician sailed from Germany to California to see Hubble's evidence first-hand. On the spot, Einstein admitted his error. Later, he called his fudged equations, "the biggest blunder I ever made in my life." Einstein's lapse of rigorous intellectual honesty had led him to miss the historic opportunity to reveal mathematically in 1915 what astronomy would discover fourteen years later.

262. The fact that a scientist cheated in order to avoid an uncomfortable conclusion is not particularly remarkable. But what was it that bothered Einstein so much that he fudged his equations rather than accept the idea of an expanding universe? After all, Einstein, the author of the Special Theory of Relativity was not one to shy away from revolutionary ideas. So, if the idea of an expanding universe did not bother Einstein, what did? Not the expanding universe but the ***implications*** of an expanding universe, what an expanding universe means, ***that's*** what's bothered Einstein. And not only Einstein. Because if the universe is expanding, then we can mentally "rewind the tape" so to speak, and we arrive at the conclusion that the universe as we know it must have had a beginning. What this beginning was we cannot know but today it's known as the Big Bang.

263. Today, most scientists accept the Big Bang idea. This is quite remarkable, on two counts: Firstly, it's a very recent theory, still under intense scrutiny and constant revision. Secondly, the Big Bang idea completely reverses the scientific worldview on the nature of nature (sorry!) and has been called, "the great intellectual revolution of the twentieth century."

264. But why does the origin of the universe matter? It might be an interesting theoretical shift but does it really qualify as "a revolution"? After all, how does the Big Bang theory affect us personally?

265. It seems that the most relevant consequence of the Big Bang is (as hinted at just before) what it ***implies*** and maybe these implications are so enormous that even Einstein didn't want to face them. Whether his reaction was conscious or subconscious, we do not know. But we do know that when he fudged his equations and delayed the new Big Bang theory by a decade, he also delayed facing up to all that that theory implied. Really, there shouldn't be much that can bother Einstein the man of science. Yet the implications of the Big Bang may indeed have made Einstein the Jew (or even Einstein the

human being) uncomfortable. For if the universe as we know it indeed had a beginning, any thinking person must ask, "What came before that? Who or what made the Big Bang?"

266. It's an unavoidable question, really. But almost by definition it is a question that science cannot answer for science deals only with what can be observed and measured. It should be noted, too, that for that very reason, there are some scientists who are quite vehemently opposed to the theory of the Big Bang and, like the ancient Greeks and for pretty much the same reason, they hold on firmly to the belief in a static universe which has always been and will always be. But more about this later.

NOW FOR THE LOGIC

267. Where science does not — indeed cannot — tread, common sense and logic does. Logically, the universe had a beginning. As briefly explained just before, it's quite simple, really. As follows: If something can be measured or can be measured in its parts, or in its physical length or breadth or depth, or in its parts of time (that is, I can watch it for a specific time or I can work out how long it has endured) then there must be a beginning somewhere. (And an end, too.) This beginning and this end might be far away, and might even be ***very*** far away. But there must have been a beginning somewhere. Whether that beginning was a big bang or a small bang (or no bang at all, for that matter) is really of no importance as much as acknowledging that there was a beginning somewhere way back and that ultimately Someone made it all happen when He called the universe into existence. That Someone we call G-d.

FINITE AND INFINITE

268. But then, when we try on our own to understand that Someone — that's when we start to blow fuses and sparks start to fly. You see, the human brain, superlative phenomenon that it is (some scientists have called it "the most stupendous mystery in the universe" — R. Grant Steen, in *"The Evolving Brain: The Known and the Unknown,"* (2007) calls it "the most complex object in the universe") is, for all its wonder, nevertheless finite. Being finite, it is equipped to deal only with finite things. It cannot deal with the infinite. It just cannot. If we try to understand infinity with our finite brain, it's a little like asking a computer to work out a mathematical problem but without installing the right computer program. However powerful the computer, it simply hasn't got the equipment to deal with advanced mathematics. So it comes up with "ERROR" or it comes up with something quite ridiculous and clearly wrong. In the same way, the human brain just hasn't got the equipment to deal with the infinite. All the usual analogies really state the same truth. "Try to describe the colour green to a person who is blind from birth" or, "Try to explain the beauty of music to someone who has never been able to hear" or, "Try to listen to a symphony with your hands" and so on and so forth. In exactly the same way, our

> Sages explain the words of the Bible, where G-d says to Moses (no less) "No man can see me and live!" As long as a person is on this earth and part of this planet and is alive on this physical world, he is limited and can never hope to understand G-d, the Infinite.

269. The problem for us finite beings trying to understand infinity is this: Whereas our thoughts are finite, "infinity" means "without end" (and "without beginning"). A finite thing has borders, boundaries. Matter is finite. Energy is finite. Time is finite. Our thoughts are finite. Infinity, by contrast, has no ends, no borders, no boundaries. Infinity goes on forever, in every direction and in every dimension.

End of the quotes from *"The Art of Amazement"* by Alexander Seinfeld (to whom many thanks).

270. Maybe we can try to understand the concept of infinity (but not the Infinite) through some sort of analogy, simply to put things in perspective. Here, for instance, is a quaint illustration of eternity (that is, infinite time) adapted from Hendrik Willem Van Loon's *"History of Mankind"*:

> Far, far away in the Land of the North, there is an island of the hardest rock. It is one mile wide and one mile deep and one mile high. Once every year, a little bird comes and sharpens its beak on this rock. When this island will have thus been worn away, one day of eternity will have passed.

So, can you understand infinity?

271. Yet we do have something pretty close to infinity and that is — our universe. As far as we can tell, the far reaches of the universe have very little effect on us earthlings. As far as we can tell, the universe — especially the remotest parts — seem to have precious little purpose for us that we can hardly see or even know about. Now, G-d is not a showman; He doesn't do things just to show off His abilities. If He does something, He has a reason for doing it. So why ***did*** G-d Almighty create this universe which is so vast, so … infinite? Read on! Read on!

THE GRAND COSMOS

272. From the whimsical "far, far away in the Land of the North" to reality, yet still in the world of analogy, let's try to come to grips with the vastness of the cosmos. Let us imagine this Planet Earth upon which we live reduced in scale to the size of a football. The surface of the planet and the air and the atmosphere and that whole region in which we exist and live and function, from the earth's crust and extending all the way up into inner space, including in this range the deepest sea bed and the highest mountain top and beyond — all this, on the scale of Earth being the size of a football, would be about the thickness of a sheet of paper. Yet Planet Earth is miniscule in comparison to the Sun — Planet Earth would fit into our Sun about one million three hundred thousand times.

273. Now, our Sun is a star. That is, it is not a planet, which is subservient to a sun, nor is it a moon, which is subordinate to a planet. A star is a humongous ball of fire,

giving off light and heat and other forms of energy. A planet, on the other hand, doesn't give off its own light and heat. It merely basks in the light and heat of its sun. If a planet has a moon, that moon is subordinate to the planet. (Like our moon orbits our planet Earth, and our planet Earth, together with its moon, orbits our Sun.)

274. Relative to other stars that can be seen and measured in our space neighbourhood, our Sun, with a diameter of about 1,392,684 kilometres, is a somewhat below-average-size star. It is situated on the outer reaches and rather sparsely populated area of our own local galaxy, called the Milky Way galaxy. Our Sun, and the planets that it holds in its gravitational field (so that they shouldn't go off wandering away towards another star or another galaxy) all make up our own little neck of the woods and is called our local Solar System. (We've been through some of this already.) There are lots and pots of other stars in the Milky Way, most of them with their own solar systems.

275. Let's get a better perspective on this cosmos of ours and meet some of the neighbours. The closest star outside of our own solar system (but still within our own Milky Way galaxy) is Sirius A, which is approximately 8.58 light years away from Earth. (We'll explain light years soon.) The diameter of Sirius A is approximately 2,335,000 kilometres across, that's almost double that of our Sun. Then there is Pollux, known as an Orange Giant, which is 33.72 light years from Earth and has a diameter of approximately 11,120,000 kilometres. Arcturus (given the appellation "Red Giant") is 36.71 light years from Earth and is 22,101,000 kilometres in diameter, which makes it about 16,000 times bigger than our Sun. Aldebaran (another Orange Giant) is 65.1 light years from Earth and is between 59,770,000 and 61,556,632 kilometres in diameter. Rigel (this fellow is a "Blue Supergiant") is 773 light years from Earth and is between 97,300,000 and 103,058,616 kilometres in diameter. Pistol Star (a "Blue Hypergiant") is about 25,000 light years away from Earth (but still in the Milky Way!) and is something between 426,161,304 and 450,520,000 kilometres in diameter.

276. Betelgeuse (popularly nicknamed "Beetlejuice" because that's what its name sounds like) is another Red Supergiant star located about 590 light years from Earth. It is something between 950,500,000 and 1,671,220,800 kilometres in diameter. If you were to replace our Sun with this star, its outer surface would be located at about where the orbit of Jupiter is. But it is a variable star and its diameter has been estimated to vary from about the orbit of Earth round the Sun to the orbit of Saturn round the Sun, that is, something in the region of 1,229,739,972 kilometres in diameter. Betelgeuse has an average luminosity about 120,000 times our Sun's output and its mass is between 8 and 17 times the mass of our Sun.

277. Antares A (another Red Supergiant) is located about 600 light years away from Earth and is approximately 1,229,739,972 kilometres in diameter. Then there's Mu Cephei (another Red Supergiant) with a diameter of 2,644,800,000 kilometres which is some 573.3 light years from Earth. (We'll come to the point soon.)

278. There is a Red Hypergiant star that is one of the largest and most luminous known stars in the Milky Way galaxy. This is VY Canis Majoris. It is an irregular pulsating

variable star ("VY" is a standard designation for a variable star) and it lies about 5,000 light years away. Estimates of this star's radius have previously ranged between 1,800 and 2,100 times larger than that of our Sun, but it is now thought that its radius is around 1,500 times that of the Sun. That means that if VY Canis Majoris was placed in the centre of our solar system where our Sun is now, its surface would almost reach the orbit of Saturn! VY Canis Majoris is estimated to have a mass of around 10 to 25 times that of the Sun and its surface temperature is estimated to be around 3,200°C (5,800°F). It's so big that if one was to fly in an aeroplane round its circumference at 900 kilometres per hour, it would take 1,100 years to circle it just once! If our Sun was placed next to it, it would be barely visible in comparison! Measurements of this star's luminosity vary quite dramatically, from around 250,000 to 500,000 times as luminous as the Sun but much of its visible light is absorbed by a large asymmetric cloud of dust particles that have been ejected from the star in various outbursts in its past. With all that, the infrared emission from the dust cloud round this star makes VY Canis Majoris one of the brightest objects in the sky. To date, it's the largest star known to man. Yet this star is only a tiny dot among several ***hundred billion*** stars which make up our own galaxy, the Milky Way! Our galaxy is approximately 100,000 light years across and the observable universe is currently estimated to be 93,000,000,000 light years across. And there are estimated to be a ***hundred billion galaxies*** out there!

279. Please bear in mind: each galaxy in the universe has on average ***one hundred billion*** stars in it. (As said, our solar system is located in a relatively sparsely populated corner of our local galaxy.) The vast majority of the stars in each galaxy are small and difficult to see from here: cool red dwarfs and dim white dwarfs. But others stars, like our Sun, are yellow and temperate. And then there are some stars, between 20 to 40 more massive than our Sun, that roam these galaxies like Titans. Known as Hypergiants, these stars are up to about 3,600 times the diameter of our Sun and are among the most luminous stars in the heavens. (We've just been introduced to some of them.)

280. All this, of course, leads us to the question: "How many stars are there in the universe?" Well, an awful lot, actually, as it turns out. Let's get some data. When looking up in a clear, moonless sky, far from the distortion and reflection of city lights, our galaxy is a wonderful thing to behold. (The pity is that it can be seen on every clear night. Imagine the fuss and excitement if this would happen only once every twenty-five years! That's the trouble when the amazing becomes the usual, isn't it? As Rabbi Eliyahu Eliezer Dessler (1892 — 1953) is reputed to have said, "The difference between "nature" and "a miracle" is simply a matter of frequency." Others say that Rabbi Yisroel Baal Shem Tov (1698 — 1760) said pretty much the same thing.) It is an ethereal sight to see the countryside bathed in the soft light of nothing other than starlight, the thousands upon thousands of tiny pinpricks of light in the sky. And all this starlight is only from the 100,000,000,000 stars (one hundred thousand million) which is our own local galaxy of stars, the Milky Way. Each star, as we've said, is a sun and most of these stars are larger than our Sun.

LIGHT YEARS

281. All these stars are themselves separated from each other by vast expanses of empty space whose distances are so large that if we were to write down the actual linear distances, in miles or kilometres, we would have to write out lots and lots of noughts! So instead, we express these distances in light years. That is, we say that the distance to such-and-such a star is so-and-so-many light years away. Light travels at 300,000 kilometres (that's approximately 186,000 miles) ***per second***. In one minute, light travels 186,000 miles times 60, which is 11,160,000 miles (eleven million, one hundred and sixty thousand miles) or 18,000,000 kilometres. That's in one minute. (That's why the light from our Sun takes almost nine minutes to reach us on Earth — it has to travel more than 93 million miles. 93,000,000 miles divided by 186,000 miles, that is, the distance light travels in one second, gives 500 seconds, which is just under nine minutes.) In an hour (sixty minutes) light travels sixty times 11,160,000 miles, which is 669,600,000 miles. In a day, it travels twenty-four times that number of miles, which is 16,070,400,000 miles, that is, more than sixteen thousand million miles in 24 hours. In a year, it travels that number of miles (16,000 million miles) times 365. That number of miles is called one light year. Some stars, they tell us, are tens of light years and even hundreds of light years away. Galaxy "IC 1011" is 6,000,000 light years across!

282. Peering further out into space, beyond the Milky Way, many of the stars in the sky are actually themselves not single suns but only appear like that. In fact, they are whole galaxies of billions of stars. How many such galaxies are there? Good question. As many as 100,000,000,000 (one hundred thousand million). That's ***galaxies***. When we multiply the number of galaxies by the number of stars in a galaxy, we arrive at the current estimate (and it can only be an estimate) of the number of stars in the known universe, which is: 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. (I don't know how to write that in words — ***you*** do it!) Note, please, that this estimate refers only to the visible universe and nobody knows enough for sure to even hazard a guess how far things stretch beyond that.

283. How can we make sense of a number like 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 ? Such a number is, for all practical purposes, absolutely meaningless. Nobody can grasp such a concept of number. One way of making sense of such a number is to compare this number to other large estimates of great numbers of things. OK. Let's try this for size: Estimates of the number of grains of sand on all the world's beaches range from 10 to the power of 13 to 10 to the power of 20. This means that there are more stars in the universe than there are grains of sand on all the beaches on earth. How many more? Not just a few more, but anywhere from one thousand times more to a thousand million times more! And that's only stars in our visible universe . . . Each star has its own planets with many of those planets immensely larger than our own world and each planet is a world to itself, just like our world is a world to itself, with things or beings, animate or inanimate, organic or inorganic, even if it's just atoms of material, filling each one. Now all this, remember, gentle reader, came about from that collision of those two cute little specks of matter. (Which came from no-one knows where, remember?) Or, according to Robin Kerrod and Giles Sparrow as described in their *"How the*

Universe Works," it all came about not from the collision of ***two*** sub-atomic specks but from the sudden explosion of their ***single*** sub-atomic condensed speck. *(See above, Paragraph 245.)* (But no-one knows where that came from either!) So, now that we have described, only superficially, just a few stars in this one galaxy (of which our solar system is a very small part) and we have been introduced to some of these huge entities, I ask you, does it make sense to speak of the Big Bang and tell everybody that all these unbelievably large entities were contained in that one subatomic particle? Even if we give that speck a posh name like "a singularity," — does it make sense?

FROM THE GRAND TO THE MINISCULE

284. When we start contemplating things at the other end of the spectrum and look at the microscopic world, we are startled by the scale of things which are almost beyond any measure of smallness. Within a single cubic inch of solid matter there are atoms numbering approximately 10 to the power of 21. That is the same number of atoms as there are stars currently estimated to be in the universe — and that's within a single cubic inch of matter! Each atom is unimaginably tiny but we can now measure with some precision the size of these atoms. Here is some indication of the dimensions of the atom: Were the particles which make up the atom to be enlarged to the size of oranges, the distance between the particle that is in the middle of the atom and the furthermost particle in that same atom would be equivalent to the distance between our Sun and the planet Pluto! And that holds true for each atom.

285. These numbers are not just big. They're huge. They're unimaginably great. Immense. When talking of such numbers, when looking at things on such a scale, our language falters; we can't find the words to describe these phenomena. Our finite minds, housed as they are in finite brains, just cannot comprehend the phenomena that we see. And what does all this mean to us? Our Sages tell us that, as far as we are concerned, Almighty G-d created all this vastness of outer space and the bigness of inner space just so that through all this wonderful phenomena we can come to understand, to a degree, the greatness of G-d Who created it all. (Now the deceptively simple saying of the Kotzker Rebbe (*Paragraph 10, above)* can be seen for the truly deep wisdom that it proclaims about G-d.) But if we try to ignore G-d the Creator and instead try to comprehend the incomprehensible and explain everything without acknowledging G-d the Creator, we are liable to come out with some laughable mistakes. (Laughable, but with very serious consequences.) Or we just blow a fuse and go crazy.

WHO MADE IT ALL AND WHO IS IN CHARGE OF IT ALL

286. When we think about the sheer vastness of the universe and everything in it, the huge numbers of worlds out there with their galaxies of stars and planets and moons, each in its orbit, each on its journey, each with its destination, each in its place; when we contemplate the uncountable numbers of atoms in the world that we inhabit; when we see the stupendous orderliness and clever arrangements of all

the incredibly tiny, tiny parts in each atom and how each part of each atom interacts within each atom and how each atom interacts with all the others within its sphere and ultimately with all of creation; when we see all of creation as a vast orchestra playing in beautiful harmony the most amazing music in acknowledgement and praise of the Supreme Intelligent Almighty G-d Who created it all, Who maintains it all and Who controls it all, truly "the Lord of Hosts," the Master of the Universe and Lord Controller of All — when we acknowledge the greatness of G-d Almighty, the active, eternal Master Controller of all and everything, we then won't find it difficult to understand that busy though He is, He still has time for each and every one of us — and especially so as He Himself has told us human beings that He desires that we should always come directly to Him. Once we truly acknowledge the ability of G-d Almighty to do all that He does, we can then come to understand that He is great enough to bother with each and every individual human being who sincerely seeks to come close to Him.

287. It could very well be that our failure to appreciate G-d is because we tend to think of Him in human terms. That is, we know our limitations and we cannot comprehend G-d Who is All-Powerful and All-Knowing. In other words, we do not make the distinction between ourselves (the created) and Almighty G-d (the Creator). In this, modern man, despite his technological prowess and progress, is still much the same as those rather limited people of the past who likewise could not (or better, ***would*** not) acknowledge G-d as the All-Powerful and All-knowing Creator of everything.

288. Perhaps just as wondrous as the vastness of the observable universe is the fact that we are here to contemplate it! Here we are on our lonely little planet, the third stone in orbit round a small sun situated in one corner of one of these billions of galaxies — thinking and talking about the Creator of it all! (Or trying to avoid the implications of the Creator by coming up with weird and laughable denials.)

289. We don't know why G-d Almighty created the universe because He has not told us. But now that He ***has*** created it all, it makes good sense to learn from it. As just said, maybe the vastness of creation, the hugeness of the cosmos, is simply G-d's way of teaching us of His greatness. There's no way that we, connected to the physical world and part of it, can see Him, neither physically nor intellectually. Yet G-d wants us to know Him, the better to live our lives as He has commanded. But He is infinite, He is infinitely great, infinitely powerful, infinitely clever. How can we comprehend infinity? So G-d created the infinitesimally miniature world of the atom and gave us the wherewithal to see it and appreciate it, and He created for us the nearest thing to infinity, namely, the vastness of the universe, and granted us the intelligence to know it, all of this, for us to appreciate, to a degree, what He is.

290. And puny, rebellious, silly little man uses this very world and this very cosmos to deny his Creator. One doesn't know whether to laugh or to cry!

THE IMPLICATIONS

291. Coming face to face with the facts, any rational, thinking person sees all the talk of

colliding specks or molecules and "Big Bangs" and "Evolution" for the sheer silliness that it is. Listen to Stephen William Hawking, the British theoretical physicist:

> "The odds against a universe like ours emerging out of something like the Big Bang are enormous … I think clearly there are religious implications whenever you start to discuss the origins of the universe. There must be religious overtones. But I think most scientists prefer to shy away from the religious side of it." (John Boslough, *"Stephen Hawking's Universe,"* New York, Avon, 1999.)

To which one is tempted to say, "Oh, good morning! Woken up at last, have you?"

292. Although calling it "the "Big Bang" makes it seem as if it didn't really have to be exact in any way, that because of its very bigness the whole thing could all have been hugely chaotic and it wouldn't have mattered — well, that also is part of the charade — and is not true. Professor Steven Weinberg, a very prominent American theoretical physicist, explains that "life as we know it would be impossible if any of several physical quantities had slightly different values . . . One constant does seem to require incredible fine tuning and this constant has to do with the energy of the Big Bang. As follows: If the energy of the Big Bang were different by one part in 10^{120} (that's a 10 with 120 noughts after it) there would be no life anywhere in our universe." (Steven Weinberg, "Life in the Universe," *Scientific American,* October 1994.) Astrophysicist Michael Turner of the University of Chicago puts this probability into perspective, explaining these impossible numbers like this: This is compared to throwing a dart across the entire universe and hitting a bullseye one millimetre in diameter on the other side." (Quoted in "Pillars of Faith" by Pinchas Taylor, page 49, and see there for more of the same.) I'm not sure that I understand the maths, but it sure sounds very exacting to me.

To continue:

293. Sir Roger Penrose, the English mathematical physicist and philosopher, said:

> "I think I would say that the universe has a purpose, it's not somehow just there by chance … Some people, I think, take the view that the universe is just there and it runs along — it's a bit like it just sort of computes, and we happen somehow by accident to find ourselves in this thing. But I don't think that's a very fruitful or helpful way of looking at the universe. I think that there is something much deeper about it."

294. Good thinking, Sir! But now follow it up to the logical conclusion! *(Urgent! See above, Paragraphs 5 — 7.)*

295. Allan Sandage (1926 — 2010) is considered to be one of the founders of modern astronomy. (He discovered quasars.) Here is what he wrote in *"Sizing Up the Cosmos"*:

> I find it quite improbable that such order came out of chaos. There has to be some organizing principle. G-d to me is a mystery but is the explanation for the miracle of existence, why there is something instead of nothing.

296. Here is a quote from George S. Greenstein, Professor of Astrophysics in the University of Amherst in Massachusetts, USA, in *"Show Me G-d"* by Fred Heeren *(page 233)*:

> As we survey all the evidence, the thought insistently arises that some supernatural agency — or, rather, Agency — must be involved. Is it possible that suddenly, without intending to, we have stumbled upon scientific proof of the existence of a Supreme Being? Was it G-d Who stepped in and so providentially crafted the cosmos for our benefit?

297. Physicist Paul Davies said that, "scientists are slowly waking up to an inconvenient truth — the universe looks suspiciously like a fix. The issue concerns the very laws of nature themselves. For years, physicists and cosmologists have been quietly collecting examples of all too convenient "coincidences" and special features in the underlying laws of the universe that seem to be necessary in order for life, and hence conscious beings, to exist. Change any one of them and the consequences would be lethal. Fred Hoyle, the distinguished cosmologist, once said it was as if a super-intellect had monkeyed with physics." (Taylor, in *"Pillars of Faith,"* page 50.)

BUT WHAT HARM CAN IT DO ?

298. Concerning those who refuse to acknowledge G-d the Creator, there are some who say, "So what? Let them believe what they want!" But they say this only because they don't realize that denying the existence of G-d has serious repercussions on the whole of Mankind. (It doesn't really make much difference to Him Personally.) Because denying the existence of G-d leads to unhappiness and social conflict and ultimately to the degradation of true humanity and its destruction whereas acknowledging G-d as the Creator and Sovereign of All results in true happiness and fulfilment — even if this acknowledgement brings with it responsibilities and duties (or maybe ***because*** of these responsibilities and duties). As mentioned before, human society in the secular Western world, with its broken families and troubled and unhappy people in relentless pursuit of instant gratification, has been called "the broken society." The Western world today suffers from a lack of righteousness, from a lack of acknowledgement of right and wrong, it suffers from a moral degeneracy that has come about due in no small part to the teaching of the Theory of Evolution — it's because of the Theory of Evolution that G-d has been expunged from Man's world. There is no moral force; there is no right and wrong (except what those in power decree, according to their own lights, what is right and wrong). There is no responsibility and duty, no accounting for one's actions to G-d my Lord and my Creator, there is no reward and punishment. There is no morality (again, except as the strong ones in power deem fit to impose it) and I can do exactly as I like and so can everybody else.

299. Without any G-d-given laws of morality and right and wrong, silly little libertarians and deniers of G-d's Authority decide for themselves what is right and wrong, what is moral and what is not, and the G-dless intellectuals come up with the most bizarre inventions of sins and virtues. Only a G-dless and blundering person could justify the disruption and damage of a medical laboratory, and would even condone

the murder of a medical doctor who is making progress in his quest for the cure for cancer, simply because necessary experiments on animals are carried out in that quest. Only morally bankrupt anti-G-d libertarians can get their priorities so twisted that they would protest and scream about the phantom called global warming while at the same time promote the most immoral debauchery, resulting in the breakdown of the human family and the destruction of a stable social structure, producing seriously unbalanced and unhappy children, all in the name of "freedom" from the rule of G-d.

300. Aldous Leonard Huxley (grandson of Sir Thomas Henry Huxley, one of Darwin's able spokesmen) wrote in his "Confession of a Professed Atheist" in *Report*, June 1966, words to the effect that he embraced the Theory of Evolution "because it allowed me to do exactly as I want." Here is what he says, in his own words: "I had motives for not wanting the world to have meaning; consequently assumed that it had none and was able without any difficulty to find satisfying reasons for this assumption … For myself, as, no doubt, for most of my contemporaries, the philosophy of meaninglessness was essentially an instrument of liberation. The liberation we desired was simultaneously liberation from a certain political and economic system and liberation from a certain system of morality. We objected to the morality because it interfered with our … freedom." (In fact, he put it more coarsely than that but we want to keep this essay clean.)

301. Richard Dawkins says pretty much the same thing: "I believe that it is a liberating thing to free yourself from primitive superstitions … I think a lot of people, when they give up G-d, feel a great sense of release and freedom." (Interview with Ben Stein in the film *"Expelled — No Intelligence Allowed"*.)

THE MORALITY OF EVOLUTION

302. According to the Theory of Evolution and its clarion cry of "survival of the fittest," the strong must overcome the weak. It is "Nature's Law." With this is justified all robbery, all oppression of the weaker by the stronger. In the past, this was how the tyrant justified his tyranny and to this day it is used by tyrants to justify their aggression and persecution of their victims. Darwin's Theory of Evolution came in the "age of science," when the affairs of man were no longer guided by morality or true religion but when "science had all the answers." Indeed, the Theory of Evolution was an integral part of that "age of science." It came at just the right time for colonial powers (usually white) to "scientifically" justify their overrunning of territories and their grabbing of others' resources and their subjugating of populations (usually black or coloured) who were deemed to be inferior. In the next century, Hitler, too, used this Theory of Evolution to justify his over-running and conquest of even non-combatant neutral countries. ("It is the law of Nature that the stronger must overcome the weaker.")

303. So it seems that Voltaire (1694 — 1778) the noted philosopher (unfortunately himself an anti-Semite) in fact got it right when he said, "Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities." *(Questions sur les Miracles à M. Claparede, Professeur de Théologie à Genève, par un Proposant: Ou Extrait de*

Diverses Lettres de M. de Voltaire.) Voltaire couldn't have known just how true he spoke! We will soon see what atrocities, what miseries, what calamities have come upon humanity because of the materialistic philosophy called Evolution.

DEADLY AND DANGEROUS AND EVIL

304. Most people don't even know that there is any dispute about the Theory of Evolution. As we have seen *(Paragraphs 49 — 53, above)* Evolution is taught as fact and is so much a part of the Western mind-set that there is hardly any question of its truth. Even if there are people who are aware of any controversy, they mostly think that it's merely a battle of ideas between modern, enlightened science in one corner *versus* their old-fashioned, superstitious religion in the other corner. Seen in that light, of course, the argument is a virtual "no-contest." This itself is perhaps one of the most incredible propaganda victories of the Evolutionists. How so? Because it diverts attention away from the plainly insane claims made for Evolution —

- ❖ Firstly, that all of the universe, all the galaxies, all the stars and planets, all of our whole solar system — all of it — came into existence by itself, from the completely random and purely-by-chance collision of two sub-atomic specks (or the completely random and purely-by-chance sudden explosion of one such sub-atomic particle).

- ❖ Secondly, that from this particular inorganic planet of rock and water and sundry minerals (which we call Earth) there emerged, quite spontaneously, the first single-celled living amoeba.

305. Apologies! This point is so glibly put that I simply have to interject with what Fred Hoyle has written about this. He says that the chance that even a *single* viable bacterium ever evolved on Earth is so outrageously small, calculated at one chance in 1,040,000, that is, a 1 with *40,000* zeroes. This is a number that "could not even be faced, even if the whole universe consisted of organic soup." (Incidentally, about this primeval soup theory, which of course can never be proven, Hoyle said that scientists have replaced the religious mysteries that shrouded the question of the origin of life with "equally mysterious scientific dogmas.") Hoyle explains that this one problem "is big enough to bury Darwin and the whole theory of evolution." That's a bacterium. With more complex forms of life, the odds only become more exponentially slim. Experts vary in their estimation of the statistical calculations, but in all cases the figure is so ridiculously small that the human mind cannot even relate to it.

Sorry about that. Back to the list.

- ❖ Thirdly, that from this spontaneous generation of "life from the lifeless," there came about plant life which continued to diversify into millions of different kinds of plant life.

306. Apologies again! It was Louis Pasteur back in the late 1800s who proved conclusively that there is no such thing as spontaneous generation of life. Life cannot suddenly appear where there was none before. If germs or microbes infest

a broth, it's because those microbes got in there somehow. If maggots appear in a piece of meat, it's because a fly laid some eggs there. Any schoolchild knows the experiments. Our food industries depend upon the fact that there is no such thing as spontaneous generation of life. Yet the whole Western world of today bases its understanding of the origin of life and that all of life on this planet in all its millions of species all came about through the spontaneous generation of life from some primeval soup which has never been proved and never can be proved! Odd, no? No, not odd if the aim is to deny G-d the Creator! Back to the list.

- ❖ Fourthly, that then by itself, randomly and by the purest chance, there branched-off from the plant kingdom living creatures which then diversified again into millions of different species of fishes, birds, animals and insects.

- ❖ Fifthly, that every one of the estimated one hundred and thirty million different species of plants and animals on this planet all evolved from this spontaneously generated single-celled amoeba.

- ❖ Sixthly, that every single specimen of each of those one hundred and thirty million species, all came about by themselves.

- ❖ Seventhly, that every single process and movement and action of each and every one of those specimens — and this includes us human beings and everything we do — all of this came about, and continues, not through G-d Who created it all with design and purpose, but ultimately only through randomness and chance mutation.

307. This is what today's "science" teaches and this is accepted as broadly true by the vast majority of the Western world. That it was accepted a hundred and fifty years ago is also, sadly, a shameful and grave indictment of the dominant religion of the Western world of a hundred and fifty years ago. Till then, that religion provided the answer to the question, "Who made the world?" "G-d!" Then, along came Evolution and the Western world started to turn its back on the religious answer and accepted its replacement. Wow! What a transformation! After all, it's no small thing to throw out a religion that rigidly controlled and held such sway over the whole of the Western world for well-nigh two thousand years! That it should be pushed out by a "theory" which, when all is said and done, has not a sliver of evidence that would be accepted even in a mediocre court of law to support it — that sure says something about the deposed religion, doesn't it? More: that it is still accepted today, and so vigorously promoted and supported by the vast majority of a public that is otherwise generally much more sophisticated and educated, is even more shocking. One must be forgiven for coming to the conclusion that it's because that religion is so utterly detested and is considered so hateful and hypocritical, and that's why hundreds of millions of people have chosen to reject it so determinedly — and happily justify their rejection of that religion by asserting that the nonsense of Evolution is more true than their religion.

308. Sadly, most people do not concern themselves with the consequences of the new faith of Evolution. They do not see how they have swapped one evil for another. Most people today would be shocked to the core if they appreciated the

implications of what Evolution really means and the evil that it leads to. For Evolution has given rise to the most despicable racism (called by the scientific-sounding name "Eugenics") and is directly responsible for bringing terrible disasters and malevolence upon humanity. Indeed, Darwin's teacher and close friend, the geologist Professor Adam Sedgwick (1785 —1873) himself quite badly bitten by the new "science" of the nineteenth century, nevertheless wrote to Darwin:

> "If I did not think you a good tempered & truth loving man I should not tell you that … I have read your book with more pain than pleasure. Parts of it I admired greatly; parts I laughed at till my sides were almost sore; other parts I read with absolute sorrow; because I think them utterly false & grievously mischievous …"

309. In a letter to another correspondent, Sedgwick was even harsher on Darwin's book, calling it "utterly false" —

> "If this book were to find general public acceptance, it would bring with it a brutalization of the human race as it had never seen before" (A. E. Wilder-Smith, *"Man's Origin, Man's Destiny,"* The Word for Today Publishing, (1993) page 166) and that humanity "would suffer a damage and a lower degradation than any into which it has fallen since its written records tell us of its history … From first to last it is a dish of rank materialism cleverly cooked and served up."

310. That's the opinion of just one academic, a contemporary of Darwin. You'll see what he's concerned about when we quote some of Darwin's own words from his books: any doubts about the sheer evil in Darwin's theories soon disappear. According to Darwin (in his *"The Origin of Species")* human races represent different stages of evolution of humans; the "fight for survival" occurs between humans, too, with some races having evolved and progressed more than others. Some of them, said Darwin, were pretty much at the same level of development as monkeys. Darwin claimed that these races would soon completely lose the world-wide fight for survival and would disappear. He maintained that it was essential for these "inferior races" to be brought to extinction and to prevent them multiplying. According to Darwin, the task befalling the "civilized person" was to speed up this evolutionary process … that since they are going to disappear anyhow, the "inferior races" could be done away with now.

311. Surprisingly, most people today think of Evolution as pretty harmless. They know that it's anti-religion, sure, but who cares about religion today? (And in truth the dominant religion of the West has got itself to blame for this.) They think (if they do, that is) that Evolution is the theory (or fact!) that humans "evolved" from monkeys. They don't see a dangerous, sinister part that you can't separate from this bizarre theory, that there is "the unacceptable face of Evolution." Well, here are the words of Charles Darwin himself in his *"The Descent of Man"* (1871).

312. > With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check (= stop) the process of elimination. We build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed and the sick. Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one

> who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man. Hardly anyone is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed.

313. The racist side to Darwin's theory found very fertile ground in the second half of the nineteenth century because, as mentioned just before, at that time the European "white man" was scrabbling around for some sort of scientific theory to justify his own colonizing crimes. With the coming of Darwin's book, the plain old materialistic philosophy of the colonial bully-boy became "science." The great, noble truth that all human beings are created by G-d in His Image was jettisoned — and the forbidden became permitted.

314. As for the eagerly-sought "scientific theory" — in the third chapter of his book, *"The Mismeasure of Man,"* Stephen Jay Gould pointed out that some anthropologists were not above falsifying their data to prove the "superiority" of the white race. According to Gould, they did this mostly by falsifying the brain size of the fossilized skulls that they had found because, they asserted, brain size had something to do with intelligence. So they exaggerated the size of Caucasian skulls (whites) and understated the size of skulls of blacks and Indians. In his other book, *"Ever Since Darwin,"* (W. W. Norton and Company, New York (1992) page 217) Gould tells how the followers of Darwin "scoured the evidence of human anatomy and behaviour, using everything they could find, from brains to belly buttons." (No kiddin'! Antoine Étienne Renaud Augustin Serres (1786 — 1868) the French physician and embryologist, really did argue that black males are "primitive" because their belly buttons are lower!)

315. With this kind of idiocy paraded as science, it's no wonder that the French Darwinist anthropologist Vacher de Lapouge, author of *"Race et Milin Social Essais d'Anthropologie"* (Paris, 1909) predicted, "It is my view that in years to come, people will kill each other because their heads are round or pointed." (How true he spoke! Just remember that photograph of a man having his nose measured in a German police station to decide whether or not he was Jewish and should be sent for extermination in Auschwitz.) As has been seen all over the world, it is but a short step from Darwin's Evolution and his ugly racism to colonial exploitation and from there to the extermination of millions of the indigenous population of America in "the conquest of the Wild West," to the perverse white supremacist mentality (epitomised by the Ku Klux Klan and the lynchings of blacks — between 1890 and 1910 some 1,300 blacks were lynched — meaning that in the space of a mere twenty years, 65 people were horribly murdered in public ***each year***) which continues right down into our own days with American institutionalised hatred for the blacks, to the killing-out of the Australian Aborigines and New Zealand Maoris, to anti-Semitism (and its extreme example of the twentieth century, the killing of six million Jews) to xenophobia — all with the sanction of "science." (Of course, it is well-known that anti-Semitism has its roots in the dominant religion of the Western world, but with Darwin, it becomes "science," too.) Sure, there has always been hatred of people who are different, there has always been hatred of "the other" (especially if "the other" has got something that I want — land, oil, brains, strength, prowess) but now this hatred is given scientific validity and respect.

316. In 1870, Max Muller, an Evolutionary anthropologist from the *London Anthropological Review*, divided human races into seven categories, with the Aborigines at the bottom and the Aryan race at the top.

317. Henry Keylock Rusden (1826 — 1910) a famous "Social Darwinist," had this to say about the Aborigines:

> "The survival of the fittest means that might is right. And we thus invoke and remorselessly fulfil the inexorable law of natural selection when exterminating the inferior Australian and Maori races … and appropriate their patrimony coolly." (Jani Roberts, *"How New-Darwinism Justified Taking Land From Aborigines and Murdering them in Australia.")*

("Patrimony" means "property inherited from one's father or male ancestor." To "appropriate their patrimony" means "to steal their ancestral lands.")

318. And in 1890, the then Vice-President of the Royal Society of Tasmania, James Barnard, wrote:

> "The process of extermination is an axiom of the law *[sic!]* of evolution and survival of the fittest." (There was, therefore, no reason to suppose that "there had been any culpable neglect in the murder and dispossession of the Aboriginal Australian.") (Again, Jani Roberts, *"How New-Darwinism Justified Taking Land From Aborigines and Murdering them in Australia.")*

319. But Evolutionists don't tell you about this side of their "science," do they? They just tell you all about random mutations and "four-winged" fruit flies and peppered moths. But this evil side is just as much a part of Evolution (even if today's peculiar "political correctness" doesn't permit it to be said aloud). With Evolution, ideas which before Darwin had been regarded as narrow-minded bigotry and heartlessly cruel, after Darwin and with Evolution became accepted and justified as "natural law."

THE ULTIMATE INSULT

320. After Darwin claimed in his *"The Origin of Species"* that human beings and monkeys were related by being descended from a common ancestor, the search for fossils to support this fiction began in earnest. Then, one day, some Evolutionists said, "Hey! Half-monkey half-man creatures might be found not only in the "fossil record" but also living in various parts of the world!" And so, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the search for "the Missing Link" started and resulted in not only some celebrated frauds and fakes but also in wholesale savagery and horrible cruelty.

321. Wholesale savagery: The Smithsonian Institute in Washington DC held the remains of some 15,000 people of various races and [the remains of some] 10,000 Australian Aborigines were sent by ship [to England] for the British Museum in London with the aim of seeing whether or not they were "the Missing Link" in the transition from monkeys to humans, as portrayed by Charles Darwin. (We won't speak here of the genocide and the abductions of children but you can read all about it in the news

story by Alan Thornhill which appeared in the 28 April 1997 issue of the *Philadelphia Daily News*.)

322. Horrible cruelty: Here's just one case, the story of Ota Benga.

Ota Benga was abducted from the Congo by an Evolutionist researcher called Samuel Verner. The year was 1904. At the time, Ota Benga was married, with two children. He was caught and then chained like an animal, put in a cage and sent back to the USA. There, the Evolutionary scientists put him in a cage together with various species of monkeys and exhibited him at the St. Louis World Fair as "the nearest link to man." Two years later they took him to the Bronx Zoo in New York and displayed him with a few chimpanzees, a gorilla called Dinah and an orang-utan called Dohung as "man's oldest ancestors." The Evolutionist director of the zoo, Dr William T. Hornaday, gave long dissertations about how proud he was to have "the missing link" in his zoo and visitors treated Ota Benga in his cage just like an animal. The *New York Times* of the day reported that:

> "There were 40,000 visitors to the park on Sunday. Nearly every man, woman and child of this crowd made for the monkey house to see the star attraction in the park — the wild man from Africa. They chased him about the grounds all day, howling, jeering and yelling. Some of them poked him in the ribs, others tripped him up, all laughed at him."

323. The 17 September 1906 issue of the *New York Journal* said that this was being done to prove Evolution but attacked it as a great injustice and cruelty. The *New York Daily Tribune* also gave space to the subject of Ota Benga's being exhibited in the zoo for the purposes of demonstrating Evolution. As the controversy continued, the worthy Dr Hornaday remained unapologetic, insisting that his only intention was to put on an "ethnological exhibit." ("Blind 'em with science!" remember?) In another letter, he said that he and Madison Grant, the secretary of the New York Zoological Society (who ten years later would publish the racist tract *"The Passing of the Great Race"*) considered it "imperative that the Society should not even seem to be dictated to by the black clergymen" who had objected to this insult to black people. Even so, Dr Hornaday decided to close that exhibit after just two days, and on Monday, September 8, Ota Benga could be found walking in the zoo grounds, often followed by a crowd "howling, jeering and yelling." Ota Benga committed suicide in 1916 when his promised return trip to the Congo back to his wife and children was delayed by World War I … Remember, please: all this, too, is Evolution.

324. This whole episode reminds me of something related that pertains to another zoo, this time, London Zoo. Time was when there used to be a great attraction there called the "Chimpanzee's Tea Party." This transformed the chimps' feeding time at the zoo into an entertaining spectacle, where the chimps were initially seated on stools round a table which was set with unbreakable (plastic?) crockery and with a couple of zoo-keepers seeing that things should proceed without too much havoc. It was all good fun, the animals almost showing-off in reaction to the children's laughter as the little monkeys behaved like little monkeys do, walking over the table to grab a banana from another chimp, drinking directly from the teapot

instead of from the cups and generally "misbehaving." But the Chimpanzee's Tea Party is no longer. It was stopped because some people felt it was "degrading" to the monkeys, "our closest relatives." It was wrong, they said, that people should laugh at them. It put the chimpanzees to shame…

325. Despite the separation of almost a century between the two things, the hypocrisy is sickening. Animals don't feel shame. Shame is an emotion that can only be felt by someone who understands right and wrong and who knows that he has done wrong. To impute to animals feelings of shame and that they appreciate dignity is not just a nonsense — it is a deliberate and gross insult to human beings. Just because you say that an animal should be treated like a human being doesn't make it into a human being, with human feelings of shame, embarrassment, with sentiments of respect and dignity! When you equate an animal with a human being — a human being created in the Image of G-d, remember — you are not elevating the animal. All you are doing is diminishing the human being. Of course an animal can be trained or conditioned to obey orders and it "knows" (from your voice or from your body language) that it has disobeyed an order, for which it "knows," too, that it will be "punished." But ***shame? Dignity?*** What kind of nonsense is this? But by talking of shame and dignity in an animal, they are not raising the animal higher. All that these people are doing is to insult human beings. They haven't made the monkey into a human being because they cannot do that. But they can imply that the human being is an animal — and this is exactly what Evolutionists mean to do. (See also the article, "We have descended from apes but we don't have to behave like them" by Anne Applebaum, in the *Daily Telegraph*, 29 August 1994.) And now see the hypocrisy! We must protect the chimp from insult, because Evolution preaches that he is our "closest relation." But then, by the same token, Evolution preaches that we humans and apes and gorillas are all brothers — and therefore it makes sense to exhibit the human African pygmy Ota Benga as a species of monkey. That is Evolution for you!

326. By the way, where would this idea of "the dignity of the ape" end? "Oh, no, I don't ride horses any more. I don't think it's right! It's not dignified to the horse to sit on its back and ride it around — would ***you*** like the horse to do that to you?" Or, "How dare you make a donkey drag your sacks of produce?" Or, "What right have you to imprison pretty little fishes in an aquarium just for your pleasure and rob them of their liberty merely for your gratification?" Etc., etc.. It's only a small step from that kind of clap-trap to the utterly false and pretentious concern for animals of some people (more often than not liberal university professors and philosophers) who try to prevent the eating of meat with the slogan, "Meat is Murder!" And of course, on the way to banning the eating of meat, these sanctimonious hypocrites try to forbid human beings from fulfilling the Divine laws of Shechitah. "Shechitah" is the method of killing animals for food that is commanded to the Jewish People by G-d, the Creator of all creatures. In the same way that He has implanted the instinct in animals to prey on each other, He has permitted humans to eat meat. Indeed, in His Instructions Manual, the Torah, He says that He created animals to be used, or eaten, by humans. But He has commanded that when humans do kill animals for food, that those animals must be killed with compassion and consideration and that prescribed method of killing is called "Shechitah." (Calling

Shechitah "ritual slaughter" is another device that has helped to make this religious duty something abhorrent. The phrase "ritual slaughter" sounds like a kind of barbaric blood rite of a backward ancient society when in fact Shechitah, it has been scientifically shown, is the most humane method of killing.) Ah, but these oh-so-caring frauds are always more compassionate and more righteous than G-d Himself, aren't they?

327. It's all very well to teach children (and grown-ups, too) that they must be considerate to animals. *"Black Beauty"* and the books by Beatrix Potter (and even *"The Wind in the Willows"*) were very useful educational tools to make people aware of their responsibilities towards animals. But please don't forget that animals are animals, they are not humans. It is sick hypocrites such as these who would kill humans in their crusade for "Animal Rights." (Or, in the words of the prophet Hosheya (13 : 2): "They that slaughter humans, they kiss calves.") So, no, it's not true that "Meat is murder!" And neither do monkeys feel shame.

328. Yet on 25 June 2008, the Cortes (Parliament) of Spain (the country of the bullfight, remember — the hypocrisy is breathtaking!) acceded to the wishes of an entity called the Great Ape Project and voted in support of extending the ***right to life and freedom*** to apes. One of the people behind this Great Ape Project is Professor Peter Singer, the Princeton University professor (what did I tell you?) of bioethics. Amongst other things (some others which I would not dare to repeat here) the learned professor has suggested that the life of a healthy pig or dog should command medical and financial resources before that of a severely disabled human baby. (See "Morality and Humanity" in *"It's All in the Angle"* by Avi Shafran for more on this.) This is the hypocrisy and deliberate confusion brought about by Evolution. On the one hand, monkeys must not be put to shame — they have their dignity! They have their rights to life and freedom. On the other hand, human beings are merely highly developed monkeys, brought to their "advanced" "developed" state by random mutation — not created by G-d Who made them in His Image for a purpose — but merely the result of a series of random occurrences and blind chance. ***Everything*** has come about through random, blind chance; the survival of the fittest has ensured that the strong overcomes the weak. No right or wrong; no good or bad. Do what you like. Follow the truth as you see it and be true to yourself. Blah, blah, blah. That is Evolution.

329. Evolution only has "instinct." With G-d as Creator, by contrast, there is order, there is moral right. With G-d as Creator, there is good and bad, there is responsibility and duty and accountability; there is achievement, there is spirituality. There is also gratitude, there is love and beauty and kindness and loyalty. As a result, there is appreciation and acknowledgement of being created in the Divine Image, there is self-worth, there is self-fulfilment and happiness and goodness. All this was said over two thousand years ago: read all about it in "Ethics of the Fathers," Chapter 3, Mishnah 18: Rabbi Akiva used to teach: "Beloved is Man in that he was created in G-d's Image; but even more beloved is Man, because it was made known to him that he was created in G-d's Image, as it is said (in Berayshis / Genesis, 9 : 6) 'For in the Image of G-d, G-d made Man'." When Mankind wakes up to the realization that G-d Almighty is the Creator of All, that He commands obedience to His Will, that

He rewards and punishes each one justly, Mankind will be on its way to fulfilling the purpose that G-d has set it and will be truly happy. As said before *(see above, Paragraph 294)* Evolution — together with Hitler and his fellow dictators and their so-called "Nature's Law" of the strong overcoming the weak and "survival of the fittest" — teaches that "Might is Right." Mankind under G-d teaches that "Right is Might."

A RAY OF LIGHT

330. Don't forget: the Theory of Evolution doesn't teach only that humans came from apes. That's only the most insulting (and libertarian) end-product of the theory (that is, human beings are just animals that have evolved from other animals and therefore can be expected to behave like animals.) You must remember that if there is no Creator and that everything came about through random chance, then that means that every single species, every single specimen of every species, every single creature, all came about by sheer random chance without any design, with no Designer involved anywhere at all. That applies to the tiniest spider as much as to the largest streamlined shark. It includes all the bodily workings of each and every creature — how this little spider manufactures its spider silk inside its body and how the huge shark grows its teeth. It includes also the activities of each and every creature — how the spider spins its web and how the shark co-operates with other sharks in rounding up shoals of fish on which they feed.

331. All this information and knowledge of the amazing workings of our world has of late caused a change in the world of science, especially in the realm of published books. Some of the books produced today, especially for younger readers, are beautifully illustrated with close-up colour photographs and detailed drawings the likes of which have never been possible before. As the unbelievable complexities in the world of nature become known, writers have gradually dropped a lot of the blatant Evolutionary talk — in the face of the sheer near-miraculous wonders that they themselves describe so well, the old Evolution talk sounds plain daft. In fact, serious writers who really appreciate the wonders they're describing, hardly mention Evolution as such. To be sure, there is still the old fictitious phraseology about animals and creatures that have "developed" or have "adapted" but this is more a hangover from the old-style scientific terminology they picked up in their schools, colleges and universities (as described in *Paragraphs 49 — 53, above*) rather than because they really believe it to be true.

332. The old guard Evolutionists, of course, the Attenboroughs, the Hawkingses and the Dawkingses, they all still keep banging on about Evolution. But even ***they*** now speak about Evolution only in general terms, without getting specific about how different things actually evolved. Nowadays, their rubbish-talk is confined to "through Evolution this has come about" and "Evolution has ensured that" and suchlike. Because even if the Evolutionists want to, they cannot ignore the wonderful complexities of the natural world and they know that they cannot show even one instance of Evolution happening. (As said, there are many examples of adaptation, pre-programmed by the Creator in His creatures, but obviously not even a single instance of one species becoming another species. Not one.) So these

people now instead ascribe to Evolution an almost mystical ability to bring about all the wonders of the world. In their desperation to deny G-d the Creator, Evolutionists, with truly religious zeal, instead attribute to their god Evolution all the abilities, all the wisdom and genius, that they deny to G-d Almighty. Of course, this is the worst form of the idolatry of old, and with the same result. Since the god they have made for themselves has no moral force — Evolution cannot be good or bad, it just ***is*** — they too assert that they are not governed by any moral force, no right and wrong, no responsibilities and duties, no reward, no justice, no good, no bad. It's the old idolatry — with the same motives. *(See Paragraphs 138 — 139, above.)*

WHAT A WASTE, WHAT A TRAGEDY !

333. Aside from the madness of Evolution and the denial of G-d as Creator, with all the moral trouble that this brings, there is another tragic result brought about by this Theory of Evolution which is often overlooked and it is this: All over the world, in universities and institutions of higher learning, there are teachers and professors, there are scientists and academicians and researchers (paid handsomely by the State) who are busy thinking, developing, delving, researching, enquiring into this business of Evolution. Morally, some of these people might be rock-bottom (sadly, it seems that in the world of Academe, intellectual prowess too often equates with low morals *(see Paragraph 300, above)* — possibly part of the legacy from the olden times when, because of the churchmen, thinkers and intellectuals were made into outlaws) — but surely they are not mentally deficient! Indeed, some of them are very clever indeed. So, can you imagine what benefits could have been brought to the world if these people did not waste their intellectual energies on such crass stupidities as Evolution and instead were to devote their mental powers to solving real problems and doing real good? But ***that's*** what happens when you banish G-d the Creator from the human world and preach the lie of Evolution and G-dlessness.

334. How many diseases could have been cured by now! How many of the world's natural catastrophes, how much of the world's hunger, homelessness and hardship could have been prevented or cured or overcome, to the benefit of all Mankind! Imagine what the world would look like if instead of pursuing the whimsical fantasy of "Evolution science" (what a contradiction in terms!) these otherwise clever people, with their almost limitless financial backing for their "research," would instead devote their mental energies and these financial resources to finding the cure for cancer or senile dementia or multiple sclerosis or solve the problem of world hunger. It is a serious charge against our modern society that so many millions and millions of government funding is wasted on puerile "research" into Big Bangs and on sending spaceships to the moon and landings on comets yet research into cancer or dementia has to be funded not by governments, but by charities! But that's the result of G-dlessness: denial of G-d the Creator leads sooner or later to the negation of Man as a compassionate human being. Denial of G-d the Creator leads Man — endowed by his Creator with high intelligence and almost limitless potential — away from caring and helping to perfect the world and it leads instead to the stifling of the great human spirit and puts in its place a cold and selfish pursuit of knowledge. Instead of real, genuine research that could be of

so much benefit to so many people, it leads to the unfeeling waste of resources and a callous hard-heartedness. What a waste! What a tragedy!

335. As part of all this futile "research into the origins of the world" and the quest for the answer to "the riddle of the universe," we have had a space race and billions and billions of dollars and roubles have been spent on putting people in space and landing a man on the moon. And space research still goes on, with international space stations and space shots to Venus and Mars and various other space telescopes and space probes. For what? I mean, of what benefit is this frenetic activity to anybody? Other than providing employment for tens of thousands of people (which I suppose could be said to be of some use, at least to them) of what use is all this? To be sure, there have been positive offshoots (it couldn't be otherwise really, considering all the technology in these projects) but "surely there are cheaper ways of developing a non-stick frying pan?"

336. (As a matter of fact, even if there have been some useful side benefits from the space programme, unfortunately the non-stick frying pan is not one of them. The non-stick coating, polytetrafluoroethylene [PTFE] (or "Teflon," to give it its commercial name) was discovered in 1938 by the American chemist, Dr Roy Plunkett, of the DuPont Company. The problem of getting PTFE to stick to metal surfaces was solved in 1954 by Louis Hartmann. So to be quite candid, it's not even true that "the only useful thing to come out of the Apollo programme is the non-stick frying pan!")

337. Here are some figures about the space exploration industry. (Remember, gentle reader, the purpose of all this "exploration" is so that we can find out the origins of the universe. This knowledge will then tell us all that we need to know ... — for what, purpose, please?) Now, the Russians never were the most open about what they spent on their part of the space race but we have some figures for America. (See *Time* magazine, 18 July, 2011, from which much of this data is taken. Apologies for not bringing the figures up to date, but you'll get the drift.) Owing to cash restraints, the article informs us, the space shuttle programme is being scaled back somewhat. But the cutbacks of ***three billion dollars per year*** won't be spent on medical research or on how to solve world hunger or any such projects. Oh goodness me, no! The money (from the American taxpayers) was to be reallocated to other NASA agency programmes — and was due to rise considerably, too. Some examples: "Robotic Missions," that is, unmanned flights to asteroids or to Mars' moons (these, of course, must precede manned missions) were expected to rise by 638% (yes, ***six hundred and thirty eight per cent)*** to $923 million ***per year***. Research into sensors and materials, they tell us, benefits academic and business partners. And so they should, seeing that spending on these important projects till 2015 was expected to rise by 113% to 1.2 billion dollars ***per year***. "Planetary Science," that is, the probes to Jupiter and Mars, were set to cost 1.7 billion dollars ***per year*** by 2015. "Exploration Technology," the technology behind inflatable modules and closed-loop life support (whatever that is) was due to cost 2.1 billion dollars ***per year*** by 2015. And we mustn't forget "Climate Science," that is, Earth-studying satellites, at a trifling 2.3 billion dollars ***per year*** by 2015. From the number of people that are being made redundant (more than 10,000) we can guess

the number still involved in this wasteful buffoonery. And all this is to tell us how the universe came about!

338. As just said, imagine what discoveries could be made by these clever, well-financed people if they would be gainfully employed in the fields of medicine alone! What cures could be invented or discovered! Imagine how many unfortunate people could be helped from the misery of illness or disease, hunger or thirst, or lack of shelter or other deprivations … But no, it is more important to spend this money and human resources on finding out "the origin of the universe"! This is the waste that comes about when people refuse to acknowledge G-d the Creator and instead expend their energies and resources on futile "investigations." By the way, what are they going to do once they've actually found out how the world and the universe came about? Make another one?

339. The sad truth, of course, is that rather than believe what the Creator Himself says about how He created everything, cynical, proud, arrogant, disobedient little Man has to find out for himself. Tell a little child not to touch something because it's hot, he won't believe you. When you're out of the room, he touches it and burns himself and finds out for himself that yes, it's hot. "As at seven, so at seventy!"

THE INNER COSMOS

340. Let us leave the wonders of outer space to help us understand the Creator and instead turn to learn about our Creator from our very selves. As the prophetic writer expresses it: "From my very flesh, I see my G-d!" (Iyyov / Job, 19 : 26) (Various other scientists are reputed to have said very much the same thing: "I have ***almost*** seen G-d under the microscope!") So let us return to the stupendous wonders that are of ***this*** world, and specifically the human body, and see again how it is so senseless to speak of things happening by themselves and "evolving."

341. As is known, all living things are made up of microscopically small parts called cells. Plants are living things and are made up of cells. Trees are plants; so are grasses, so are flowers and mosses and vegetables. Animals, fishes and birds are living things and they also are all made up of cells.

342. Human beings are also living things and our bodies too are made up of cells. There are various estimates of the number of cells that make up the average adult human, ranging from approximately three trillion cells to more than 37 trillion cells. (It all depends, amongst other things, on what you consider a cell and how you measure the count.) The trillion meant here is the American trillion, that is, one million times a million. It is written as 1,000,000,000,000.

343. There are various kinds of cells. There are blood cells (these are of the smallest cells in the body) and there are skin cells (these are of the largest). There are muscle cells; there are bone cells; there are liver cells, fat cells, hair cells — to mention only a few. Each kind of cell has its own job to do in the body. A liver cell's job is to be part of the organ called the liver and do some of the tasks that the liver carries out, namely to clean the blood of toxins and to see to the recycling of

the usable parts of the body (to mention just two of the more than 400 jobs that the liver does). A skin cell's job is to be part of the skin and do some of the things that the skin does. A blood cell has to swim along in the stream of fluid (called the blood or the bloodstream) through the network of veins and arteries and blood vessels and capillaries and do the job of a blood cell (usually to carry oxygen to every one of the trillion other cells in the body). All the cells of the body are continually bathed in fluid and this brings nutrients and oxygen to each one.

344. Generally speaking, a cell consists of three parts. Firstly, there's the outer flexible single-layered (or, in some cells, multi-layered) membrane which keeps most of what is outside, out, and keeps what's inside, in. ("Most," because this membrane *does* allow some needed specific substances from outside the cell to come into the cell and it also allows some unwanted or used-up substances to make their way out of the cell.) Secondly, there is a jelly-like fluid called cytoplasm in which there are nutrients which keep the cell alive. In this cytoplasm there are also a fair number of various tiny, tiny organs which all carry out many vital chemical processes. And thirdly, usually in the centre, there is the nucleus, which is the control centre of the cell, usually surrounded by its own membrane.

345. The nucleus contains the genes in which is the coded information necessary for the reproduction of the cell itself and for all the functions of the tiny little organs in the cell — and of the whole organ of which this cell is a part, and consequently of the whole body.

346. Each cell is itself made up of pretty much the same material as all the others, namely, proteins, fluids, chemicals, acids, fats, minerals, etc., and all these elements are arranged and constructed into the various components that make up the completed cell. What makes each cell into the particular kind of cell that it is (liver cell, bone cell, fat cell, etc.) is the result of the processes carried out by those tiny little organs in the cell, each of those organs having its own function.

347. Cells need energy and most obtain their energy by breaking down chemicals in tiny organs, called "Mitochondria," in which energy-releasing chemical reactions occur. In the cell there are a number of another kind of organ called "Endoplasmic reticulum" which assemble raw chemical material into other useful substances. Within the Endoplasmic reticulum itself there are tiny, tiny organelles called "Ribosomes" which make proteins, which themselves have hundreds of different uses. There are "Lysosomes" which contain digestive chemicals which break down food substances; there is the "Golgi body" which gathers substances in the cell and carries them to the cell's surface for removal through its semi-permeable membrane. There are "Centrioles" which help to organize the process of cell division and duplication and multiplication. And there are many other parts to the cell, too.

348. All these functions are accomplished through complex chemical reactions within each particle and organelle of the cell and which are all interconnected with the other parts in the cell and which of course are connected to other cells and other body organs.

349. As just explained, each particle in the cell is different. Some particles store energy; some convert energy into movement or heat. There are parts of the cell which act like large filing cabinets which hold the files which contain the blueprint or masterplan for the cell to replace itself after its "best before" date has expired or the information and instructions to replace only certain parts of the cell, all as the need arises.

350. As said, each of these tiny, tiny organs in each and every cell has its own function and job to do and the way it does its job is through a series of chemical exchanges or reactions. Different chemicals react with each other in different ways and the ways that the chemicals and acids and proteins in each of the parts of the cell act, react or interact with each other results in something happening to that organ or particle of the cell. This makes that tiny particle of the cell do something to another tiny particle in the cell and that results in the whole cell behaving in a specific way. (It moves in a certain way or in a certain direction or it goes into spasm or it produces a chemical which has an effect on other cells or parts of cells, etc..) All this then has an effect on other cells and they in turn affect yet other cells. Eventually all these cells affect the whole organ (the liver, the thyroid gland, the stomach — whatever) and ultimately the organ will have an effect upon the whole body, all of it working in incredible synchrony and harmony like a huge orchestra, but with an unseen conductor. These chemical reactions that we're speaking of happen continuously, in every cell throughout the body. In some cases these chemical interchanges occur ***two hundred times a second*** and in certain cases these chemical interchanges occur as many as ***two thousand times a second.***

351. One of the most sobering thoughts when viewing all this frenetic activity is that the moment the body of which this cell is an infinitesimally small part dies, all the cells cease to function and all the physical material of which they are made simply collapses into its elements and it all starts to decompose and rot. What keeps all of it going is life. Nobody has ever seen that mysterious thing called life. But everybody knows that when it's not there, everything dies.

352. The chemical actions and reactions occurring inside each cell happen in known chemical ways called "biochemical pathways" and it is these chemical actions and reactions that are portrayed in superb maps. These biochemical pathways are amazingly complicated to describe but once they are known and defined this information can hopefully be used to treat those diseases which come about through malfunction of parts of cells or of cells or of groups of cells. Some of these malfunctions can often be treated by correcting a biochemical fault with some other chemical, or group of chemicals, administered as a medicine. The chemical actions and reactions in each cell, these pathways, are so complex to explain that it is said that it took Professor Gerhard Michal and his team of microbiologists and cartographers three years to compile a map which he called "Biochemical Pathways." In fact, it was so difficult to draw a single map of all that goes on in the cell at the same time that the professor and his team had to resort to drawing two maps (which — surprise! surprise! — he called "Part 1" and "Part 2") but these two maps are to be viewed as if they were superimposed one on top of the other. (*"Biochemical Pathways," Parts 1 and 2*, edited by Gerhard Michal, published by

Boehringer Mannheim Pharmaceuticals.) What is portrayed in these maps is what goes on in each and every single cell, as said, at a rate of anything between two hundred and two thousand times per second. What the professor did in his maps, though, is merely to describe in diagrammatical form the chemical actions and reactions in the cell. Just the drawings of these chemical happenings took three years to do, so complex and complicated are they, so we can imagine how wonderful are the actual processes themselves! (Sadly, these wall charts are no longer obtainable but I understand they have been rewritten as a text book.)

ALL FROM THE ONE CRAFTSMAN

353. Evolutionists like to point out how all the different species of creatures of the world share similar characteristics. They all work in similar ways. They eat and digest food to obtain their energy, for instance, or some of them reproduce in a similar way to other species. They cite this as proof that they must all have come from one common ancestor (but, they quickly assert, quite randomly and without any design or purpose). But this is so twisted and perverse! ***Of course*** there are similarities between species! There are similarities throughout the whole of Creation. It is to be expected. Not only is it to be expected — it couldn't be otherwise! Because similarities in the various creatures are a clear demonstration that all of creation is from the same One and Only Master Craftsman.

354. The Evolutionists love to tell you that the DNA of humans and monkeys is the same except for a mere 10% difference between them, the implication being that there is a close genetic relationship, which presumably is supposed to show that Evolution is not so far-fetched. (But of course they don't mention that there are some forty million differences between the two species' respective nucleotides. Neither do they tell you that almost half of the DNA of humans — 47% — is the same as the DNA of the banana.) But in any case, so what? So what if the material that G-d Almighty used to build all the creatures in His world is the same? The genius is in how He used the same basic material to build such an incredible range of diverse creatures! That all these creatures are basically all made of the same stuff is clear proof that all of these creatures come from the One Creator. Any differences in the genetic makeup of any creatures, however small those differences are, result in different creatures — that's the wonder! (One hundred and thirty million different species of plants and living animals — that's the latest estimate.) And each different creature is there for a reason, as indeed those who know about the ecological balance on this planet keep on telling everybody. And all these creations all work together in the most stupendous synchrony and harmony. In His Infinite wisdom, G-d Almighty ordered that each and every creature shall fill its niche, whether it be a particular algae in a tiny pond or whether it be a huge star in a corner of the universe. All things come from the same Creator, and only from Him, and each thing has its place in His plan. So why should it be so surprising that many living creatures on this planet share the same characteristics and operate in the same way? All together, the whole of Creation declares: "One Creator!"

355. And again, puny, rebellious, silly little Man uses this very unity in G-d's creatures to deny his Creator. And again I ask, to laugh or to cry?

356. Researchers in the field of molecular biology are beginning to actually say that it is extremely improbable that inanimate matter transformed itself into living cells. Dr Harold Klein, chairman of the National Academy of Sciences Committee concluded that, based on the complexity of even the simplest bacterium, it is impossible to imagine how life could ever have come into being by itself. (*"Scientific American"* (February 1991) page 104.)

357. In the human body, the profound intricacy of the brain alone speaks volumes about design. It really makes no sense to speak of this brain as the result of mindless randomness and chance and accident. Put it like this: everybody agrees that electrical pumps and dialysis machines and suchlike need designers and engineers and clever inventors, right? Yet at the same time those that deny G-d the Creator are willing to say that the *actual* heart and kidneys, which these machines only mimic, are the results of lucky chance! Does that make sense? If you look at the whole human body, with the complexity of each cell in the body, the details of the eye, the perfectly coordinated circulatory, muscular, skeletal, digestive and nervous systems (to mention but a few) and the interdependency that there is between them all, it is quite apparent that the world and its creatures were all designed with plan and purpose, and plan and design means Planner and Designer. (*"Pillars of Faith"* by Pinchas Taylor, Mosaica Press, Inc., 2014, page 46.) Ah, but there is none so blind as he who will not see!

358. In the book, *"The Truth: God or Evolution?"* Marshall and Sandra Hall tell the apocryphal story about Sir Isaac Newton (1642 — 1727) the author of *"Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica,"* President of the Royal Society, Master of the Mint and Astronomer Royal, arguably one of the greatest geniuses of recent centuries and a religious man, who once designed and had constructed an extremely complicated model of the solar system whereby by means of an intricate system of cranking handles and rods and cogwheels and gears the model planets would be set in their respective orbits round the model Sun. One day, a non-religious colleague, reputed to have been Edmond Halley, came into Sir Isaac's study and stood there admiring the contraption. "Isaac!" he exclaimed, "this is wonderful! Who made it?" Sir Isaac replied matter-of-factly that it had made itself. His colleague exploded in protest, "Come now, Isaac! It's amazing! Who is the gifted craftsman who made this orrery for you? Anyone can see it speaks of design and great intelligence. Why should you want to deny the craftsman the credit due to him?" Said Sir Isaac, "Let your ears hear what your own mouth is saying! You will not accept the absurdity that this model made itself. You assert that it must have been carefully designed and made by an intelligent and talented craftsman and you are upset with me for refusing to give credit to the craftsman who so skilfully made it. Well, how much more so does the actual solar system, of which this is but the model, testify to the Supreme Intelligence Who made it all!"

359. In the context of the realities of the universe, the so-called scientific Theory of Evolution is so insane! The frantic activity of all these people, each one busy with his own "variations on a theme of madness," calls to mind those puerile activities of

the alchemists of old, looking for the "Philosopher's Stone," experimenting and trying to discover how to change lead into gold and trying to find "the Elixir of Life." Well, it's time to grow up and acknowledge G-d the Creator and start to live our lives as he has told us to. In this, and in this alone, will Humankind, the Crown of G-d's Creation, find fulfilment and happiness.

360. G-d Almighty is not only the Creator of All. He is also the Father of all Mankind. As a good father stands aside and allows his growing son to experiment and even to make mistakes on his journey to adulthood, so, too, does G-d stand aside and lets His human children experiment and progress. Eventually they will rediscover their Father and will acknowledge that He intends everything for their best. In the meantime, of course it pains the father to see the harm and the hurt that his son inflicts upon himself. After the son has tried all the fakes and futilities, he will come back to his father, fully willing to accept the discipline and rules that the father imposes because the son now understands that these are for his own good and always were for his own good. When the Children of Man thus return to their Father in happy reconciliation, the Father, too, will be happy to take them back again. After all, they are His children, and He loves them.

It is finished and complete!

Praise be to G-d for His help in this feat!

תַּם וְנִשְׁלָם

שֶׁבַח לְאֵ-ל בּוֹרֵא עוֹלָם

QUESTIONS and QUERIES

Tick the relevant boxes, "YES" or "NO"

1.	Is there any real proof for the Big Bang?	***YES***	***NO***
2.	Is there any proof or evidence for the two little sub-atomic specks (or the one speck) that are said to have exploded into the universe?	***YES***	***NO***
3.	Can anyone explain how it is possible, in scientific terms, that all the mass and energy that comprises the universe should be contained in those two specks (or the one speck) ?	***YES***	***NO***
4.	If the planets are just bits of rock that broke off from a larger piece (or larger pieces) is there some provable explanation of how come that gravity is that precise.	***YES***	***NO***
5.	If the planets in our solar system were all thrown off from the Sun, is there anybody who can explain and prove why some planets are spinning in a different direction to others and why some planets are whizzing round in orbit in a direction different to others?	***YES***	***NO***
6.	Is there anywhere on Earth where I can dig down and see a continuous series of rocks where the present day rocks are on the top and Cambrian rocks are on the bottom? (Obviously there could be local shocks which may affect the rocks, but away from these places, I should be able to dig and see a continuous series. Is there such a place anywhere on this planet?)	***YES***	***NO***
7.	In the context of the physical world, is there any difference between the word "evolution" as it is commonly used, and "it happened by itself, by chance, randomly, not caused by anything or anybody"?	***YES***	***NO***
8.	The way we've tested scientific theories (for example, the theory of relativity) is by the predictions which they make. Has evolution made any testable predictions?	***YES***	***NO***
9.	Can anyone show or prove where the first amoeba came from?	***YES***	***NO***
10.	Is there a sample anywhere on Earth where animal oil is changing into mineral oil?	***YES***	***NO***

Tick the relevant boxes, "YES" or "NO"

11.	Is there a case study of evolution taking place anywhere in the world, for example, from a porcupine to a bird or a dog to a cat?	***YES***	***NO***
12.	Seeing that different species are supposed to have evolved from common ancestors, has anybody been able to show and prove the common ancestor of cats and dogs?	***YES***	***NO***
13.	Has anybody been able to show and prove at what point in time some particular apes allowed their strength to weaken so that their descendants should become humans who would not need their physical strength any more as they had decided that as humans they would not want to swing around trees any more?	***YES***	***NO***
14.	Can anyone explain and prove why humans elected to become physically weaker than many animals?	***YES***	***NO***
15.	Can anyone explain and prove why so many animals have stayed the same, *e.g.* sharks and crocodiles?	***YES***	***NO***
16.	Can anyone explain and prove why animals spent millions of years evolving ways of protecting themselves from predators (for example, camouflage, poison and spiky bits) yet plants didn't do the same?	***YES***	***NO***
17.	Is there a provable explanation of why so many creatures have exactly two eyes, two ears, one nose and one mouth despite that in a world of random mutations, there should be more variety?	***YES***	***NO***
18.	Is there a provable explanation of how, while the eye was evolving, those species whose eyes didn't work correctly survived and how enough of them survived to correct this negative mutation?	***YES***	***NO***
19.	Can anyone explain and prove why two genders, male and female, is the best method of procreation rather than asexuality?	***YES***	***NO***
20.	Can anyone explain and prove some reason why no species have more than two genders?	***YES***	***NO***
21.	If it is true that it is the law of nature that "the strong shall overcome the weak," can you explain what is wrong with bullying?	***YES***	***NO***
22.	Can you give a scientific reason (not a moral justification) why if it is wrong for me to be a bully only because at present it happens to be that you are stronger than me and ***you*** say that it is wrong for me to be a bully, why shouldn't I try my best to be stronger than you and overcome you so that I should be able to tell you that it is wrong of ***you*** to be a bully?	***YES***	***NO***

Tick the relevant boxes, "YES" or "NO"

23.	If you say that no, there is nothing wrong with my trying to be stronger than you, it will follow that when I succeed, I may bully you — it is the law of nature — but, of course, I will try to make sure that you should not overcome me. Yet it is the law of nature that if you can, you should be the stronger and try to overcome ***me*** and then if you succeed, it will be alright for you to be a bully over me. If so, each of us, in turn, is only following the law of nature and trying to be the stronger and therefore there can be nothing wrong with being a bully. Can you explain why, then, should anybody be punished for being a bully, or a predator, or a tyrant, or a despot?	***YES***	***NO***
24.	In the same way, can you explain in scientific terms how can any side in any war or conflict impute to the other side any wrongdoing in their pursuit of trying to be the stronger and overcoming the weaker? It is the law of nature! For example, after the Allies won the Second World War, they put the Germans on trial for what they called "war crimes" and "crimes against humanity." But if it is the law of nature that the stronger shall overcome the weaker — because that is how the human race has survived and succeeded — then it wasn't wrong of the Germans to try to dominate the rest of the world because that is how the human species is supposed to progress and succeed. So, can you explain why do people call them "crimes against humanity"? Can you explain why even if they did fail in their attempt to be the stronger, why were the Germans punished for making the attempt instead of being rewarded for at least trying?	***YES***	***NO***
25.	Can you explain in scientific terms whether if the Germans had won the Second World War, they would have been right to put the Allies' leaders on trial for ***their*** "crimes against humanity" and for their "crimes against the evolution of humanity" because they had tried to stop the law of nature and had opposed the stronger Germans?	***YES***	***NO***
26.	Can you explain in scientific terms (not moral justification) how if it is better for the sake of the species that the weaker elements should be eliminated so that they should not adversely affect the "gene pool" of the species, what is wrong then with trying to eliminate from the human gene pool the weaker elements or the degenerate specimens of humans?	***YES***	***NO***
27.	If it is the law of nature that the stronger shall overcome the weaker, that is, that there is nothing inherently right or wrong with being the stronger or the weaker but that for the sake of the success of the species it is important that the species shall be strong, can you explain scientifically (not morally) why cannibalism is wrong?	***YES***	***NO***

MILLIONS AND BILLIONS AND TRILLIONS AND ...

	ENGLISH	***AMERICAN***
1,000,000	One million	One million
10,000,000	Ten million	Ten million
100,000,000	One hundred million	One hundred million
1,000,000,000	One thousand million	One billion
10,000,000,000	Ten thousand million	Ten billion
100,000,000,000	One hundred thousand million	One hundred billion
1,000,000,000,000	One billion	One trillion
10,000,000,000,000	Ten billion	Ten trillion
100,000,000,000,000	One hundred billion	One hundred trillion
1,000,000,000,000,000	One thousand billion	One quadrillion
10,000,000,000,000,000	Ten thousand billion	Ten quadrillion
100,000,000,000,000,000	One hundred thousand billion	One hundred quadrillion
1,000,000,000,000,000,000	One trillion	One quintillion
10,000,000,000,000,000,000	Ten trillion	Ten quintillion
100,000,000,000,000,000,000	One hundred trillion	One hundred quintillion
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One thousand trillion	One sextillion
10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	Ten thousand trillion	Ten sextillion
100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One hundred thousand trillion	One hundred sextillion
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One quadrillion	One septillion
10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	Ten quadrillion	Ten septillion
100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One hundred quadrillion	One hundred septillion
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One thousand quadrillion	One octillion
10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	Ten thousand quadrillion	Ten octillion
100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One hundred thousand quadrillion	One hundred octillion
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One quintillion	One nonillion
10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	Ten quintillion	Ten nonillion
100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One hundred quintillion	One hundred nonillion
1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000	One thousand quintillion	One decillion

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a partial list of sources of material used in the compilation of this essay, listed here in no particular order with some of these mentioned in the essay itself. There are many more and there are many more than those, too, but they are beyond memory's reach. In addition, there are dozens of books and websites that expertly and scientifically demolish the Theory of Evolution utterly and completely. In fact, with the facts that are known today, it is more difficult to believe in Evolution than it is to believe in G-d the Creator.

The Neck of the Giraffe or Where Darwin Went Wrong, Hitching
Evolution, A Theory in Crisis, Denton
The Evolution Revolution, Spetner
Darwin's Black Box, Behe
Icons of Evolution, Wells
Life — How did it get here? By Evolution or by Creation?
Genesis and Genes, Bogacz
The Disasters Darwinism Brought to Humanity, Yahya
What Darwin Got Wrong, Fodor and Piattelli-Palmarini
In the Beginning, Aviezer
Worlds in Collision, Velikovskjy
Evolution, The Great Debate, Blackmore and Page
Intergalactic Judaism, *R.* Lister
Forbidden Science, Milton
Ages in Chaos, Velikovsky
The Facts of Life, Milton
Before the Flood, Wilson
Rejoice, O Youth! *R.* Miller
Nature's Destiny, Denton
Not By Chance, Spetner
Sing, You Righteous, *R.* Miller
Permission to Believe, *R.* Kelemen
Our Miraculous World, Forchheimer
Human Intelligence Gone Ape, Greenberger
Beyond a Reasonable Doubt, Waldman
Earth in Upheaval, Velikovsky
The Obvious Proof, Robinson and Steinman
A Thin Line Between Theory and Fantasy, Balsam
Reasonable Doubts, Berman
Summer for the Gods, Larson
The Unity of Heaven and Earth, Katz
It's All in the Angle, *R.* Shafran
Radiocarbon User's Handbook, Gillespie