

The Lie of Evolution

Pastor David Ministries

Ezekiel 34:10, 23

www.pastordavidministries.com

**Revised
January 2026**

2Peter 3:5,6 “For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: (the Genesis flood) 6- Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished:” The Genesis flood is of the utmost importance in the comparison between evolution and creation. (Search for documentaries on YouTube called, “The Quest for Noah’s Ark” and “In Search of Noah’s Ark 1976”.)

The archaeological evidence left on earth many years ago tells the only physical story we have of what happened. Since the difference between these two concepts is extremely different, incompatible and far from each other, the job of coming to an honest conclusion ought to be easy. The one should be close to the real archaeological evidence and the other should be far from the evidence.

This article intends to show that the scanty evidence which supports evolution is almost entirely big fat lies, or on rare occasion, flimsy misapplied evidence. But, in most cases, deliberate lies..... they know they’re lying. What could possibly be more fun? However, most of the time they don’t show any evidence at all..... they don’t need to..... they just say it’s true, and most people believe them anyway, without evidence. What do they need any evidence for? They don’t. All the general public just follows along and believes them no matter what they say. The big question is: how do they do it with a straight face, without laughing? The general public is soooooo gullible.

The word “*evolution*” has been greatly misused and incorrectly defined in modern times. Therefore, a clear definition must be given of this word. The main purpose of the modern use of this word was started over a century ago (by Darwin's 1859 “*On the Origin of Species*”), to give an explanation of the origin of life, because certain people rejected the predominant religious teaching, back then, that God created the world and human beings in six days, approximately six thousand years ago.

The “theory” of evolution didn’t exist before that. The “theory” of evolution is exclusively a modern phenomenon. Most people were much more religious back in those days. The main purpose of the “theory” of evolution was to state very clearly that no creator was necessary for our existence. Its very essence is that of atheism.

I repeat, when Darwin lived the predominant belief of the majority of people was that the creation account taught from the Bible was true. Creation used to be the commonly accepted belief of the origin of the world. Most people were much more religious in those days,..... and the theory of evolution was something new.

Moreover, the word “*evolution*” has been greatly misused. For example, some people talk about the “*evolution*” of the computer. But, everybody knows that the computer had human creators and that its “creation” (**not** “evolution”) has been a slow and gradual process by human creators all within the last century. The computer could never have “evolved” without creators; it was “created”, it didn’t “evolve” all by itself. However, it is more likely that a computer could evolve all by itself than that human beings could evolve all by themselves; humans are much more complicated. The DNA code that forms human beings cannot be altered by mutations without causing abnormal inferiority. Mutations are never improvements. Anything that shows intelligent design cannot have any **random** deviations without ruining the original design.

Everything that requires intelligent design must have a creator. **Random** chances never produce intelligent complicated design. Can a monkey typing **random** keys on a keyboard produce an intelligent book? **Never, never, never.** Evolution is a lie. Anything having intelligent design demonstrates the handiwork of a rational creator, guided by reason.

The word “*development*” implies the existence of creators, whereas the word “*evolution*” implies the non-existence of creators; that it was self-producing. When people use the word “*evolution*” concerning things that had creators, it causes a mix-up in people’s minds, because they can see very plainly the existence of the things created, thereby inappropriately producing a reinforcement of the belief in the “theory” of evolution applied to the origin of life, without a creator. The subject of whether or not there was a creator has become irrelevant and/or meaningless, because of this misapplication of the word “evolution”. Whereas, the existence of a creator should be the central point. Using the word “evolution” inappropriately confuses people. (See article listed below on: The Consequences of Using Incorrect Terminology.)

The “theory” of evolution supposedly happened by means of **random** chances, which in real life never produce organized intelligent design. It also “assumes” that all species are always slowly changing into different species.....

which is false. (“assume” means to make an “ass” (donkey's rear end) of “you” and “me”) No specie has ever changed into a different specie. The DNA code itself prohibits that. Children are always different than their parents, but children are **always** the same specie..... and not any other specie. All species have variations from one generation to the next, (They are not identical twins of their parents.) but none of them are changing into a different specie; the variations always have limits. The “theory” of evolution must “assume” that there are no limits. No fossil of any intermediate form between any two species has ever been found..... never, zip, zero, nada. **All** of the links between **all** of the species are **all** missing. 00.00% exists. The “missing link” is not just the absence of an intermediate fossil form between ape and man. There is no link between **ANY** two species. **ALL** the links between **ALL** of the species are missing!

It is true that the word “evolution” originally comes from old Latin and that before the modern “theory” of evolution (started by Darwin), concerning the origin of life, it was used in a more general manner, very similar to the word “development”. The Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary defines evolution as: “**a process of change in a certain direction: UNFOLDING**” The commonly accepted modern definitions of “evolution” are only listed in the modern dictionaries, older dictionaries did not have any mention of species “evolving” into other species.

But, the original meaning was not the same, many years ago, as compared to how they use it today. It is inappropriate to use the word “evolution” for anything going through a development (creation) process, the way they feel at liberty to do now, like talking about the “evolution” of the computer. The computer did not “evolve”, it was “created” by people. Any “process of change” directed by **random** chances does not ever produce anything with organized design, which requires rational mental capacity.

It is very important when dealing with the origin of life and the origin of the planet Earth not to confuse its meaning. Since the formation of the modern “theory” of evolution of life, there has been attached to it a very powerful connotation of an anti-religious and atheistic rejection of the creator “God” that goes along with the package. This atheistic mentality is a danger that has now been automatically attached to the word “evolution”, even when it is used in reference to other things, which are not pertaining to the origin of life on earth. (Like the supposed “evolution” of the computer. The computer did not “evolve”, it was created.)

Amazingly, when a bunch of expert evolutionists and creationists get together to have a debate, (there are many videos of these debates on YouTube) it

is the evolutionists who always bring up religion first. The creationists are ready to talk about science, but the evolutionists want to talk about God. The main complaint they have is that they expect that if God really does exist, then why is there so much badness in the world? (Gen 3:17-19) If indeed God is a God of love, then why aren't we living in paradise? Well, the human race started out in a paradise. It was called the "Garden of Eden". God gave them only one rule to live by: they were forbidden from eating the fruit from one certain tree. (Gen 3) If they had not disobeyed God by eating from that tree, we would all still be living in that paradise right now..... with no sickness, no aging and no death.

And rest assured, if those people complaining that we're not living in paradise were living in the "Garden of Eden", they would have eaten from the forbidden tree just like Adam and Eve did. Yet, God has made a plan that permits people to eventually get to paradise, in the next life. Why aren't the people who complain that we're not living in paradise right now not interested in the opportunity of salvation, and paradise in the next life? (See article listed below on: Salvation.)

We must also confront those people who consider the whole concept of creation, about 6,000 years ago, to be absurd stupidity. Well, the only other option is to believe that living organisms came from non-living materials, changing over time, caused by **random** chances. Which is to say, in so many words, that we came from a rock. Living organisms never come from non-living materials.

The obvious absurdity of their rock theory is the only reason for their need for lots and lots and lots of "time". So, they twist the evidence and claim the earth to be billions of years old. They need lots and lots of "time" in order to cover-up the unmistakable impossibility of their theory that living creatures came from rocks.

Now,..... Can we get back to talking about science instead of religion?

The Bible teaches that, approximately six thousand years ago (more or less) God created the world in six days. (Literal days consisting of 24 hours. They were not six extended periods of time, as some people propose. Gen. 1:5 "And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.") (Evolution and creation are contrary to each other, and no attempt should be made to combine them or to blend them together. Evolution is a lie! Christians must not make accommodations for that lie.

Christians must see it for what it truly is..... a lie. Not even a mistake. It is a deliberate lie!) Then, God rested on the seventh day as an example for people to dedicate one day a week for rest from regular work and to devote that one day a week to religious worship service. (Gen. 1,2)

There is a big difference between the ages of the earth being six thousand years, according to the teaching of creation in the Bible, as compared to about six billion years, more or less, according to the “theory” of evolution. (It really doesn't matter exactly how many years, because they're always changing it.) (Just to make it a nice round number, we could make it a million to one difference.)

The important questions are: First, where do evolutionary scientists get their number of years from? (The average person doesn't know. But, they follow along anyway.) Second, why do they feel free to change that number whenever they get in the mood, and then teach it as though it's an undeniable fact? The number of years they give is always changing..... and yet they teach it as though it's an undeniable fact. And, anyone who contradicts them is stupid. Answer – They make-up that number of years however they want, with feeble twisted evidence or no evidence at all, because the general public will believe them, no matter what they say. They don't need any proof.

And third, why do they even need billions of years, anyway? Answer - Since nobody ever actually sees evolution happening in real life, the evolutionists conclude that it happens so slowly that it is impossible to actually see it in progress. (No, if it was happening in real life we would see half-way intermediate forms of species, right now.) Therefore, before they begin looking for evidence, they have to assume that there must have been billions of years in the process. So, they end up twisting the evidence to make it fit their previously assumed conclusions.

But in reality, the real reason why nobody ever sees evolution happening is because it never happens. No specie ever changes into a different specie. No fossil of an intermediate specie between any two different species has ever been found. Not even one. In fact, if evolution were true, no “specie” would exist at all. Every creature would be in the process of changing into something else. There would be no such thing as any creature remaining as a consistent, enduring “specie”.

And, they have to ignore the fact that ALL intermediate forms would be impractical, inferior and dysfunctional. They insist that intermediate forms would be superior advancements. But, NO. In the real world, intermediate forms would produce a creature which would be crippled and disabled.

In order to measure the age of the earth, one must examine some sort of process that has been happening on a constant regular basis, assuming that the process has been continuing at the same rate in the past. (In this case, it is necessary to “assume” something, whereas in those other cases “assuming” is incorrect, wrong and irrational. It is important to remember that this type of “assumed” evidence must be considered only “probable” evidence, not absolute proof.)

In the Bible, people have existed since the Garden of Eden, which is a close approximation of the age of the earth. But in evolutionary science, the Garden of Eden is not considered acceptable. They consider it to be a myth or fairy-tale. In the Bible, the time from Adam to Christ is about 4,100 years. And from Adam to our modern age, is about 6,123 years. The Jewish calendar claims the year to be 5,783 since creation.

Continuing the discussion of using a scientific method for measuring the age of the earth: One approach involves measuring quantities of specific substances that result from constant natural processes. For example, a very steady process is the accumulation of cosmic dust on the surface of the earth, the moon, and Mars. Evolutionary scientists once measured the speed of this process and the total amount of cosmic dust present—and the results yielded an age close to the biblical figure: around 6,000 years.

Notice – they thought that the first space capsule to land on the moon would sink into an enormous amount of cosmic dust and be lost, because there are no weather conditions on the moon to alter its location. But, when the first space capsule landed on the moon they found exactly the quantity of cosmic dust as would be expected for a biblical age of the moon. The difference in quantity is about a million times more for evolution; enough to cover a multi-story building.

Not only that, but those little lunar rovers with wheels could not work riding on top of billions of years of soft cosmic dust, any more than regular cars can drive on top of deep snow. (That’s why they sell 4 wheel drives, so that people can get through deep snow in the winter time. In fact, they would need something more like a snowmobile to ride over all that cosmic dust.) This dating method of the age of the earth, moon and Mars was then rejected by the evolutionary scientist’s because it did not give them the results that they wanted, regardless of the obvious soundness of this method.

The composition of cosmic dust is easy to identify and does not decompose like some other materials. On earth, much of it that fell on land would have been washed into the oceans by rain. So, the oceans should contain everything that fell directly into them **plus** a large amount that was washed off the land. Yet,

scientists cannot find billions of years' worth of cosmic dust—not on the land, not in the oceans, not anywhere. If evolution is true and the earth is billions of years old, then where is all that dust? How could it just disappear from the surfaces of the earth, the moon, and Mars? It's not possible.

In addition, in the “theory” of evolution it would be expected that the main ingredient in the content of the layers of sediment ought to come from the cosmic dust which is continually falling on the earth's surface. But the material content of the sediment is much different from the content of cosmic dust. The layers of sediment were formed by the Genesis flood, not from cosmic dust. Mostly, the layers of sediment were formed at the end of the flood as the water was draining off the continents into the oceans. And, as that was happening, the oceans were sinking lower and the mountains were rising higher. In fact, before the flood, there is no reason to believe that there were any tall mountains at all.

There have been also **MANY, MANY** other good and sound dating methods which were also originally proposed and tested by evolutionary scientists (their own people), but those were also rejected and denied because those methods did not give them the results they wanted. Pretty soon those evolutionary scientists had trash cans that were overflowing with rejected dating methods. Eventually, they needed big dumpsters to handle all the abundance of evidence they were throwing out.

The truth is, there is an **abundance** of sound evidence that the earth is very young, **much** more evidence than the evidence that the earth is old. (like comparing an ant to an elephant) Also, this demonstrates how the evolutionary scientists start with their assumed theory and then dishonestly try to twist the evidence to make it fit their previously invented conclusions..... and how they reject the majority of the evidence that doesn't agree with it. (Notice – their conclusions are **always** formed before the evidence is examined. Christians also form their conclusions before examining the scientific evidence, but that is because Christians have already received the information from a faithful guide, from God above. The evolutionists don't have any guide from above. The important question is: which explanation does the evidence fit?)

In reality, there are only **a few** dating methods used by evolutionary scientists that appear to support an old earth. And the **only reason** those methods were accepted is because they produce the **oldest possible ages**—not because they are better methods. In fact, there have also been other methods that produced **medium-range dates** that were also rejected—again, because they didn't support the billions-of-years narrative necessary for evolution.

However, the **vast majority** of the **best** evidence still shows the earth to be very young; the biblical age. In addition, those few methods that give the oldest age are noticeably less stable because they are based on a process that pro-

bably has changed over the years due to things like the Genesis flood. (Which the evolutionists also reject.) (Search on YouTube for documentaries called, “The Quest for Noah’s Ark” **and** “In Search of Noah’s Ark 1976”.)

It is also very probable that before the flood, the tallest mountains were much lower than the mountains are now. And, as the mass of water drained off the land, after the flood, quite probably the ocean floors sank lower, which caused taller mountains to be pushed up higher than before the flood. (Remember, the inner part of the earth is liquid lava.) As a result, much less water would have been necessary to cover all of the land, during the flood. In fact, there is no reason to believe that any tall mountains existed before the flood.

Even now, they’ve been talking for years about how they’re expecting global warming to cause the water level in the oceans to get higher and higher. But, what’s happening, while a lot of ice is melting and filling the oceans with more and more water, the ocean floors are sinking and the land is getting pushed up higher and higher. So, we should **not** expect to see the water level in the oceans get much higher. Yes, the water level may rise **a little**, but not **a lot**.

And, why do they even need billions of years, anyway? Answer: Since nobody ever actually sees evolution happening in real life, they have to conclude that it happens so slowly that it is impossible to actually see it in progress. Therefore, before they begin looking for evidence, they have to assume that there must have been billions of years in the process. So, they end up twisting the evidence to make it fit their previously assumed conclusions.

But in reality, the real reason why nobody ever sees evolution happening is because it never happens..... and, therefore, a super old earth is not necessary. If evolution were true regular “species” would not even exist, every creature would be in some sort of intermediate form. ALL animals would be changing into something else. The truth is, ALL species stay within the limits of their own specie. All over the world every animal, including humans, fit into their own specie. Species changing into other species never happens. If evolution were true, then no “specie” would exist.

The flood would have caused changes in the earth's atmosphere and crust, which in turn would have caused changes in the aging process of almost everything, including humans. The Bible says that people lived much longer before the flood. Noah lived to 950 years of age. Gen. 9:29 (also read: Gen. 5 for additional lifespans.) (Notice – the 2014 film “Noah” is loaded with errors. Hollywood producers are not in the business of historical accuracy—they’re in the business of selling movies. So when they use a true story, they often fictionalize it to

make it more marketable.) (Noah's ark has been seen by witnesses on the top of mount Ararat, in Turkey, usually buried in snow.)

(See: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Searches_for_Noah%27s_Ark

and search for documentaries on YouTube called, “The Quest for Noah’s Ark” **and** “In Search of Noah’s Ark 1976”.)

Noah’s ark is box-shaped, not boat-shaped, as clearly stated in the Bible. It did not need to travel, just float. Mount Ararat is not the tallest mountain, but it is very difficult to climb. So, it's impossible that such a massive structure was **built** on top of it. More likely, the Ark **landed** there after the waters receded. (Its box shape was one of the few things they got right in the 2014 film “Noah”.) Its purpose was to float, not travel. It had no rudder, no motor, no sail and no oars. It was also the right size for the job. That box shaped construction on the top of that mountain is the same size and shape as Noah's ark clearly stated in the Bible.)

Gen 6:15 “..... The length of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits.” (See documentaries on YouTube called, “The Quest for Noah’s Ark” **and** “In Search of Noah’s Ark 1976”.)

Please notice, there are also reports that ancient remains of a different boat shaped structure has been found up there in a valley, next to the mountain, close to where the real ark was found, which is the same size, but a different shape. A very simple explanation for that is that it’s a replica similar to the “Noah’s Ark” like the one built in Williamstown, Kentucky, USA. They call it “Ark Encounter”, which they made very close to the “Creation museum” in Petersburg, Kentucky, USA. And.... just like the replica made in Kentucky, the other replica in the valley, near the real ark, had the right size, but wrong shape. How could those builders of that replica not be aware of the abundance of reports made about the box shape of the real “Noah’s Ark”? (Smells fishy to me.)

(Notice that there was never any rain before the flood. It was much more humid then and a good layer of dew watered the ground every morning. Gen. 2:5-6) (There were no rainbows in the sky before the flood. God made a promise by the rainbow, after the flood, never to destroy the earth by water again. Gen. 9:13-16) (See documentaries on YouTube called, “The Quest for Noah’s Ark” **and** “In Search of Noah’s Ark 1976”.)

Fossils themselves cannot be formed unless they are buried quickly and completely, as in a flood. After the heavy rain for 40 days and 40 nights (Gen. 7:12), eventually, all that water drained off the land into the oceans.

More than likely, the land was much flatter before the flood, but after all

that water drained into the oceans, the ocean floors sank, which caused the mountains to be pushed up much higher than before the flood. Remember, under the earth's crust is liquid lava. The earth is kind of like a giant balloon filled with liquid. And, if something pushes down on one part of the balloon, the other parts of the balloon rise up higher.

Also, understand that as the water was draining off the land, it caused sediment to flow and cover many plants and animals, burying them quickly and entirely which was how the fossils were formed. This was also how underground deposits of petroleum were formed. Without a flood, underground petroleum could not exist. Apart from the flood there is no feasible manner which could have formed those deposits of petroleum or coal. It is impossible for evolutionists to explain these things.

Please notice, that ALL of the levels of sediment were formed at the same time, in the same flood. So, ALL of the levels of sediment are the same age. This is why the evolutionary scientists never date the levels of sediment. NONE of their dating methods can possibly give them different ages for any of the levels of sediment. So, they already know not to attempt dating sediment.

So, evolutionists have to use a very unusual method for dating old fossils and sediment, which isn't really dating at all. They use what they call "index fossils", which are small commonly found fossils available all over the place. According to evolutionists those "index fossils" are like markers that indicate at what age a particular fossil or sediment is. But, according to creation, all fossils would be expected to be found scattered pretty much evenly all over the place. Of course, those evolutionists can very easily select any "index fossil" they want to say any age they want. They can just make it up as they go along. And who's going to contradict them? Almost everybody believes them no matter what they say.

A plant or animal which dies under normal conditions, out on open land, **never, never, never** forms into a fossil. Trees or animals that die in normal conditions out on open land always rot, decompose and fall apart (or get eaten by other animals/insects) before they could ever be formed into fossils. Without the flood, fossils of entire creatures in sediment underground could not exist.

(Notice - regarding the mass extinction of the majority of species that can be found in the fossil record. The Bible does not say that Noah got every last specie into the ark. It says that his **instructions** were to: [Gen 6:19](#) "And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female." His **instructions** were to gather two of "every" sort (specie). But, it never says that he actually got every last specie. Obviously, it didn't really matter if he got every last one.) (It's also possible

that most of the dinosaurs were deliberately left out.) So obviously, if Noah failed to get any particular specie, it would have become extinct after the flood.

What's more, even with their supposed billions of years, canyons like the Grand Cannon could never have been formed by that teeny tiny river that flows at its base. The Grand Cannon must have been formed by a giant flood.

In the oceans, hundreds of underwater cities have been found which obviously were at some time in the past above the water line of the ocean. There are more than 200 known underwater cities in the Mediterranean alone. Many of those underwater structures are explained very extensively in the History Channel's documentary series "Ancient Aliens", 2010, season 2, episode 3.

2Peter 3:5,6 "For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water: (the Genesis flood) 6- Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." The Genesis flood is of the utmost importance in the comparison between evolution and creation. (See documentaries on YouTube called, "The Quest for Noah's Ark" **and** "In Search of Noah's Ark 1976".)

The most widely used scientific method to determine the age of younger fossils (not rocks) used by evolutionists is by a process known as carbon dating, a technique that measures the rate of decay and radioactivity in an organic object. Carbon-14 is not a stable isotope, so it decays over time, whereas carbon-12 does not decay, so by measuring the two against each other, they're able to get a general age. In order to do carbon dating, you need organic material. You need wood or bone..... something that lived. A piece of stone can't be carbon dated. (Please notice that this method is not as accurate as they claim it is. It's good for general ages, but not for precise ages. The results might be double the true age or half of the true age, but not a million times the true age.)

The half-life of carbon-14 is 5,700 years, making it reliable for dating organic matter up to about 50,000 years old. After that, the quantity of carbon-14 is so small that it is no longer measurable. Therefore, it cannot be used to measure anything that is supposed to be more than 50,000 years old. The problem is that, according to creation, the flood happened about 4,000 years ago. So, ALL of the fossils should be 4,000 years old. But, because the evolutionists assume that those fossils are much older, they assume that carbon dating cannot be used on those fossils. They never use the carbon-14 dating method on them. The truth is

that carbon-14 DOES work on those fossils, but since they don't want a young age, they already know that they have to avoid using carbon-14. So, they lie, and use a different method to get the age they want.

Carbon-14 dating never gives any age of any fossil to be millions of years old. This means that no fossil really is that old. And the fossils that they claim are millions of years old, they must be very careful to never use carbon-dating on them. So, if they want a super old age for any fossil, they have to use some other method, like "index fossils", which they can make any claims they want, and everybody just takes their word for it. Is there anyone who ever goes to double check? No. Never. We need someone to carbon-date those index fossils. Rest assured they're not as old as the evolutionists claim they are.

Remember, carbon-14 dating method is only used for younger fossils, but for fossils that are supposedly millions of years old, **they say** that there is no scientific method that will allow anyone to date the object or bone itself. (This is another lie) (Notice – This is another case when they don't get the results they want, (like the cosmic dust on the moon) so they find a deceptively covert way to reject their own methodology (carbon-14 dating), just for certain cases, without letting anyone know that their own methodology disproves their own theory..... and then they find a different way to get the results they want.)

In other words, when they carbon date a dinosaur bone they get a very young Bible age, which they don't want. So, they inappropriately conclude that carbon-14 dating doesn't work on dinosaur bones (without giving any understandable explanation), and therefore they have to use a different method. (But, the truth is, carbon-14 dating **does** work on dinosaur bones. The young Bible age results they get are indeed true.)

They say they have to date a dinosaur bone according to the age of the deposits in which it is found. (Are they talking about the level of sediment? No. Try asking them.) In other words, they select an object next to where the bone was found and use that (which they call "index fossils"), assuming its proximity must be a result of being the same age. (How can they date an object next to the bone, but not the bone? And, why can't they date the level of sediment?) Something smells fishy. Yeah, it's fishy all right. Supposedly, there are lots of little "index fossils" near the bone that they're trying to date. And, what if each one they have listed for a different age? Well then, they can just pick whichever one they want, and give it whichever age they want to give it.

In fact, the guy who goes out to examine any fossil could just take along with him a pocket full of those small "index fossils", and then he could just pick whichever one he wanted, out of his own pants pocket, to say the fossil was any age he wanted. They don't ever have anyone peeking over their shoulder to check if they're doing it right. After all, is it believable that every single dinosaur bone they evaluate has an "index fossil" right next to it? And if not, is it believable

that, in the event that there wasn't an "index fossil" next to it, would they excavate a large area all around their find just looking for one of those little "index fossils"?

They would need a lot of heavy duty land digging equipment to do that! Phooey! It's a whole lot easier for the paleontologist to just carry a variety of those little "index fossils" along in his pocket. There..... problem solved. After all, nobody ever contradicts them anyway. They can do anything they want and claim it's true. (I'm not saying all this because I've actually seen them carrying "index fossils" in their pockets. I haven't. I'm saying it because this is the type of dishonest thing they would do. After all, the "index fossils" themselves are evaluated to be any age they want. Have they ever dated any of those index fossils? NO! They don't have to. Everyone believes them anyway.) (Remember, they say that carbon dating can't work for anything over 50,000 years.)

Well..... if you ask them about their dating method, they will probably say something like: The levels of sediment are dated by the "index fossils" found in it. And..... the "index fossils" are dated by the level of sediment which they are found in.That's circular reasoning. (But you're not supposed to notice that. This is how they date the levels of sediment without actually dating the levels of sediment. But you're not supposed to notice that, either. And..... as long as nobody goes to check it out for themselves, which they never do, they can keep on saying any age they want.)

They ~~probably~~ just look at it and give it any age they want, claiming that it has a reputation of regularly being found next to other "index fossils" of the assumed age they whimsically decided to give it. Then, they could pick out whatever "index fossil" they want out of their pants pocket, and claim they found it nearby. In other words, the object has the age they assumed because they assumed the age it has. They present evidence as fact, which is nothing more than their own whimsical invention rather than scientific evidence.) Remember, evolution is in the lie business, not in the truth business..... And, they love it that way. What could possibly be more fun? They already know that the general public never investigates to see if what they say is true.

And, what are "index fossils"? Since ALL of the levels of sediment were formed at the same time, in the same flood, evolution cannot date the levels of sediment in any normal manner. So, they teach that each level of sediment represents a certain age many years ago when certain animals lived leaving only the fossils of that age behind. There have always been certain types of small creatures in abundance in each age (according to them), so if you know what types of "index fossils" are present in any particular section of sediment, then you can know what age the sediment is by finding those common small fossils in it. All of this is not a dating process at all. It is a false assumption by which they can

select any age they want for anything they want. Lies, lies, lies, lies.

After all, if creation is true, then all of the “index fossils” are scattered in all of the levels of sediment, and those evolutionists can just pick whichever ones they want in any level, and make whatever claims they want about anything. The “index fossils” method permits them to claim anything they want. The “index fossil” methodology is not scientific evidence at all.

The truth is that if they were to use carbon dating on all those “index fossils” the results would be very much different than the ages they claim them to be. If creation is true then they would get ages very close to the time of the flood, about ~4,000 years ago. Remember, the reason why they need billions of years is because nobody ever sees evolution in progress. Nobody ever sees any creature changing into a different specie. Intermediate forms of animals don't exist. It never happens. So, they claim that it happens so super slowly that it's impossible to actually see it in progress. But, the truth is that nobody ever sees it happening because it never happens. And the earth is **not** billions of years old.

And, what if ALL of those “index fossils” are scattered in an abundance ALL through every one of the levels of sediment? This is what you would expect to see if the Genesis flood is true..... if the Bible is true. Well, folks..... is there anyone who will take a look for us? This whole “index fossil” system is calling God a liar, saying that the Bible's account that God created the world approximately 6,000 years ago is false. We need somebody to make a real good video documentary to prove where the “index fossils” are really found. And, we need to see the results of carbon dating on those “index fossils”.

So who is the real liar? God or the evolutionists? I'm an old man, and I don't have the means or the equipment necessary to do this kind of search. Isn't there anybody who can? And..... rest assured, a carbon-14 dating test of those “index fossils” will give the Bible age, which means that ALL of those “index fossils” they claim to be millions of years old are really closer to the Bible age.

If the Bible is true, then ALL of the levels of sediment were formed as the flood water was draining off the land and into the oceans, displacing a lot of sediment along the way. All of the underground fossils found in sediment were buried quickly and entirely at the same time in that flood. And ALL of the “index fossils” are scattered at random in ALL the levels of sediment. We should expect to see that their entire system of “index fossils” is a false claim. After all, they can't get their age of millions of years any other way. Why not? We should expect them to use a system, like the “index fossils”, which is so exceedingly obviously falsifiable.

But, the mere fact that they cannot date the levels of sediment in any normal manner is proof that ALL of the levels of sediment are the same age, formed in the same flood, as the flood waters receded off the land, which buried many plants and animals, as the sediment was moving toward the oceans, after the rain

stopped. This was how all of the fossils were formed, and how all of the deposits of petroleum and coal were formed. The evolutionists have no understandable explanation for the formation of underground deposits of petroleum or coal. Plants and animals which die out on open land could never form underground deposits of petroleum or coal. A deposit of coal was from a mass of trees all pushed together in a big pile and covered with sediment. That can't happen in any typical manner as trees die out on open land. But, it could happen in the aftermath of a flood.

According to creation, all the ages had the exact same types of fossils available, so **all** of the supposed "index fossils" are present in **all** of the levels of sediment. But, since almost all of the paleontologists are evolutionists, they don't have anyone else peeking over their shoulder, so they can ignore the "index fossils" that they don't want and then they can pick whatever "index fossils" they want and claim any age they want for whatever level of sediment they want. They don't even have to do any real "dating" for those "index fossils", because almost everyone believes everything they say, anyway. What do they need any real scientific evidence for? They don't. Everybody believes them, no matter what they say.

Whereas according to creation, all of the fossils were buried in the same flood about 4,000 years ago. And, all of the "index fossils" were scattered pretty much the same in all of the levels of sediment. And, all of the sediment was formed at that same time, which was previously located in a different place on land, all created by God. No matter what effect the water had on all that sediment, its true age is from the beginning when God created it at the same time about 6,000 years ago.

So, when they try to date a dinosaur bone, they can just pick the "index fossil" that gives them the assumed age they already knew they wanted, before they started, which they already knew they would **not** get if they used carbon-dating on any fossil. Carbon-14 dating cannot be used on any fossil to give a very old age, and there are no very old fossils. Carbon-14 dating **never** gives a super old age on any fossil, and none of the fossils are super old. (**ALL** fossils were formed during the same flood approximately 4,000 years ago.)

(I repeat – the reason they have to assume the earth is billions of years old is because in real life nobody ever sees any specie change into a different specie. Intermediate forms of animals changing into a different specie ought to be seen among us, but it never happens. Therefore they conclude that the process of species changing into other species must happen so slowly that it takes such a super long time to happen that it had to have taken millions of years. But, the truth is that nobody ever sees it happening because it never happens. Half-way transitional creatures never exist. No intermediate fossil of any animal changing into a

different specie has ever been found, present or past. Evolution is a lie, not a misconception. They know they're lying. No specie is ever, or has ever changed into a different specie.) And, therefore, a super old earth is not necessary. (Beware.... intermediate **hoax** fossils have been presented previously, but they have always been exposed to be hoaxes. Evolution is a lie.) They also want to call God a liar. So, each person has to choose who they're going to believe. One or the other has to be a lie.

Notice how they completely ignore dating the level of sediment in which a bone is found. All this doesn't make sense, does it? It smells fishy. That's because they don't want to tell anyone that their own dating methods disprove their own theories. The real reason they won't carbon-14 date a dinosaur bone itself is that their carbon-14 dating methods give them an age that they don't want. They must reject their own methodology without letting anyone know that their methodology gives them results they don't want.

How is it possible that they can carbon-date other bones, but not a dinosaur bone? And, since carbon-14 dating never gives any bone a super old age, then how do they get the age of those "index fossils" which they say are super old? They don't. It's not necessary. Everyone believes them no matter what they say. They always reject any evidence that doesn't agree with their theory. Lies, lies, lies, lies. Their ~~trash cans~~, rather, big dumpsters are overflowing with an abundance of their own rejected evidence. (Those dumpsters are the primary place where creationists get their evidence against evolution from.)

Carbon-14 cannot be measured after about 50,000 years. Therefore, they never attempt to use it on anything they believe is older than that. However, if the creation account of the Bible is true, then there are NO fossils 50,000 years old. Meaning, that ALL fossils can be carbon-14 dated. But, since they insist on the old age of the earth, they refuse to even attempt to use carbon-14 dating on anything which they claim to be older than 50,000 years. Therefore, we need someone else who is willing to date those "index fossils", which they claim to be millions of years old, to see their true age.

The dating methods they use to date things that are supposedly millions of years old (apart from using index fossils) are three main types: radiocarbon dating, potassium-argon dating and uranium-lead dating. All of these are classified as Radiometric dating (often called radioactive dating), which are techniques used to date either rocks or carbon, usually based on a comparison between the observed abundance of a naturally occurring radioactive isotope and its decay products, using known decay rates.

However, these dating methods have to assume that the rate of decay

has always been constantly the same over a very long time, which is impossible to prove and is probably incorrect. After the flood, the atmosphere of the earth was changed. Even **people** aged differently after the flood because of that change. However, when fossils are found in their natural sediment they are usually not dated at all, by any of these three methods. They usually “date” them artificially by finding close “index fossils”. More about that later.

It should also be remembered that when God created Adam, he was not created as a newborn baby. He obviously would have died, not being able to even feed himself. Adam was created with an appearance of age, even though he was the same age as a newborn baby. Likewise, it is possible that God could have created the earth with an appearance of age. Even though it is unlikely that God created the earth with things like an accumulation of cosmic dust already on it.

Maybe it was something like how when God created the stars. We know that light takes a certain amount of time to travel from such long distances as the stars. But, in this case, God created light first, and then after creating light, He created the stars and the sun. So, when God created the stars, He also created the rays of light already en route traveling to the earth.

Going back to carbon-dating The carbon-dating method also assumes that the rate of decay of radiocarbon, carbon-14, has always been constantly the same over a long period of time. But likewise, this is an assumption which is probably incorrect. It is impossible to prove, and probably not true because carbon-14 is produced as a result of certain cosmic ray interactions in the atmosphere. But if those cosmic ray interactions changed in the past, which they certainly would have done if the Genesis flood was true, then the production of carbon-14 that is present in the atmosphere at the time when it was fixed in whatever fossil that is being tested, will **not** have been the same as it is now, thereby giving them inaccurate results.

In the case of carbon-14, you can only guess at how much the result will be thrown off. The true age of all fossils buried during the flood is 4,000 years. But, my guess is that any carbon-14 test would probably be about double. So probably the test results would be more like 8,000 years. I don't know. I'm just guessing. And be aware that carbon-dating is rarely used. They usually use “index fossils” because that is the easiest, and always gives them the results they want. And, if they are testing any fossil which they believe to be very old, they would NEVER use carbon-14 dating anyway. They would insist on using “index fossils” every time.

It is possible that before the Genesis flood (about 4,000 years ago) there

was an enormous constant layer of water vapor in the earth's atmosphere that would **not** have been there any longer after the flood (During the flood it rained for 40 days and 40 nights. Modern natural cloud formations cannot produce rain for 40 days and 40 nights.) That layer of water vapor was different than cloud formations that produced regular rain after the flood. (Before the flood it never rained, neither were any rainbows ever seen in the sky. (Gen 9:12-15) It was much more humid then (which slowed down water evaporation) and a good layer of dew watered the ground every morning. Gen. 2:5,6)

That water vapor layer in the atmosphere was probably in a different position than cloud formations afterwards, too. (God created it that way from the beginning.) (It would have produced no rain until the flood.) It would have been there constantly, kind of like the ozone layer is now. It would have assisted the ozone layer in protecting against harmful ultraviolet rays from the sun, which in turn would reduce the aging process of almost everything, especially humans. (And, it would have changed the effect of carbon-14.) This is exactly what would throw off carbon-dating. And also it would completely throw off all those other evolutionary radioactive dating methods, by a lot more than double.

That extra layer of water vapor would also produce a greenhouse effect on the entire earth, which would explain why the north and south poles were ice free many years ago, before the flood. (Ancient maps of Antarctica have been found (Piri Reis map) that show the exact land formation with no ice on it. Also, notice that that ancient map shows places, like the Caribbean, where ocean water is now very shallow, as land. Quite obviously, back then the ocean water level was lower than it is now. And, there has been found evidence of tropical plant life in Antarctica, below the ice.

See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iVhKtHP7hSQ>

This video states that Antarctic has evidence of a warm climate under all that ice, but they falsely assume a long-term continental drift explanation as part of evolution. The idea of a pre-flood world-wide greenhouse effect is inconceivable to them. They can't explain it any other way.

That extra constant layer of water vapor would also explain why there was a change in air pressure, which would cause other unusual changes in how plants and animals grow. In some modern experiments, they double atmospheric air pressure inside an air tight chamber which causes changes such as small cherry tomato plants to grow to the size of trees and produce giant tomatoes. Many animals grew to much larger sizes in those days. Even very large foot-prints of humans in fossilized mud have been found.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IXDBX99qePA&t=4s>.)

The atmospheric air pressure is measured by a barameter. Usually, barameters are used to predict variations in weather conditions because when atmospheric air pressure is low, most of the time heavey rain clouds gather in

those “valleys” of air “waves” in the sky. However, natural variations in air pressure cannot reach double in our day due to any natural conditions. Special conditions are needed in order to simulate the existence of extra air pressure caused by the existence of additional water vapor in the atmosphere which must have existed before the flood.

The “theory” of evolution also teaches that the levels of sediment in the ground are progressively older as you dig down. Supposedly, older levels are always under younger levels and older fossils are always found under younger fossils. But in reality, what is actually found is a mass of chaos like what would be expected in a gigantic world-wide flood. At times, (not often) what is supposed to be younger levels of sediment are found in very large areas under supposedly older levels of sediment. (Notice – none of their dating methods actually work on sediment. They have to assume the ages of the levels merely by observing which levels are above or below the others.) **All** fossils are **always** found in **random** levels, as would be expected in a flood.

Truth or Lie? Are the fossils found in random levels? When the evolutionists say the facts are the opposite, the observers must take a look for themselves. Be careful, evolutionists are liars. You have to see it for yourself. We need a documentary in video form to show everyone which case is true, especially the “index fossils”. Those “index fossils” must be carbon-14 dated. Rest assured they are NOT millions of years old. ALL of the fossils were formed in the same flood, only a few thousands of years ago.

Sometimes, fossils of entire trees, including roots, are found standing upright through many levels of sediment; exactly what would be expected in a flood, and impossible for evolution to explain. In paleontology this is called a, “polystrate fossil”, commonly found in coal deposits. Without a flood, coal deposits couldn’t even exist. The only possible way a coal deposit could be formed is in a giant flood. In some cases, the sediment covered large deposits of animals and vegetation, which became petroleum later on. It is impossible for evolution to explain deposits of petroleum or coal.

After the flood, when the water was draining off the land into the oceans, it would drag a lot of sediment with dead animals and vegetation. As the sediment covered the animals, it would form fossils, usually entirely intact. Otherwise, when animals die in a normal manner out on open land, their bones get scattered around, after they die.

In fact, if you stop and think about it, regardless of the fact that most fossils are found lying in a horizontal position, the width of the body itself would

have to consist in many levels (ages) of sediment. How many years of naturally forming sediment would it take in order to cover the thickness of a dead carcass lying on the ground? And how could the remains of that dead animal stay intact during all those years? It couldn't!!! Underground fossils cannot be formed without a flood! (Notice – the word “polystrate” fossil is never used by evolutionary paleontologists. Its very existence disproves evolution, so they cannot even use the word. Most dictionaries won't even list it. If a dictionary does mention it, they might explain it by saying, “**brief episodes of rapid sedimentation**”—which is just a **roundabout way of saying ‘flood’** without actually admitting it. They don't like using the word “**flood**” in any scientific context. Sure..... little floods have always happened from time to time. But, a giant world wide flood. They won't accept that.

And, how could a coal deposit exist anyway without a flood? As the large mass of water was moving off the land towards the oceans, it pushed all those trees into a large pile, then covered it with sediment, where it later became a coal deposit. Without the flood, there could be no coal or petroleum deposits. The theory of evolution has no explanation on how underground coal or petroleum deposits were formed. **Nothing, nothing, nothing**, evolution has **no** explanation!!!

Trees or animals that die in normal conditions out on open land always rot, decompose and fall apart (or get eaten by other animals/insects) before they could ever be formed into fossils. They must be buried quickly and entirely, as in a flood, or they don't form into underground fossils. Also, if an animal died under normal conditions, how many years would it take for naturally forming sediment to cover the animal? Millions? What would happen to the remains of the animal/tree in the meantime?

Trees completely decompose in a matter of a few short years, with nothing like bones left behind. So, how could there exist fossils of trees? Without the flood, fossils of trees are impossible. Without the flood, mass deposits of coal or petroleum are impossible. Yet, they exist, because the Genesis flood is true. Since the Genesis flood must be true, then all of the fossils and sediment are exactly the same age. They were all buried, in the same flood, at the same time, approximately 4,000 years ago.

This is the only explanation why there are giant deposits of vegetation and animal life which have formed into petroleum and coal under the ground. If those plants and animals died slowly year by year, under normal conditions out on open land, they would never have formed those giant underground deposits of petroleum or coal. Those deposits must have been formed in one single massive event, a giant world-wide flood pushing all those plants and animals into one area and then covering them with sediment, as the massive flood water drained off the land into the oceans. Without the flood, those giant underground deposits of petroleum could not exist!!! Evolutionary scientists cannot provide any other explana-

tion for the existence of those deposits of petroleum. Those massive deposits of petroleum are what provide the enormous production of the entire energy source to run modern machinery, like gasoline for cars.

Their dating methods don't give consistent ages for the levels of sediment, which is why those evolutionary scientists always ignore the levels of sediment whenever they use their dating methods for fossils. According to creation, all the levels of sediment are the same age. This is why none of the evolutionary paleontologists use levels of sediment to date any of the fossils they find, nor do they ever bother to date the levels of sediment. They already know that the results won't agree with their "theory", which they teach as though it is a fact.

Notice – I did not say that they never make claims on the age of layers of sediment, I said that they never date it. They are always stating the ages of almost everything. That doesn't mean that they are actually putting it through a testing process, and using real test results. Most of the time they just say the ages with no analysis whatsoever. Why should they? Almost everybody believes everything they say anyway. They don't need any proof. That would be a lot of extra work anyway. People accept whatever they say without proof. So, they don't need any proof.

Remember, they are liars. And on occasion, some of their people will say (assume) things that they cannot prove, based on assumptions which are not their personal area of expertise, because they're not paleontologists. The evolutionary paleontologists know very well that all fossils are always found in random levels, which they refuse to admit openly.

This also means that their "theories" about the different ages (periods), the Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous are all a bunch of hokum. Again, as I said above, these are stated ages without actually using any real dating process. They are stating the ages of these "periods" (Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous) without any real scientific analysis whatsoever. They know they're liars, and they like it that way. Ooooooh, what could possibly be more fun for them. There are so many people out there that will believe everything they say. And they can do it with a straight face without laughing. Or, you could say, maybe they actually believe their own lies.

Obviously, the dating methods that evolutionary scientists use are not stable. In one case a single rock was dated at 516,000,000 years old. While the same rock was dated at 1,111,000,000 years old using a different method. And the same rock dated at 1,588,000,000 years old using a third method. That's why it's so much better for them to use "index fossils" rather than any real dating process. That way they can set the years to whatever they want, without going through all that extra work with those unstable dating methods. In addition, they

are using those methods dishonestly. They finagle and twist them around however they want in order to fit their “theory”. Therefore, they usually date things using “index fossils”, then, they don’t run into any of these dating problems. With “index fossils”, they can **make up any date** they want without having to deal with conflicting data from their own unstable methods.

They never date the sediment itself. They always “assign” the age of sediment, using “index fossils”, which are formulated any way they want. The only thing they can do is to compare each level with the levels above it and below it. They supposedly date objects found in different **random** levels of sediment (which they can easily twist however they want), and ignore which level they were found in.

How is it possible that they can date an object next to a dinosaur bone but not the dinosaur bone itself? (Smells fishy!) Answer – they know how to select whichever “index fossil” they want and come up with any results they want..... and the objects which they claim to date at extremely different ages are always found in **random** levels, in **any** of the levels of sediment, which they refuse to confess openly. They are experts at cheating however they want. They don’t have anyone checking what they do anyway. Almost everybody believes them no matter what they say. So, what do they need any honest evidence for? They don’t.

Remember, if creation is true then ALL the fossils were formed during the flood, about 4,000 years ago. By this, we should know that if any of those fossils were put through the carbon-14 dating process, they would be found to be only the Bible age. None of them are millions of years old, especially those “index fossils”, which is what they use to claim those fossils are millions of years old. And, if the flood really happened, then we would expect to find all kinds of animals and all types of fossils jumbled together in the same layers. And that’s exactly what we do find.

There have also been found, in numerous different locations, fossils of human footprints running through fossilized mud along with dinosaur footprints. Where the two paths cross, the human footprint actually steps inside the dinosaur footprint. The “theory” of evolution teaches that the dinosaurs were extinct millions of years before the first humans existed. According to evolution, this is impossible—humans and dinosaurs are supposed to be separated by millions of years. (Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous. They say that humans were never in the same period as the dinosaurs.) Those fossilized footprints are/is another example of evidence that the evolutionists have to throw in the trash.

(See YouTube video: “The Delk Track”

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IXDBX99qePA>.)

In places like **Glen Rose, Texas** (along the Paluxy River), there have been reports—and even video recordings—of human footprints along side or crossing over dinosaur footprints in fossilized limestone. Some of these prints were even found inside the same trail, as if a human stepped into the same mud as the dinosaur just moments later.

Of course, many evolutionists quickly claim these are fakes, or that they must have been made millions of years apart and somehow got preserved in exactly the same layer—a laughable explanation. To cover their tracks, some scientists began removing the prints, flooding the area, or even destroying the limestone slabs where the human prints appeared. Why? Because such evidence violates their theory, and they'd rather erase it than admit their assumptions were wrong.

These kinds of fossil tracks directly challenge the entire evolutionary timeline. But instead of honestly facing the evidence, they hide it or discredit it. And once again—almost everybody goes along with everything they say.

Now here's something interesting: When scientists attempt to date actual dinosaur bones using carbon dating, the results often come back showing young ages—which is far younger than the 65+ million years evolution claims. So, what do they do with that data? They throw it out.

They dismiss it by saying that carbon-14 dating is only accurate up to 50,000 years, and therefore the method is unreliable for older fossils. But the problem is, if those bones were really 65 million years old, there should not be any carbon-14 left in them at all. Carbon-14 decays relatively quickly, and it becomes undetectable after about 50,000 years. So, if dinosaur bones were truly that old, they should contain zero carbon-14. The very presence of carbon-14 proves that they are not that old.

But because the results don't fit their narrative, the data is discarded. This is how evolutionary science works: If the evidence supports their theory, they publish it. If the evidence contradicts it, they throw it out. That's why their dumpsters are over-flowing.

What about soft tissue found inside dinosaur bones? Scientists have actually discovered soft, stretchy blood vessels and red blood cells inside fossilized dinosaur bones. This discovery shocked the scientific community, because soft tissue cannot survive for millions of years—it decays too quickly. The maximum survival time (even under the best conditions) is just a few thousand years. So how do evolutionary scientists respond?

https://news.ncsu.edu/2025/03/soft-tissue-samples-can-survive-in-several-different-dinosaur-fossils/?utm_source=chatgpt.com

AND

https://palaeo-electronica.org/content/2022/3739-soft-tissues-in-fossil-bone?utm_source=chatgpt.com

AND

https://www.livescience.com/41537-t-rex-soft-tissue.html?utm_source=chatgpt.com

First, they were in denial. Then they began proposing impossible preservation theories, trying to explain how soft tissue could last for tens of millions of years. But these explanations violate everything we know about biology and chemistry. Instead of rethinking their timeline, they rewrite science to protect their theory.

During the flood, massive waves and currents would have swept animals across continents, mixing creatures from different regions and burying them all under heavy layers of mud and sediment as the waters receded. This is why we find mass graves of dinosaurs, often jumbled together, with bones scattered, twisted, or even preserved mid-motion—as if they died suddenly.

Many dinosaur fossils show signs of rapid burial and violent death, consistent with a global catastrophe. Fossils have been found in lifelike positions, with their necks arched back in the classic "death pose"—a result of muscle spasms during drowning. You don't get that from slow, peaceful natural deaths.

Also, the idea that an asteroid wiped out all the dinosaurs is just a theory—with no clear evidence that it happened. Even if an asteroid hit the earth, it would **not** explain why the dinosaurs died everywhere, only just in that area.

One of the most common objections people raise is: "How could Noah have fit dinosaurs on the Ark?" Simple answer: He didn't need full-grown adults. Many dinosaurs grew very large, but they didn't start out that way. Noah could have taken young ones, not fully grown. After all, he only needed two of each kind, not every individual species. That includes two of each dinosaur kind. For example, Noah didn't need a full-grown Brachiosaurus the size of a building. He could have brought a juvenile, much smaller, lighter, and easier to care for.

The Ark was massive—Genesis 6:15 says it was 300 cubits long, which is about 450 feet, longer than a football field. There was plenty of space for two of each land animal, especially if they were young and small.

Some people ask, "If dinosaurs were on the Ark, what happened to them afterward?" Good question. Just because a species was saved on the Ark does

not mean it survived long-term. Many animals eventually went extinct after the flood due to massive changes in the climate, landscape, food supply, and atmosphere.

Before the flood, the world was much more humid and likely had a different air pressure and oxygen level. This may have allowed certain animals, including dinosaurs, to grow much larger. But, after the flood, conditions were harsher, colder, and less stable—making it harder for some species to survive. Also, remember: the ecosystem was destroyed. Their food sources were likely wiped out. And when animals struggle to find food, they can't reproduce, and populations collapse quickly.

Some dinosaurs may have survived for centuries after the flood—giving rise to the “dragon” legends found in cultures all over the world. The word “*dinosaur*” wasn't even coined until the 1800s. Before that, people simply called them “dragons”.

Ancient history is full of references to dragon-like creatures, often described with incredible detail—long necks, powerful tails, armored bodies, wings, and fire. Some of these may have been exaggerated stories, but others could have been based on real encounters with now-extinct dinosaur species. Just like the woolly mammoth, the dodo bird, or the Tasmanian tiger (*Thylacinus cynocephalus*), dinosaurs may have gone extinct relatively recently—but that doesn't mean they never existed alongside humans. In fact, that's exactly what we would expect if the Bible is true.

Admitting that the Bible might be true would mean admitting that there is a God, and that He has authority over mankind. And that is something many people simply refuse to accept, no matter how much evidence is presented. But for those who are willing to be honest, the truth is clear:

- The earth is young.
- The flood happened.
- The Bible is true.
- And God is real.

Evolution is not just a theory—it's a religion disguised as science. It's a belief system with its own priests (scientists), its own sacred texts (science textbooks), and its own god: **time**. Whenever a problem arises—like missing intermediate fossils, incorrect dating, or conflicting evidence—the answer is always the same:

“It just took more **time**.”

Time is their miracle-worker.

Time makes everything possible.

Time can turn slime into scientists, rocks into reptiles, and fish into philosophers.

But the truth is, **time** is not magic. It doesn't explain anything.

You can't pour water on a rock, wait a billion years, and get a bird. That's not science—that's fairy tale logic. And yet, that's what evolution asks us to believe. (Funny, they claim that the Bible is a fairy tale.)

They say life came from non-life, without a Creator.

They say order came from chaos, without a Designer.

They say intelligence came from blind chance, without a Mind behind it all.

But that's not science. That's a worldview—a religion—and it takes more faith to believe in evolution than it does to believe in the Bible.

Evolution is not supported by the fossil record.

It's not supported by biology, genetics, or geology.

It's supported by indoctrination, by selective teaching, and by a stubborn refusal to consider the possibility that God might be real.

(See article listed below on: Salvation.)

Because if God is real...

Then we're **accountable**.

And that's what they truly fear.

The lie of evolution isn't just about science—it's about **rebellion**.

It's about man trying to erase his Creator so he can become his **own god**.

That's the original sin in the Garden of Eden:

"Ye shall be as gods." [Gen 3:5](#)

But the truth remains:

In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth.

Not random chance.

Not blind evolution.

Not billions of years of accidental progress.

God spoke..... and it was so.

Evolution is a lie **disguised as science**, taught as fact, promoted in schools, museums, and media, and swallowed by millions who have never even questioned it.

But behind the lie is an **agenda**—a desire to explain the universe **without God**, to free mankind from **moral accountability**, and to replace truth with theory, and **faith in God** with faith in man; it is a religion of Humanism.

They claim to "follow the science," but they reject the most obvious

scientific truths:

- That life cannot come from non-life.
- That rational design demands a designer.
- That information doesn't write itself.
- That fossils don't form without a flood.
- That soft tissue and carbon-14 don't last for millions of years.

And still, they cling to the lie—because the alternative is too **uncomfortable**. But for those who are willing to **see the truth**, the evidence is overwhelming:

- The flood happened.
- The earth is young.
- Dinosaurs lived with man.
- Evolution is false.
- And **God is the Creator**.

You can accept the lie, or you can accept the truth.

But you cannot do both.

Choose wisely.

Because what you believe about **where you came from** affects everything about **where you're going**. Heaven or Hell. (See article listed below on: Salvation.)

When Marco Polo first went to China, the emperor there had “dragons” (dinosaurs) as royal pets. In the enormous Likouala swamp in the Congo, central Africa, very large crocodiles have been seen. At www.youtube.com there are now videos of Nile river crocodiles that are very long. Search for “crocodile attacks” on www.youtube.com. The largest one ever caught was 23 feet long. It took 100 people to catch it. They don't say if anyone died in the attempt to catch it.

In addition, other larger dinosaurs have been seen, by local natives, which always chase away all of the normal size crocodiles and hypos. The local natives there have seen those dinosaurs regularly. But, you'll have to excuse them; they didn't know that those animals were extinct millions of years ago. (They didn't know that those animals belong in the Triassic or Jurassic period.) All they know is that they've seen them. (See documentaries called: “creation evidence from South America” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zdvDt7D-ud4&t=17> and “Mystery Of Acámbaro” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5_EVoauQh_4.)

Thousands (not hundreds) of sightings of the Loch Ness monster have been reported in Scotland. Even in America, near Burlington, Vermont, in Lake Champlain there have been many sightings of a creature very similar to the Loch

Ness monster. The local people there call it: “Champ”. The sightings of “Champ” go way back to the Native American Indians before the first European settlers came to America. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a5ORIAZG2Gc>)

The Bible talks about the existence of giant creatures on earth existing at the same time that human beings lived. The biblical description sounds like a fire breathing dragon (dinosaur). (Job 41) There are many ancient legends of valiant men who go out to slay a fire breathing dragon, who were afterwards treated as heroes. (Example: Beowulf. The real story of Beowulf (not the liberally altered movie) can be downloaded free at www.gutenberg.org.) (Notice – Just like the story of the Titanic, Beowulf probably started out as a true story, but then other fictional parts were added on. Also, it’s kind of like how when someone goes fishing, and actually catches some fish, but latter on they tell stories about the made-up size of the fish.)

Also, there is a Norse legend called the “Völsunga saga” from which Richard Wagner, the German classical composer, made his opera “Der Ring des Nibelungen” which includes Wagner's famous piece, “Ride of the Valkyries”. (See it at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=buGGwaszugs>.) It is the legend of how Sigfried the hero rescues the princess Broomhilda from the fire breathing dragon, named Fafnir. Also, do a Web search: “fire breathing dragons”. Dragons are popular in modern movies. But they were also popularly sculpted many years ago as stone images.

This heroic killing off of those dangerous creatures is a much more realistic explanation for the almost, but not entire, extinction of the dinosaurs. Before modern firearms were invented, a poisoned arrow would have done the job. (In North America, in the last few centuries, wolves, jaguars, buffalo and grizzly bears almost became extinct, because people tried to kill them off. They shot them down as often as possible. The modern mentality that those animals should be preserved and maintained didn’t exist back then. They considered those animals to be dangerous and life threatening to all human beings. In their minds, getting rid of them completely was the appropriate thing to do.) (Also, the ice age following the flood may have been responsible for killing many of the dinosaurs. And again, if Noah excluded them from the arch, how could they have survived?)

Interestingly, in many museums they discovered that dinosaur bones (especially Tyrannosaurus Rex) are radioactive and have to be treated with special lead paint in order to prevent danger to the people visiting the museum. It is possible that ancient man killed off many of the dinosaurs using radioactivity. (Read about the technological advancements before the flood in the article listed below: Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels.) The phrase “see article” means to “see article”. Some people have questions and those questions have been an-

swered in the designated article.

Even in modern times, when they first discovered radioactivity, they soon discovered that it was very lethal. This may also explain why they can't use their normal radioactive dating methods on dinosaurs; they always get results they do not want.... And their ~~trash cans~~, rather, many big dumpsters are already overflowing with rejected evidence.

In many ancient drawings, engravings and sculptures done by people many years ago, there has been found an abundance of dinosaurs (dragons). Sometimes those depictions show dinosaurs eating people..... or at other times they even show a person riding on the back of a dinosaur. (See documentaries called: "Creation Evidence from South America"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zdvDt7D-ud4&t=17> and "Mystery Of Acámbaro" https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5_EVoauQh_4.)

In modern times, we have the bones of dinosaurs in museums. But for the cases of bones dug out of the ground, the appearance of the skin and flesh can only be guessed at. Whereas, in those ancient drawings, engravings and sculptures, those artists show the outer appearance in reality how they saw the living animal for real. All this is contrary to the teaching of evolution. Evolution teaches that all the dinosaurs died off a long time before the first human beings existed. And they commonly give the most unbelievable flimsy explanation that caused the extinction of the dinosaurs. They say that one lone asteroid that fell in Mexico killed every dinosaur on earth. Wow, that explanation is about the stupidest possible. An explanation dumber than that is not imaginable.

Some years ago it was commonly taught in universities that humans evolved from apes. Notice that this theory was originally proposed with no evidence whatsoever. It was assumed simply because the body parts of apes are very similar to humans. Afterwards, numerous times, fossils of intermediate forms between ape and man were found, (the "missing link") always using very scanty meager fragments of bones. So scanty, that it was very easy for them to invent anything they wanted. Lies, lies, lies, lies, lies. In addition, those bone fragments were usually found in different places and probably didn't even belong to the same creature. Lies, lies, lies, lies, lies.

But **every time** there were other highly respected evolutionary scientists (their own people) who disproved the validity of those fossils. (Which were usually poorly fabricated hoaxes.) How about that?! An honest evolutionist?! WOW!!! (Maybe you think I'm just kidding. The chances of finding an honest evolutionist has about the same probability as finding an honest politician. Ha, ha, good luck

in trying to find one of those.)

No real “missing link” between ape and man has ever been found. This is why it is called “missing”. In fact, no real “missing link” between any two species has ever been found. **ALL** of the links between **ALL** of the species are missing. No specie has every slowly changed into a different specie. **NEVRER!!! NEVRER!!! NEVRER!!!**

As a result, eventually it was necessary to change their “theory” and propose that man did **not** evolve from apes..... but rather.... apes and men both evolved from a “common ancestor”, which brings up some questions. First, if their evidence that man evolved from ape was so meager and easily disproved, then, is their evidence that man and ape both evolved from a “common ancestor” also so meager and easily disproved? (Answer: Just like the first theory, they also proposed the second theory with no evidence whatsoever, zip, zero, nada. They did not even have a name for the “common ancestor”. It didn't have a name because it never existed. But, they were expecting to find some evidence..... eventually some day. No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.) (Notice – comments about “Hominids” are written farther down. ↓↓↓)

Second, what is that common ancestor? Why doesn't it have a name? (Answer: It doesn't have a name because it doesn't exist. **Nobody has ever seen one**..... And there is **still** no **believable** evidence that it ever did exist. If it did exist, they would have no need to use the term “common ancestor”, they would be saying: “man and ape both evolved from _____”. But, they can't fill in the blank because there isn't any such a thing. They invented this “theory” with no evidence whatsoever. It was proposed simply to dodge the issue that they can never find any intermediate forms for their first “theory”. **All** of the links are missing!!! No fossil of **any** creature half-way between **any** two species has ever been found. Not just between man and ape, **ANY TWO SPECIES!!!**)

Third, evolution teaches that species are always improving due to “natural selection”..... so, why did man improve but the apes got worse, which supposedly “evolved” from the same “common ancestor”? (Reverse evolution, a clear contradiction.) Fourth, why are there no modern species with superior intellect similar to humans? And fifth, why do modern apes continue to exist, which are supposedly inferior (reverse evolution, a clear contradiction), but the “common ancestor” is now extinct (and can't be found), which is supposed to be superior to modern apes? (Reverse “natural selection”, a clear contradiction.) (Notice – if “natural selection” were true, no apes would even exist; they would have all changed into human beings.... or another specie similar to human beings. Why would **any** of the inferior creatures still exist? You would also think that there should have been many other species to evolve higher intelligence like humans If evolution were true..... as in movies like Star Wars, with all their non-

human intelligent life forms.)

It is true that paleontologists give a name to every fossil they find, but none of the fossils **ever** found have they officially given the honor of being that “common ancestor”. Why? First, **all** of those supposed candidates for the “common ancestor” look like some form of extinct apes, which would be a big fat embarrassment because they have already confessed that man did not evolve from ape. (Notice – those fossils don't look like “intermediate forms”, they look like apes, pure 100% apes. And, among the extinct ones, there are many different types, much more than species still alive in modern times. Nonetheless, they are **all** 100% apes, not intermediate forms.)

Second, none of those supposed candidates for the “common ancestor” have a “link” (intermediate form) to the specie before or after it. What good is it, if it is a dead end? No intermediate form between any two species has ever been found. There aren't any. Third, they don't want the embarrassment of having someone come along and disprove it, just as it has already happened to **all** of the other supposed “intermediate forms”, which was why they had to change their “theory” to man and ape both evolving from a “common ancestor” instead of man evolving from ape. Notice – the embarrassment is even more intense when it is one of their own people, an evolutionary scientist, who disproves their false “intermediate forms”, which are now called “missing links”. Now, nobody ever attempts to disprove their “common ancestor” because they have learned how to invent a “common ancestor” (missing link) without really having one.

Fourth, lately they have been using the general term “**Hominids**” for that supposed “common ancestor”, (why is the word “**Hominids**” plural but the “common ancestor” is singular? Answer – they don't want to pick one so that it can't be disproved.) This is a deceptive way of inventing a name for something that should have a different name. Don't forget, they all look like a group of extinct apes. Notice – try looking for evidence of “**Hominids**” on the internet. All you can find is artwork, which is fake. Lies, lies, lies. Sometimes, they will even show photographs of live apes as “**Hominids**”, because they can't show anything real. The whole theory of the “common ancestor” is based on a lie.... and the name “Hominid” is a lie. All of the “Hominids” are 100% apes which are now extinct. They are not “common ancestors” and they are not halfway between anything. They are 100% apes.

Try looking on the internet for “Hominids”. All they can ever show is either pictures of live apes or fake art-work. The whole idea of this supposed half-way intermediate form is a big fat lie.

Those paleontologists have found a few fossils of different kinds of extinct apes in the last few decades that look extremely different from each other.

So, they put all those different kinds of extinct “apes” into one inappropriate group and falsely changed their name to: “Hominids”. (Web search: Hominid fossil images.) Take a look at them. Even a child can tell they don't belong in a group other than “apes”, and if they don't belong in a group other than “apes” then they shouldn't have a name other than “apes”. THEY ARE “APES”, AND SHOULD BE CALLED “APES”, NOT “HOMINIDS”.

They have even used fossils of human skeletons and called them “Hominids”. But, what else could they do? There are no “Hominids”, so, they have to show something..... anything. Every supposed fossil of a Hominid is either 100% ape or 100% human. And, most of what they show when they're talking about “Hominids” is fake art-work. Lies, lies, lies, lies. Their artist just makes up whatever looks half-way between ape and man. And, sometimes they even show photographs of live apes, and call them “Hominids”. Lies, lies, lies, lies.

The absence of a name is an extreme embarrassment to the “theory” of the “common ancestor”, which should not be a diversified group, but rather, an individual specie. **The “common ancestor” has no name because it does not exist!!!** At first, they had an imaginary fake art-work creature without a name, but now they have a fake name without a creature. They refuse to select any of their supposed candidates for the “common ancestor”. As long as they never select one, it can never be disproved, and most of what they show when they talk about “Hominids” is fake art-work. Lies, lies, lies, lies.

This name problem is kind of like taking a gorilla, a chimpanzee, an orangutan, a baboon and a small Capuchin monkey and putting them all in the same group and giving them a new name. (And then claiming that the entire diversified group is somehow the one and only “common ancestor”. Internet search: ape images. See how many different types there are.) Normally, the name “apes” could be used, but the evolutionists can't use that name because the theory they invented, when they had no evidence, states that ape and man both “evolved” from the same “common ancestor”. So, the name “apes” won't work, despite the fact that what they call “Hominids” are nothing but a bunch of extinct “apes”. Occasionally, they will even show photographs of live apes as “Hominids”, because they don't have anything else to show. I've even seen pictures of human skeletons labeled “Hominids”, because they have nothing else to use. No “common ancestor” has ever existed. They made it all up.

Therefore, it can be concluded that those “Hominids” are mostly different species of extinct “apes” with a new name slapped on them to avoid embarrassment, so that they can continue with the second theory they invented, with no evidence, rather than going back to the first theory they invented, with no evidence. People don't trust scientists who are always teaching their theories as absolute and undeniable facts..... and then changing those theories..... and then

start teaching the new theories as though they are absolute and undeniable facts not theory. They themselves have changed their undeniable facts!!! (No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.) At first, they claimed to have a creature, but without a name, now they have a name, without a creature.

The existence of extinct species of apes does not mean that they were changing into something else. (Some people say that now there are many more extinct species than living species. Some say that 97-99% of all species that existed in the past are now extinct.) The “theory” that species slowly and gradually change into other species is falsely assumed by the evolutionists with no evidence whatsoever. (“assume” means to make an “ass” (donkey's rear end) of “you” and “me”.)

The name “Hominid” is used instead of “ape” to avoid the embarrassment of going back to the first “theory” that man evolved from apes, which they have already confessed is not true. They insist on sticking to the second theory which they invented, with no evidence, rather than going back to the first theory they invented, with no evidence. The first “theory”, that man evolved from apes, they used to teach in universities as an absolutely undeniable fact. Now, they teach the second “theory” as an absolutely undeniable fact..... not “theory”. They themselves have changed their own undeniable facts!! (No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.)

Also, it is more difficult to disprove a group rather than an individual fossilized creature. Except for the fact that the “group” does not even look like it is composed of creatures that belong in any other “group” other than “apes”. And how could such a diversified group all be the single ancestor of any one specie? (They still refuse to select any particular one of all those “~~Hominids~~”, rather, extinct “apes”, as the one and only “common ancestor” of both ape and man. (How can an “ape” be a “common ancestor” of both “ape” and man? How can an “ape” be the ancestor of “ape”, and yet supposedly be a different specie, at the same time?) Even back when they were teaching that man evolved from apes, they refused to select any particular ape, among the extremely diversified group, as the one and only ancestor of the human race. Now, they insist that the entire extremely diversified “group” they call “Hominids” is/are the one and only “common ancestor”.)

But, they knew they could get away with slapping any ol' thing together, because almost all the leaders in American universities hate God so much that they'll go along with the “theory” of evolution anyway, no matter how ridiculously it is presented. What do they need any scientific evidence for? They know they do not need any real evidence. Most people will accept it anyway, no matter what. (This is a religious matter, not a science matter. The purpose of the “theory” of evolution is to deny the existence of God. It is atheism.)

After they've slapped the new name (Hominids) on those extinct “apes”, then they contract an artist to invent a creature (drawing or sculpture) that looks exactly halfway between **ape** and man. (Notice – the “common ancestor” is not supposed to be halfway between ape and man. That would be reverse-evolution for the ape. They started the lie of inventing artistic fabrications of non-existent halfway creatures between ape and man back when they were teaching that man evolved from apes. But, what else can they do now? **Nobody has ever seen the “common ancestor”**, so it's not possible to make a drawing or sculpture of something that has never been seen before.)

Not only that, but it is not possible to make one single image of an extremely diversified group, like the “~~Hominids~~”, rather extinct “apes”. So, the artist just makes an image of a human and changes it a little to make it look halfway ape-ish, and then sticks some fur on it. Also, don't forget, all the Hominids, which are supposed to be a different species, look like apes. Try searching the internet for images of “Hominids”, you will either get fake art-work or you will get photographs of live pure 100% apes. And sometimes, a few rare cases of human skeletons with the label “Hominids” on them.

They don't even have to worry about making their fake artwork look like any of the fossils of those extremely different looking extinct “~~Hominids~~”, rather, extinct “apes”, which look like apes. (It's not necessary for them to select one. Nor is it necessary for the artist to make the artwork look like any of the fossil evidence.) They know that the people who go along with the “theory” of evolution don't really care about any real scientific evidence. They've already made up their minds before they have even looked at the facts.

Try asking them which one of the Hominids are they trying to make their artwork look like. Rest assured, they won't say. Just like how they would not say back when it was being taught that man evolved from ape; which ape? (a gorilla?, a chimpanzee?, an orangutan?, a baboon?, a Capuchin monkey?) If they never select one..... then it can never be disproved.

And notice – Previously, they had the embarrassment of never being able to produce the “missing link”. But now, the way they use these invented “Hominids” is that the “Hominids” replace the “missing link”, so that no further searching for a “missing link” is necessary. Therefore the need for proving or disproving is never applied because those new “Hominids” **are** the supposed proof of their own existence. Yet, nobody has ever seen one. Lies, lies, lies, lies. All they have is fake artwork, humans and apes. But no “Hominids”.

And, those “Hominids” are **not** intermediate forms. They are a very diversified assortment of extremely different species of pure 100% apes, which are now **ALL** extinct. They're **not** halfway between anything. There are even some WEB pages of Hominids with pictures of modern live apes. They can't even

make up their minds exactly what a Hominid is. How about that?!? Oh, they can change it all around and make it whatever they want, and most people will still go along with it anyway. Now that they have an official name for the “missing link” people think it’s not missing any more.

And voilà, their artist has created the supposed “common ancestor” which looks exactly like those other artistically invented creatures they made back when they were teaching in universities that man evolved from apes. How about that?! The artistically fabricated portrayal of the evidence for their second “theory” looks exactly like the artistically fabricated portrayal of the evidence for their first “theory”. (“evidence”? What “evidence”? They don’t have any “evidence”. All of their artwork is a false invention by an artist.) Remember, all the artist really did was to halfway ape-iffy an image of a human being and stick some fur on it. Don't forget, in real life, all the supposed “Hominids” look like apes, because they **are** apes. And also, don't forget that the “Hominids” supposedly evolved into apes, so how could they look no different than apes? Why are they supposed to be a different specie than apes, yet, at the same time they are apes? Well, **since nobody has ever seen the “common ancestor” it’s impossible to make a drawing of it.** Whoops, I said “it”. The “Hominids” are plural. Supposedly, a whole bunch of extremely different species of extinct apes are the one and only “common ancestor”. Singular or plural? They still won't say.

So, the only thing they can do is to make the same ol' imaginary (fake) half-human/half-ape artwork they did before. But, you aren't supposed to notice that. In fact, now they don't even need an artist. They could just use those same ol' drawings and statues they used before. The museums and science books could just slap a new name on the same ol' fake artwork they used before. (No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.)

In some museums they even made statues of chimpanzees, walking along one after another, and each one was altered to look a little more like a human. Well, that's exactly what they would need if evolution were true. But, no such thing exists in real life. Those statues were pure artwork. Lies, lies, lies, lies.

Oh yeah, sometimes you see those creatures that change a little one-by-one on T-shirts, too. From a chimpanzee all the way to a human. Pure fantasy. Lies, lies, lies, lies.

Interestingly, when they first started teaching their theory of a “common ancestor”, the science books didn't use art work for the “common ancestor”. Back then, they didn't even have the name “Hominid” either. All they had was the phrase “common ancestor”. In their science books they showed a time-line with drawings of all the species along the supposed lineage of the history (supposed evolution) of the human race. Notice that none of the creatures on the time-line

had any intermediate forms between **any** of the species. **All** of the links between **all** of the species have **always** been missing. 00.00% exist. They have a perfect score: absolute zero.

Those paleontologists have spent an enormous amount of time trying to find just **one** (missing) link between man and the supposed previous “common ancestor”. But they normally don't tell anyone that they don't have **any** intermediate form between **any** of the species. **Every** intermediate form is missing!!! No intermediate fossil between any two species has ever been found. 00.00% exist. They have a perfect score: absolute zero. So, instead of calling it “THE MISSING LINK”, the plural state has to be recognized. “They”, not “it” are “THE MISSING LINKS”. **ALL** the links are missing. No specie ever changes into a different specie. **ALL** species are exactly the way God created them from the beginning of creation.

In their science books, back then (before they invented the name “Hominid”), at the end of the supposed lineage, there was a drawing of a man next to a drawing of an ape with a divided arrow to both coming from the same question mark: “?”. Obviously, instead of a drawing of a creature, they used the question mark, “?”, which represented the “common ancestor”. They used a question mark, “?”, because they didn't know what the supposed “common ancestor” looked like. They didn't even have a name for it. **Nobody had ever seen one**, so it was impossible to make a drawing of it. They had no evidence at all. The “common ancestor” never existed!!! Yet, they were teaching it as though it was an undeniable fact.

What difference does it make whether or not they had any scientific evidence? They know that the people who go along with the “theory” of evolution do not really care about any real scientific evidence. They had already made up their minds that evolution is a fact..... not a theory. They can even change their undeniable facts and contradict themselves as much as they want to, and most people will still follow them anyway. (This is a religious matter, not a science matter. The purpose of the “theory” of evolution is to deny the existence of God.)

So..... they have **no** evidence whatsoever that any of those extremely different looking supposed “common ancestors” (inappropriately named “Hominids” instead of “apes”) are ancestors of human beings at all. They have assumed that with no evidence. Those creatures did not slowly and gradually change into human beings and those evolutionary scientists cannot prove that they did. They would need **many** fossils of creatures at every minor alteration from the “common ancestor”, at every slightest stage, all the way to human beings. (Just like the artist did on the T-shirts.) But that evidence does not exist, except in their fake artwork. They can't even find **one** “common ancestor”, much less can they

find one halfway between, and even less can they find a series of stage-by-stage gradual changes. In order to do that they would have to actually pick one.

There ought to be an abundance of those things, at every slightest stage of change. (According to the “theory” of evolution.) If evolution is true there ought to be MORE fossils of halfway intermediate forms than regular species. In fact, the entire fossil record ought to be almost completely intermediate fossils.

Notice how easy it is to think of an intermediate form between ape and man because the body parts are very similar. But, try to imagine what the halfway body parts would look like between species that aren't so similar. Nobody could imagine it because it is not possible, nor has anyone ever seen such a thing. The impracticality of impossibly formed halfway evolved body parts must be completely ignored, in order for people to continue following evolution. How can a horse's hoof be halfway between anything else? It can't. It is impossible.

Don't forget, the absence of halfway developed body parts is the main reason why they have to assume that the earth is very old. Nobody ever sees evolution in progress, because nobody ever sees halfway developed body parts. **NEVER, NEVER, NEVER, NEVER.** There is no such thing as halfway developed body parts. Nobody has ever seen one. They have a perfect score, absolute zero. So, they concluded that the reason why nobody ever sees one is that the process moves so slowly that it's impossible to see it happening. Therefore, they need lots and lots of time..... and therefore, the earth must be super, super old. But, the real reason why nobody has ever seen any halfway “missing links” is that they never existed. That's why they're missing. And..... the earth is very young; the Bible age.

But, if evolution were true, there would be halfway developed body parts all the time. **Every** creature would **always, always, always** be changing into something else. The concept of “species” maintaining the same form continuously, long term, would not exist. **Every** creature would continuously be improving. But, in reality what we always see in real life is that every creature always stays as their own specie. Species are always their own specie. They never change into anything else. **NEVER, NEVER, NEVER, NEVER.**

The only real thing they can show is that they have found only very **few** fossils of extremely different kinds of extinct “apes” that are no longer living, which they don't want to confess are nothing but “apes”. (Note – those creatures are **not** intermediate forms. They are apes. Pure 100% apes.) So, they slap on a different name (Hominids) to avoid the embarrassment of going back to their first “theory” that man evolved from ape. (... to avoid the embarrassment, and also to avoid

anybody disproving it. The whole thing is arranged so that the essence of the proof is assumed into the name itself.)

People don't trust scientists who are constantly changing their undeniable "theory" and then teaching the new "theory" as an undeniable fact, when they used to teach the previous "theory" as an undeniable fact. They themselves have changed their own undeniable facts. (No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.)

If it were true that those creatures were ancestors of human beings then they could take any of the modern apes and breed them until they slowly and gradually change into human beings. But they can't do that, and never will, because it's impossible. The DNA code itself won't permit it. No specie has ever slowly and gradually changed into a different specie. God created all the species to stay within their own groups. Every one of the species has limits to how much they can change, from one generation to the next. The "theory" of evolution must reject the existence of those limits. No fossil of any intermediate form between **any** two species has ever been found, never, zero, zip, nada. **All** of the links between **all** of the species are **all** missing. 00.00% exists. They have a perfect score: absolute zero.

Any of the more recently found evidence of such intermediate forms should be examined with the greatest suspicion. Those evolutionary scientists have a long standing reputation of lying and stretching things to make them fit their "theory". In addition, they also have a long standing reputation of rejecting, twisting or ignoring the **majority** of the evidence that doesn't fit their "theory", like the **majority** of the sound dating methods that give a very young age for the earth, (The difference is a million to one. The number "million" is very large, not small.) or like how all fossils, including "index" fossils, are **always** found in **random** levels of sediment. Every single paleontologist knows it, but they never openly face the fact and confess that it doesn't fit their "theory". They know their "theory" is a lie and they like it that way. They're not in the **truth** business; they're in the **lie** business.

Whenever a young person is starting out as an evolutionary scientist, they have to learn the customary evolutionary style of presentation from older scientists. Otherwise, they run right into a "brick wall", kind of like a wild bird inside a building for the first time. The bird flies directly at a window thinking that it's going to fly out through the opening, but then the bird hits the glass, and sometimes hurts himself badly. Any new young scientist has to learn how to dodge the "glass windows" that disprove evolution, in order to progress. They have to learn how to lie in order to get around the truth: the "brick walls". They can't progress

without consciously knowing that evolution is a lie.

At first, every new young evolutionary scientist doesn't know how much evidence has already been thrown out in the trash. Otherwise, being new in the trade, they might start looking for what they think is a good idea, new evidence, without realizing that it has already been thrown out in the trash. After all, what would happen if they tried to date the age of the earth, levels of sediment or a dinosaur bone? Or, even worse, what if they tried to carbon date some of those "index fossils", or accidentally disproved one of the intermediate fossils? (What intermediate fossil? They're not supposed pick one. That's the whole purpose of changing the theory. Changing the theory was accompanied with the understanding that no specific candidate for the "common ancestor" was to be selected, so that there is nothing that can ever be disproved. And..... along with the new fake name "Hominid", it was understood that the "missing link" was no longer missing.) Now.... there is nothing to disprove, because the "Hominid" is presented as the "link" that used to be missing. And, it can't be disproved, because no real evidence is presented.

And..... those new young scientists have to learn to keep their stupid mouths shut!!! If they want to be evolutionists, then they have to learn how to keep the evidence that has already been thrown in the trash..... in the trash, without digging it up again. The older scientists do not like having to look at that stuff all over again. Those youngsters have to learn how to just follow standard procedures without asking questions. They have to learn that they don't need any real evidence at all. They have to learn to lie, and get good at it. Most people will just believe it and follow along anyway. (It's impossible to progress without consciously knowing that their "theory" is a lie. And..... most especially, those "Hominids" are the biggest lie of all.)

It works pretty much the same in religions, too. Supposedly, the very essence of religion is a matter of "truth". But, over the years, the enemy (Satan) has "**....crept in unawares.....**" ([Jude 1:4](#)) with both his "wolves in sheep's clothing" and his lies (errors). So, whenever diligent people get involved in any religion, they are always faced with the fact that their religion has a lot of lying going on inside it. Most people handle this problem by simply following along with everybody else (go with the flow), and eventually they get accustomed to it. Most people don't like rocking the boat. They don't even perceive any errors. (See all the other articles, listed below.)

For those people who really don't recognize any errors in their own church, try visiting other churches. Every church is different, with different errors and different strengths, yet they all think that their church is the best road to God,

and all the other churches are the ones loaded with errors, not theirs. And..... if you observe those other churches with an impartial and unprejudiced attitude, your own churches' errors ought to become clearer and clearer.

They don't stop and think that if they had been born and raised in a different place, among different people, they would have followed the other crowd equally as much in a different religion (church). And, they would have believed the whole time that the other religion (church), which they would otherwise be accustomed to as the "best" and "true".

In addition, many times they slip into a sort of arrogance about their superiority in religion. It's amazing how almost all religious people perceive their own religion to be the "best" possible spiritual road to God. They like thinking of themselves as "superior". Yet, at the same time, most of them know very little about any other church, and they are usually oblivious to the strengths and good characteristics about any other church. (This "arrogant" "superiority" is one of the most destructive corruptions in **all** churches.)

Also, as compared to the theory of evolution..... if you are standing in a group of ten thousand people who are all looking up and saying that the sky is green, that doesn't mean that the sky is actually green. Large groups of people all saying the same lie can be very persuasive on neutral observers. The truth is that the sky is blue and those ten thousand people are all liars. In both science and religion, those liars love doing things like that. They know perfectly well that the sky is not green, but they know how influential a large group of people can be on neutral observers. I repeat, evolutionary scientists all know that they're lying. And they like it that way.

The evolutionary scientists don't really need any evidence anymore, because they already have almost everyone believing that the "theory" of evolution is undeniably true. All across America, in every major university, the "theory" of evolution is taught as a fact for which they no longer need to bother with presenting evidence. They always teach it as though it is undeniably true, usually with no evidence presented whatsoever. They also teach it as being very important and are constantly pushing it, even when it's irrelevant to the subject being taught..... And the meager evidence they, on rare occasion, bother to present is always twisted somehow and irrelevant to evolution, proving nothing. (This is a religious matter, not a scientific matter. Remember, the main purpose of the "theory" of evolution is to deny the existence of God.)

However, in most cases, they present evidence based on their "index fossils", which is false. Their "index fossils" are incorrectly dated, so the informa-

tion is false. They are in the habit of presenting false evidence on a regular basis. And any real evidence that they find usually contradicts evolution, so they throw it out into one of their overflowing big dumpsters.

Those universities are hereby disqualified..... Their diplomas, in these fields of study, are hereby rendered incompetent/dishonest by the **abundance** of their own evidence against them, which they themselves have rejected, and try to hide. Take a look through their ~~trash cans~~, rather, their many big dumpsters at how much of their own abundance of evidence they have thrown out because it didn't fit their theory. (By now, they need many large garbage trucks to haul it all away. Not the regular size garbage trucks. They need the big ones. Lots of them.)

And, remember those T-shirts they have with those drawings of apes walking along, changing into people. Well, those images should be people turning into smaller monkey's with a graduation cap on, and holding one of their diplomas. But, the last one should have the label "professor" under it. That would be much more fitting to their condition. (And don't forget to put a tail on the "professor" monkey.)

Be careful, those evolutionary scientists have a long standing reputation of falsifying, hiding or twisting evidence to make it fit their "theory". One time they even found (fabricated artistically) a creature exactly half way between man and ape (the "Nebraska Man"), back when they were teaching that man evolved from apes. Later, it was discovered that the entire creature was artistically fabricated out of finding one tooth..... which was afterwards determined to be from an extinct pig. Notice – even until today, when they show their supposed evidence, it is **always** presented with artistic fabrication; the artist deserves **all** of the credit. (Another example of a deliberate hoax similar to the "Nebraska Man" was the "Piltdown Man". https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Piltdown_Man.)

Besides, even if it is true that many years ago there existed some other types of "apes" closer to humans than modern apes, it still does **not** mean that those things are ancestors of human beings. Those evolutionary scientists are making inappropriate and unjustifiable assumptions. ("assume" means to make an "ass" (donkey's rear end) of "you" and "me") No specie has ever slowly and gradually changed into a different specie. No intermediate form of any creature between any two species has ever honestly been found, never, zero, zip, nada. They have a perfect score: absolute zero.

Anything presented by that type of people should be examined with the greatest suspicion. Lies, lies, lies, lies. Those people have a reputation for being very dishonest, in the past. Why do you think this article is called "The **Lie** of Evo-

lution”? If the “theory” of evolution were true, there would be an **enormous** abundance of intermediate forms, at every slightest stage of changing into something else, all over the earth (with many intermediate forms between every specie), not just a few rare cases that are easily disproved by any honest paleontologist. In fact, regular species would not exist. Every creature on earth would be continuously changing into something else. All the creatures that exist would be nothing else but exclusively “intermediate” forms.

(“honest paleontologist”? Does such a being really exist? The only honest ones were the ones that disproved those fossils of false intermediate forms between man and ape. (“THE MISSING LINK”) But, since they changed their “theory” to the diversified group called: the one and only “common ancestor”, “honest paleontologists” have become extinct. Or, it could be said that since no real “common ancestor” is ever selected, then no paleontologist is ever necessary to examine it.)

There should be **many, many more** intermediate fossils than fossils of regular species, according to their theory. The mere fact that their intermediate forms are **always** based on very **few** rare cases, itself disproves their “theory” and should raise suspicion of the honesty of the meager, pitiful evidence they claim to find. The very nature of their “theory” of slow and gradual changing species **demands** that the quantity of intermediate forms must be **many, many more** than the quantity of regular forms. “Regular forms” should not even exist.

In fact, what is now considered “regular forms” would be nothing more than a temporary short, short, short, short, brief, brief, brief, brief spot on a continuum of continual change. The existence of “species” alone maintaining the same form for thousands of years completely disproves the “theory” of evolution. If evolution is true, regular species would not exist. EVERY creature would be in the process of changing into something else.

Thousands of years ago human artists made images of animals that look exactly like all of those same animals today. Horses have always looked like horses and nothing but horses for thousands of years. They couldn't even come up with a “Mr. Ed”, a talking horse. (See “Mr. Ed” on YouTube.)

More recent findings of “missing links” always have very scanty rare evidence and the evolutionary scientists are now always embarrassed to say which “theory” they're trying to prove; man evolving from ape or man and ape both evolving from a “common ancestor”, because all of their evidence of the big diversified group they call, the one and only “common ancestor”, always look like apes. That is, “Hominids” always look like apes, because they **are** apes. Those “Hominids” are NOT intermediate forms. They are old extinct apes. 100% apes. They are NOT a “common ancestor” of anything other than their own specie.

Despite the fact that they've been teaching the second “theory” instead of the first for decades, the general public still thinks of “man evolving from ape” whenever they hear the subject of “evolution”. Whether the evolutionists like it or not, the general public can't get the first “theory” out of their minds. Especially because the fake artistic evidence they present for their second theory looks just like the fake artistic evidence they used to present for their first theory. (People don't trust a scientist who teaches one “theory” as being an undeniable fact and then changes it to a different “theory”, and then teaches the next “theory” as being an undeniable fact. **They themselves have changed their undeniable facts.** Also, their big diversified group which is supposedly the one and only “common ancestor” always look like apes.) (Notice – their art-work looks like a halfway intermediate form. That's because their art-work is a lie. The truth is that halfway intermediate forms don't exist.)

Not only that, but, most people don't even understand the purpose of using the name “Hominids” instead of “apes”, especially since all the Hominids look like apes. People look at it, and can't figure out why they changed the name of those creatures from “apes” to “Hominids”. Most people don't even know about their change in “theory” at all.

What, on earth, do they need this second theory of the “common ancestor” for? Why do they have to call something (apes) by a different name (Hominids)? (I repeat – their art-work looks like a halfway intermediate form. That's because their art-work is a lie. The truth is that halfway intermediate forms don't exist.) They're in the **lie** business, not in the **truth** business.

The average person doesn't seem to understand that the reason they changed the theory was that they couldn't find any evidence that man evolved from apes. And, discovering a lot of species of extinct apes doesn't indicate that they were halfway between anything at all. The “Hominids” are supposed to be the “missing link”, so, supposedly it's not missing any more. The only problem is.... the “Hominids” are just a bunch of extinct apes. It's a fake “missing link”. The “Hominids” are a false claim, and the halfway intermediate form (link) between ape and man is still missing.

But, that doesn't matter. As long as they're a massive group, they can keep looking up and saying that the sky is green, and people will believe it's green anyway. Those evolutionary scientists might even invent a third “theory” someday and teach that as being absolutely and undeniably true in their “universities”, which don't deserve to be called “universities”, because they tolerate this type of irrational and dishonest hokum, while rejecting the enormous bulk of facts that support creation (young earth) much more than evolution (old earth). All of the major universities in the US, which were started back near the beginning of the US, used to teach creation when they first started. It is only in modern times that

they switched to teaching the theory of evolution.

Rest assured, God gives special wisdom to people who reject the education and diplomas from those universities. Their diplomas belong in the trash along with all their rejected scientific evidence. Everyone who accepts their diplomas in this field of study will never know God's wisdom. (Also see video on YouTube called: "The Most Successful People Explain Why a College Degree is USELESS"). Why are the most successful people usually **not** college graduates? If all those professors were successful, they would be too busy with their success to waste time as a small-time college teacher.

And..... how did all those universities get started anyway? What makes them any better than anyone else? Weren't all the great thinkers in the past people who stood out and were different from everyone else? Even Einstein, when he started out proposed theories which none of the university professors could understand. Obviously, he didn't learn those theories in any university.

Well.... who started all those universities? What were their qualifications? Were they started by people who graduated from some other universities? Or, were they just any ol' Joe who invented their own diplomas? Now-a-days, with the help of computer programs like "Photoshop" or "Paint", just about anybody could invent their own diplomas that look better than any diploma from those universities. For some strange reason their diploma's always look bad.

Why is it always said that doctors who don't know what they're talking about are "quacks"? When a bunch of ducks walk together, each duck waddles back and forth with its head held high as though he is very important. The "self-important" waddling itself is very comical. As they waddle along with an air of "self-importance", each duck tries to quack louder than all of the other ducks, so that what he says will sound more important than any of the other ducks. When the group gets larger, the quacking gets louder. But, none of the ducks are ever listening to what any of the other ducks are saying. Each duck wants to be heard above all the others. The quacking sound itself that the ducks make is very comical.

It would be a good idea if the people in the artificial duck call business (like Duck Dynasty) could make a musical duck call, like a clarinet, a real musical instrument, properly tuned so that it could produce real music with the comical sound of an artificial duck call. Maybe they could make just a mouthpiece that could fit onto a clarinet or saxophone. Those mouthpieces are detachable. For serious quacking they could use a bass clarinet or bass saxophone.

Laughter, if it is applied correctly, can have very significant healing properties; it's very therapeutic. (People in low spirits don't heal as well as people in high spirits.) (Technically speaking: The American Journal of Medicine has found that

laughter “..... increases secretion of catecholamines (adrenaline hormone) and endorphins (pain blocker)... which in turn increases oxygenation of the blood, relaxes the arteries... speeds up the heart, decreases blood pressure... which has a positive effect on all cardiovascular and respiratory ailments... as well as overall increasing the immune system response.”)

Those “quack” doctors (especially psychiatrists) would get a lot better results if they played a musical duck call for their patients..... of course, they'll have to be sure to play it very loud so that everyone will think they really know what they're quacking about. They could also teach their patients how to play quack songs, too. Songs like “pop goes the weasel” would be particularly therapeutic. Curly, one of the three stooges, turned into superman when he heard that song.

The quantity of evidence in favor of creation and against evolution is like comparing the size of an honest elephant to the size of a dishonest ant, a million to one difference. They have dishonestly described an ant hill as though it were a mountain. It is as though they have “tunnel vision”, like horses with blinders next to their eyes to keep them from seeing anything other than what is directly in front of them. The pitiful meager evidence that they occasionally present is **always** irrelevant and insignificant to any important point. It is immaterial and impertinent, which proves nothing.

For example, they show that in every specie, offspring are always somehow different than their parents, from which they falsely assume to mean that the children will eventually change into a completely different specie, little by little. But showing a specie actually changing into a different specie has never been done. They can't..... because it never happens in real life.

Or, they'll talk about things like “natural selection”, “mutation” or “genetic drift”, all of which are assumed to produce positive variations, but without presenting any evidence of actually changing into a different specie. Or, they'll take two different types of the same specie (like two different dogs) and mix them together and claim they got a new specie that didn't exist before. Yet, they can't figure out that what they got was just another animal of the same specie, which is not any other specie other than the one they started with. They're not able to understand that their assumptions are faulty. No specie can even mate with a different specie. And.... no specie has ever changed into a different specie..... and “genetic drift” is falsely assumed. Genetic DNA is fixed, it doesn't “drift”. Any alterations, which are called “mutations”, are always something bad, never something better. Anything better requires intelligent design, which cannot be produced by random changes.

Another example is found in the 2014 Christian film “God's Not Dead”,

when a student in a philosophy class at a secular (non-Christian) university was required to prove before the class the existence of God. He chose to use the argument of creation vs. evolution as a demonstration for the necessity of the existence of God. The atheist professor responded in class by quoting the noted atheist professor Stephen Hawking, “the world's most famous scientist”, professor of physics at Cambridge, who is “in favor of a self-designing universe” (the Big Bang Theory. “Designs” don’t come from random chances. “Designs” come from a designer, a creator.) Who said, “**Because there's a law such as gravity..... there is something instead of nothing..... is why the universe exists, why we exist. It is not necessary to invoke God to set the universe in motion.**” Interestingly, this brings up one of the few aspects in which both creation and evolution are in agreement, that something came out of nothing.

The fact is that, “**gravity**” is an invisible force that scientists can only study its effects (laws). They can **not** see it or know where it comes from or what makes it work. Whereas, the Bible explains it: **2Pet 3:5 “..... that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth.....”** It is by the “word of God” that the invisible force called “**gravity**” exists, and also by which things hold together and don’t disintegrate into vapor, or by which objects don’t go floating off the planet into outer space..... and by which everything was created.

By the end of that movie “God’s not Dead”, the student confronted the teacher. “Why do you hate God? Science supports his existence..... You know the truth.” “How can you hate someone if he doesn't exist?” Obviously, when a person hates God, they recognize his existence.

Go ahead, take a look at their “evidence” on any web page about evolution. Notice – don't waste time looking at the teaching of the “theory” itself..... look for the evidence. They have a bad habit of teaching their “theory” as a fact without showing any evidence at all. They are also very good at beating around the bush, and running in circles about things that don't matter. And, they're experts at making mountains out of ant hills. The truth is, that it may be a very long job and a very time consuming job trying to get any “important” evidence at all out of them. (Other than irrelevant insignificant ant hills, which they talk about as though they were mountains.)

They know they don't need any evidence. The people who follow their “theory” don't care about evidence. The pertinent facts are, for example, how no specie has ever slowly and gradually changed into a different specie. The DNA code itself won't permit it. No fossil of any intermediate form between any two species has ever been found, never, zip, zero, nada. **All** of the links between **all** of the species are **all** missing. 00.00% exists. They have a perfect score: abso-

lute zero. Or, how the earth is young, not old. **These are the important things.** They are very good at dodging the important stuff, and focusing on the trivial or the irrelevant.

And what about “**THE MISSING LINKS**” (many stage-by-stage intermediate forms) of the specie before their supposed ancestor of the human race? Their “common ancestor”..... What ancestor? They refuse to even select one. And..... “**THE MISSING LINKS**” (many stage-by-stage intermediate forms) of the supposed specie before that? (Before what? They haven’t even selected it yet.) And.... “**THE MISSING LINKS**” (many stage-by-stage intermediate forms) of the supposed specie before that? Where are their intermediate forms? They are ALL missing!

There should be **many, many** intermediate forms at every slightest alteration of change from one specie into another. Each specie, including species not related to the supposed lineage of human beings, needs evidence of slow and gradual change (many stage-by-stage intermediate forms) of each animal at every slightest stage of progress..... from a single cell organism all the way up to the modern species. The evidence of those stage-by-stage “links” between each specie does not exist. Their links are **ALL** “missing”, 00.00% exist. They have a perfect score: absolute zero.

They can't even find **one** halfway intermediate link, much less each stage-by-stage continuum of gradual changes. There is no such thing as any “intermediate form” of any creature at all, never, none, zip, zero, nada. No specie has ever slowly and gradually changed into a different specie. In some of their museums they have figures of creatures, side-by-side, gradually changing into something else, but that is done exclusively with art-work. The artist deserves **all** the credit. They are in the **lie** business, not the **truth** business.... and they like it that way. Or, maybe they can't tell the difference between the truth and a lie. Well, the psychologists in those “universities” can't fix this type of mental illness, so maybe the psychologists are just as bad. Their diplomas in psychology belong in the trash equally as much as the diplomas in paleontology. (See article listed below on: Self-Love and Self-Esteem.)

Without a complete set of “links” (many intermediate forms at every slightest stage of change) between each specie throughout the entire “evolution” of man, their ancestor, inappropriately named “~~Hominids~~”, (which should be called “apes”) is a useless error and a dead end. Supposedly, the “Hominids” are the “missing link”. Well..... was that “**Hominids**” or “Hominid”? Was that “is” or “are”, was that singular or plural? Was that “link” or “**links**”? The truth is, they can't even make up their minds what the Hominids are, much less can they decide if it's singular or plural.

Did the human race evolve from a bunch of different species, or just from one specie? They haven't decided yet. Nevertheless, they say it's an undeniable fact. They say that evolution is a fact..... and only an idiot would ask to see the evidence for such an obviously indisputable thing. So, stop asking questions! Only a complete moron would reject evolution. They want people to follow the crowd without asking for evidence.

Even if they did use the name "apes" (going back to the first theory), it would still be necessary for them to select one from the many different types of apes as the "ancestor" of humans. (Don't forget, "links" between ape and man don't exist. They already confessed that.) It is extremely unrealistic to imagine that all of the exceedingly different types of "apes" are somehow ALL the one and only "ancestor" of humans. They refuse to pick one so that it could never be disproved, like **ALL** the other missing links have been disproved. (by their own people) By never selecting one, it eliminates the possibility that it could ever be disproved.

Is it really true that there is not even one evolutionary scientist who will stand up and confess that this "common ancestor" (the assortment of extremely different "~~Hominids~~", rather, extinct "apes") is/are false? They have already confessed that man did not evolve from apes, so now they also need to confess that man did not evolve from a variety of very different, inappropriately named "~~Hominids~~", rather, extinct "apes", the big diversified group that is called the one and only "common ancestor". (Why is the "common ancestor" singular and also plural at the same time? Because they can't even make up their minds what it is.)

How could all of those extremely different looking "~~Hominids~~", rather, extinct "apes", all be ancestors of humans, all at the same time? Why don't they select one? Answer: First, they don't have to. People who hold to the "theory" of evolution don't care about any real evidence. Second, if they selected any specific one, it would leave them open to be disproved, like **all** the other "missing links". By never selecting one, it can never be disproved.

And.... the Hominids are supposed to be the one and only "missing link". Was that "missing link" or "missing links"? Link between what? The "link" can't be between "ape" and "man", you know. They've already stated that man did not evolve from apes. So, they conclude that the "missing link" has been replaced by the "common ancestor", which they call "~~Hominids~~", which are nothing but a bunch of extinct apes. Every single fossil is either 100% ape or 100% human. They themselves have already confessed that man did not evolve from apes.

Oh, don't forget, sometimes they even show pictures of real live apes as those "Hominids". The word "sometimes" means that they can't even make up their minds what exactly is a "Hominid". Is it the "common ancestor" of apes and

man? Or is it an ape? Is there really not even one honest competent person among all those evolutionists who will stand up and confess that there is something wrong with this theory?

Theory?!? Who says it's a theory? They say that evolution is an undeniable fact, not a theory. Just like how when they used to teach that man evolved from apes. But..... now that they themselves have changed this undeniable fact, they expect that everyone else accepts this new undeniable fact equally as much as they accepted the last undeniable fact. **They themselves have changed their undeniable facts!!!** And now, nobody really knows what to believe.

No specie has ever slowly and gradually changed into a different specie. None of those "~~Hominids~~", rather, extinct "apes", was ever the ancestor of human beings and they cannot prove otherwise. They will even make false claims, like: those "Hominids" walked in an upright position like humans, not like regular apes that walk bent over with their hands on the ground. But, they won't confess that a lot of animals are capable of standing upright. Modern apes, bears or even dogs can be taught to stand up on their rear legs and walk standing upright. The Meerkat, a small carnivore belonging to the mongoose family, found in southern Africa, is famous for standing in a tall upright position. In the 2006 film "Night at the Museum", when the little Capuchin monkey, named Dexter, stole the security guards' keys and went running off with them, he ran in an upright position just like a human being would do. Yet, that monkey was 100% ape. He even had a tail.

Next, there is the question of "creation of life" experiments. If indeed it is true that life evolved all by itself, then it would be possible for a scientist to "create" (not evolve) living cells in a laboratory from non-living materials. However, this has never been done. In fact, it has been proven that at every stage of the development (creation, not evolution) of a living cell, oxygen **cannot** be present. Contact with oxygen would ruin the material substance before it could get to the next stage of development (creation).

But, at the very instant that a living cell is formed (created), oxygen must be present or else the living cell would die immediately. The change must be instantaneous: the absence of oxygen immediately followed by the presence of oxygen, within seconds. (This is possible only in a laboratory with a creator, not out in the real world) (... and where could you find a place in the real world with no oxygen? There isn't any. Both air and water are full of oxygen.) (All of this is just hypothesis. No living cell has ever been created from non-living materials.) (See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JzAPGcjYtjY&t=27s>.)

Also, don't forget about the extreme complexity of the DNA code that exists in every living cell for every creature. It would be more believable that a

tornado passing through a junk yard could assemble a perfectly functional car out of old scattered parts than that a living cell formed its own DNA code all by itself, by chance. It is **not** realistic that living organisms “evolved” all by themselves, by chance. Random chances don't form order, they form disorder. Tornadoes passing through junk yards leave big messes, not functioning cars.

The existence of plants and animals itself is evidence of design and intelligence. By nature, things left to themselves produce disorder, not order. The biggest problem is that God seems to be gone. He's not anywhere to be found. We can't locate him. So, how did all these plants and animals come into existence with nobody here to create them?

Well, God has decided that he's **not** going to interact among us in the way most people think that he should. He seems not to be here..... and yet he is here. The spirit of God is everywhere, all at the same time. Nothing could continue to exist without the invisible force called gravity. Gravity not only keeps objects from floating off the earth into space, but it makes material objects stick together and not disintegrate or vaporize. The handiwork of God is all around us every day, just look. The invisible force of gravity cannot be seen any more than God can be seen. Yet it exists. Gravity itself is the handiwork of God. Gravity itself shows the continual presence of God.

In addition, all of the laboratory attempts to create life always involve the use of very elaborate complex laboratory equipment and procedures which could never have existed out in the real world without a creator. (Like the unrealistic condition that some of the development stages require a temperature much, much higher than the boiling point of water, then the tiny product they get must be removed immediately from the heat, or else the high temperature will destroy it; a condition that could only exist in a laboratory.)

(See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JzAPGcjYtjY>.)

Another unrealistic condition is that all of the substances they use in their experiments are always in the pure state, a condition that could never exist out in the real world. They already know before they start that impure substances would contaminate the experiment. But, one thing is for sure, it can't happen without a creator.

It is impossible for life to be formed (created, even by a scientific human creator) from non-living substances. How much less could life have “evolved” all by itself, by chance..... Random chances produce disorder, not order. The existence of complex plants and animals requires an intelligent designer, all those things could never have come into existence due to random chances left to themselves.

In fact, if the “theory” of evolution were true, there would be living cells spontaneously forming out of non-living substances all over the place, every day.

But that **never** happens in real life. All living things are always born from other living things; parents always produce children. Living things never “evolve” from non-living materials. This could remind us of the age-old question: which came first, the chicken or the egg? Answer - God has always existed, and he created the first pair of chickens, male and female, which could produce eggs.

But, even if those scientists did create life, in a laboratory, it would only show that a creator is necessary. If they want to prove the “theory” of evolution, they need to show life forming all by itself out in the real world, not in a laboratory. They themselves would not dare to waste time attempting to look for such a ridiculous thing. They know it would be a waste of time, because they know perfectly well that the “theory” of evolution is **not** true.

They also know that looking for such a thing and never finding it, would be more proof against them that they would have to add to the already abundance of evidence that they've already thrown out in the trash, into their already overflowing big dumpsters.

They know they're lying, every time they falsely teach this “theory” as a fact. They're in the **lie** business, **not** the **truth** business..... and they like it that way. After all, what could possibly be more fun, than watching multitudes of gullible people brainlessly follow along their ridiculous absurd “theory”?

Only God can create life from any materials, whether from previously existing materials or from newly created materials. God just spoke the word, and life was formed by His words alone. Gen 1:24 “**And God said, let there be and it was so.**” God created everything by His words alone. 2Pet 3:5,7 “**.....that by the word of God the heavens were of old,.....” 7- “But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store,**”

And..... what is this mysterious force that makes everything stick together, called gravity? Not only does it keep every loose object from floating off the Earth into outer space, but it makes the molecules in every object hold together so that it doesn't fall apart and disintegrate, flying apart in every direction, almost like vaporizing. Gravity is the main factor that makes all matter exist. So, how does this invisible force work? God makes it work by ordering it so by His word! 2Pet 3:5 “**..... that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth.....**” Scientists can evaluate the natural laws about what gravity does, but they can't explain how it got there, how it exists or what makes it do what it does.

On the History channel documentary “Ancient Aliens”, their scientists (who otherwise would have been evolutionists) propose that the first life on earth

was brought here by extraterrestrials at the beginning. (See article listed below on: Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels.) They only propose this theory because of the obvious absurdity of life evolving from non-living materials, all by itself. (If they were evolutionary scientists they would never confess this.) However, despite the fact that they are right about the absurdity of life evolving from non-living materials, all by itself, they seem to forget that even if the first life started on some other planet as opposed to Earth, it still had to have had some sort of starting point. They themselves confess that it could never have evolved, all by itself..... But, they refuse to admit that the only solution that works is that it could only have been created by an eternal being. God has no starting point.

The second involvement of extraterrestrials they propose is the development of humans themselves, later on, from lower species by means of advanced genetic engineering. They recognize the extreme complexity of humans as compared to any of the lower species and propose that it could never have happened all by itself by means of evolution, by chance. Random chances don't form order, they form disorder.

It is interesting how they recognize the absurdity of the "theory" of evolution..... and that some other explanation must be necessary, involving some sort of intelligent being(s). Surprisingly, they do not want to reject the "theory" of evolution entirely. They combine their "alien" theories along with evolution..... whichever way happens to be convenient for them. But, the truth is that evolution should be rejected entirely. They are mistaken when they accept certain stages of evolution and yet not other stages.

It is too bad that, like the evolutionists, their "theories" also reject the involvement of God, the creator. They just substitute the involvement of the creator God with the involvement of creators that are extraterrestrials. They recognize that it is obvious that some type of intelligent being(s), apart from evolution, must have been involved to produce human existence.

But, they don't want to face the obvious question: How did the extraterrestrials come into existence? Those extraterrestrial theorists have rejected both evolution and creation, so how could the extraterrestrials have come into existence without the possibility of evolving or being created? Answer: God is eternal. He had no starting point. The extraterrestrials were created by God, and should be called "angels" or "demons", as they are called in the Bible. (See my article listed below on: Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels.)

Yet another important question would be the change of species through breeding. If the "theory" of evolution were true, then it would be possible to breed animals until they would eventually change into different species. For example, someone could breed dogs or horses until eventually they would get cats, ele-

phants or lions. (Or at least a dog or horse with human intelligence or speech, like “Mr. Ed”, the talking horse. See Mr. Ed on www.youtube.com.) People have been breeding dogs and horses for thousands of years, and yet they have gotten nothing but dogs and horses, that have always been speechless. This completely kills the “theory” of evolution absolutely dead.

Parrots and a few other birds can talk, yet it is impossible to breed them so that they can understand what they say. The only thing Parrots can do is repeat sounds they hear out of habit, with no real understanding. Even Koko the gorilla who learned thousands of sign language vocabulary words doesn't surpass the intelligence level of a dog taught to do tricks or a parrot that speaks without any real understanding, merely repeating sounds.

(See Koko on www.youtube.com.)

(And how about the little dog in the 1994 film “the Mask” who unlocked a car door from inside and opened it by pulling the door handle? Would Koko be any smarter if she could do that? Teaching an animal to do tricks does not constitute a conversation or real intellect. Teaching Koko to do sign language vocabulary words does not surpass teaching a dog to sit up and beg when he wants food.)

How is it possible that the foot of a dog could be half way between a dog's paw and a horse's hoof? What would it look like? Such a thing couldn't exist..... and there is no evidence that it ever did exist, except in fake artwork. Species cannot slowly and gradually change into other species. All supposed intermediate forms would be impractical and dysfunctional. An animal's foot that was halfway between a dog's paw and a horse's hoof would be dysfunctional. Natural selection would not make such an impractical, dysfunctional and cripple animal improve; it would be useless and inferior, not an improvement. And, in reality, such creatures have never existed. **All** the types of species throughout history have always been 100% functional. (Mutations are discussed below. ↓↓↓) The discussion now is about animals in a normal condition. One hundred percent functionality cannot happen during intermediate stages. **Intermediate stages are dysfunctional and inferior**, which means that “natural selection” doesn't work. The word “dysfunctional” means the animal would be cripple.

If the “theory” of evolution were true, the presence of “species” would not even exist at all. **Every** creature would be in a continual state of change and the majority of creatures would be in some intermediate stage between what is now considered “species”. Almost every animal would have no other possible animal they could even mate with. Most of their body parts would be in some sort of dysfunctional weird impossible (crippled) formations that have never been seen in any fossil or living animal. No fossil of any creature between species has ever been

found with dysfunctional intermediate-stage body parts.

The theory of “natural selection” cannot possibly apply to dysfunctional intermediate-stage body parts. Dysfunctional intermediate-stage body parts are not an asset, they are a hindrance, which would **not** be an improvement. This is the main reason why the DNA code has limits to how much any creature can change, from one generation to the next. The DNA code will not permit intermediate-stage dysfunctional body parts. God created all species with normal body parts, which are at maximum functionality, within their own specie.

“Intermediate” stage? Intermediate between what? This word alone implies that there exists other “regular” forms. But, if evolution were true, there would be no “regular” forms. Everything would be in the state of changing into something else. The whole concept of having “regular” species would not exist. And what could any animal mate with, every other animal would be changing into some other random creature. It would be impossible for any animal to find a mate.

They might say that unusual mutational forms of creatures are a reality of life. But, deformed freaks of nature are **never** improvements on a specie. Any possible alteration to a normal specie (mutation) is **always, always, always** inferior and impractical; **never, never, never** an improvement. Freak abnormal mutations never start new improved species. Freak abnormal mutations are never an improvement which supposedly, according to their theory, “natural selection” would cause to produce more superior offspring. Mutated forms of creatures are always deformed crippled freaks that **always, always, always** are so bad off that they die-off at a young age.

The only reason why this “theory” of intermediate-stage body parts has been widely accepted between humans and ~~Hominids~~, rather, extinct “apes”, is that most of the body parts are very similar and a transitional form between most of those body parts would still be functional during the intermediate-stage. However, despite the fact that most of the outward body parts seem very similar, some of the inward body parts, like the speech center and brain, are very much different and a transitional form would **not** be functional. The extremely different speech center was why they had to teach Koko the gorilla sign language rather than speaking.

The whole concept of dysfunctional (cripple) intermediate-stage body parts must be completely **ignored** between species or else the “theory” of evolution cannot be considered rational, even by atheists. They must **ignore** the obvious impracticality of dysfunctional (cripple) intermediate-stage body parts. And, they must also **ignore** the fact that they have never found even one fossil of any creature with intermediate-stage body parts, between any two species. **There is no such thing!!**

Try to imagine the hand-shaped foot of an ape changing into the foot of a human. Even that would be dysfunctional during the intermediate stage. The

animal would be crippled. It couldn't walk like a human or climb a tree like an ape during the intermediate stage. It would NOT be superior, as "natural selection" says, it would be lame and inferior.

Yet, one more problem is that different species cannot inter-breed. There are many internal inconsistencies in type that make it impossible for different species to inter-breed and produce offspring..... And if they can't inter-breed, how could any specie possibly slowly change into a different specie that they couldn't even mate with? It is not possible that any specie could slowly and gradually change into a specie that they couldn't even mate with. The internal inconsistencies in type that prohibit them from inter-mating could not possibly be at a halfway point..... and then suddenly switch to a different type..... a male and female both at the exact same time. How absurd can you get? (No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.)

Variations within the same specie can inter-mate, like different types of dogs, but not with a different specie. A dog cannot mate with a cat. If the "theory" of evolution were true, this condition would not exist. In addition, there would probably be a lot of species that could even reproduce without mating at all.

Concerning dogs, there are many different kinds, but as with every specie, there is a "limit" to how much they can change. This "limit" is the very essence of what makes a "specie" to be a "specie". A dog will always be a dog. God not only created all the animals to be in groups of "species", but He also created "limits" for each specie to which they must always stay within. You can breed big dogs and little dogs, but you will never breed a dog the size of an elephant, nor the size of an ant. Those sizes are outside of the "limits" for dogs. Nor do dogs ever have claws like cats. And they never have paws halfway between any other formations. The existence of these "limits" completely disproves the "theory" of evolution. Species **never** change into other species.

The only possible exception to these "limits" would be some sort of "freak" of nature, which is scientifically called a "mutation". A "mutation" is not a normal variation within the "limits" of the specie, like breeding a cuter looking dog. Those "mutations" are **always** something bad, abnormal and inferior, **never** something better. (Like the "Elephant Man". See the real "Elephant Man" on Wikipedia.) A "mutation" is **never, never, never** an improvement on the specie, and they usually die young, as did the Elephant Man. Even human engineered creations cannot be halfway between two different designs. Unless, like the dogs, they are really variations of the same type (specie), which is NOT a "mutation".

A "mutation" is caused by damage somehow being done to the DNA code, usually from something like radiation or drugs during pregnancy, kind of like a car getting into an accident. Is it possible to wreck a car in any way and get an

improvement? Is it possible to smash-up a cheap old VW and end up with a new expensive Bugatti, worth \$4 million? (No laughter, please, folks, this isn't a comedy.) There is no such thing as a car accident causing an improvement on the car. (Be careful, they say they can get beneficial mutations. But, that is because they have difficulty distinguishing between a natural variation within the "limits" of a specie and a "mutation".) A "mutation" is caused by damaging the DNA code. The concept of "damage" causing improvement is contradicting the second law of thermodynamics. Damage never produces an improvement. (See videos about this natural law on <https://www.youtube.com>.)

Furthermore, a car accident would not change the original car design from the factory. (That is, the original DNA code of any specie. Mutated formations never have offspring in accordance to any new mutation. If they ever have offspring, any healthy offspring always have the original DNA, including only natural variations within the "limits" of the specie, never the mutated changes.) In the case of the Elephant Man, his reproductive organ was in normal condition. So, if he had any children, they would **not** look like little elephant children, but rather, they would look like normal children. (His mother was not an elephant woman, she was a normal looking human being. In fact, they say she was beautiful.) (See 1980 film: The Elephant Man.)

Another example of damage (mutation) to the DNA code would be a corruption error in a computer digital recording. Normally, when a digital recording is made, the copy is identical to the original, just like how when living cells form other cells (mitosis), the DNA code in the new cell is an identical copy of the original. But, if a computer is malfunctioning or if the hard disc has a defect, it is possible that the copy could be corrupted. If someone creates some new music and wants to copy it, is it possible that a corrupted copy of their music comes out as an improvement? Could a corrupted copy ever produce better music than the original? How absurd! Corrupted audio copies **always** sound bad. Better music requires a composer, a designer, a creator.

Likewise, any damage to the DNA code will **never, never, never, never** produce a better creature. The idea that "genetic drift" could alter a specie so that it would eventually change into a different superior specie is like saying that defects in audio recordings will eventually change a piece of music into a completely different superior piece of music. A person who wants to write new music could just look for a malfunctioning computer that records improperly. Then they could re-record a bunch of music over and over again until finally they get superior music. (No laughter, please folks, this is not a comedy.) Digital recordings are intended to be identical, just like DNA duplication in any creature from one generation (cell) to another. Any possible alteration (mutation) in the copy cannot possibly be anything but bad. Computer programming is the same way. Can a bad

copy of a program ever be an improvement on the program? **NO! NEVER!**
Superior programs require a programmer, a designer, a creator.

Nobody has ever bred an animal and got an improvement on the specie outside the natural “limits” of that same specie. (Obviously, this does not include changes within the “limits” of the specie, like breeding a more attractive dog, which is still a dog and not anything but a dog. Example: long hair Chihuahuas are much more adorable and cuter than regular short hair Chihuahuas..... but they're still dogs. Internet search: long hair Chihuahua images.)

The “theory” of evolution must reject the existence of “limits” to how much species can change. They call this absence of “limits”, “genetic drift”, which is hokum. The term “genetic drift” should be called “genetic damage”, which is always something bad. Those evolutionary scientists always “assume” that since all species have children that are different than their parents, there is no “limit” to how much they can change. If this were true then no “specie” would even exist. **All** creatures would be continually in some intermediate stage of changing into something else, getting better and better as the years go by, with no creator or breeder involved. This would also mean that there should be nothing to inhibit different species from inter-mating or even self-producing without mating at all. But all that is false. Species can only mate with their own specie.

Before modern technology, horses were very important work animals, and the quality of their breeding was of utmost importance for thousands of years. Everyone knows that if you want a better animal, you won't get it without a breeder. Everyone knows it. (Which means “natural selection” is nonsense.) Species **never, never, never** get better all by themselves without a breeder. (And inferior variations of species normally have **more** offspring than supposedly superior variations. A cheap farm horse usually has **more** offspring than an expensive thoroughbred race horse.) Hybrid animals are noted for having fewer offspring. Sometimes they're even completely sterile.

(On youtube there are many documentary videos that explain why hybrid animals are (almost always) sterile. The supposed “superior” animals normally have fewer offspring, not more offspring. How absurd does the “theory” of evolution have to be presented before people will reject it? (Remember, this is a religious matter, not a scientific matter. The main purpose of the “theory” of evolution is to deny the existence of God.)

Or, how about in the plant world? How about the superior orange, called a “naval orange”. What makes it “superior”? It has no seeds. How can a seedless orange reproduce more orange trees? With no seeds? How do they do it? They can't..... not without a breeder. As stated earlier, superior species are usually sterile. They don't have more offspring, they have fewer offspring.

And what about the old “theory” of “the survival of the fittest” or “natural selection”, as some people call it? Do race horse owners get their superior race horses using “the survival of the fittest” or do they use a breeder? (No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.) How absurd does the “theory” of evolution have to be presented before university professors will stop teaching it as though it is an undeniable fact? All the universities that accept this type of irrational absurd hokum do not deserve to be called “universities”; they have disqualified themselves. Their diplomas belong in the same dumpster they threw all that rejected evidence that didn’t agree with their theory of evolution.

What about the evolution of a body part like the eye? Supposedly, evolution is a process that happens very slowly and gradually over many years. They say that the eye “evolved” slowly and gradually over many years, improving all by itself little by little as time went by, as a result of “the survival of the fittest” and random changes, with no breeder. But if that were true, then for a long time some poor creatures had a part-way developed eye that was nothing more than a useless and troublesome lump on their faces, which would **not** make them the supposed “fittest”. (And how did it get on their faces anyway? And, why a pair in front? Why not one in the front and the other in the back? Or, as some species have, one eye on each side of their heads, which gives them a panoramic view; practically the same as having an eye in front and an eye in back.)

How could “the survival of the fittest” or “natural selection” make a useless halfway developed eye improve? It couldn’t. Everything that improves does so by some sort of intelligent design, not by random changes. To improve, you need a creator (a designer). Random chances produce a mess, not improvement. A tornado going through a junk yard produces a big mess, not functioning cars. And, most confidently, **not** better cars.

The existence of useless and troublesome lumps on the face would **not** put that creature into the category of the “fittest” and somehow make it have more offspring..... and somehow the creatures without those useless lumps have fewer offspring. Those useless and troublesome lumps would be an unprofitable dysfunctional hindrance, not an asset. Creatures either have fully functioning eyes or they do not, because God created them that way. No specie has ever started a part-way developed eye that improved little by little, all by itself, by chance, neither in the past nor in the present. Random chances don't form improvement, they form disorder. Can a monkey typing random keys produce a best selling novel? Never in a million years. Never in a billion years. Never in a trillion years. It can **not** happen.

Or, how about two students in an English class who both turn in word-for-word identical writing compositions? If they claim that it happened by chance, should the teacher believe them? Is that possible? Can random chances produce

any such thing? NO! So, why do the evolutionists teach opposite absurdity?

Everything that exists from whatever source of intelligent design cannot possibly come from random chances. Whether it is a cleverly written book, or a well designed car, or a living creature, nothing that requires intelligent design could possibly come from random chances. Random chances produce disorder, not intelligent design. All living creatures are in the form of intelligently designed species that could never have existed due to random chances.

What's more, the human race itself does not go along with the theory of "the survival of the fittest". The most advanced people (fittest) are having the fewest children and the least advanced people are having the most children. Professional educated women (fittest) are usually too much caught up in the advancement of their careers (superiority) to be bothered with what they consider to be the inferior lowly waste of time of raising and training children at home.

The modern "feminist" movement has converted women into men. Being women is considered inferior, and so they have to become men, superior (the fittest). But, even if they have children, they usually end up paying someone else to take care of them and raise them; they normally spend very little time raising them. Most professional women would consider it an insult if someone (a man) said they would be better off raising and training children at home.

Despite their higher education, (from "universities" that don't deserve to be called "universities") those women aren't capable of understanding that the greatest contribution they could give to humanity is by doing a quality job of raising and training children at home. (This comment is not intended to insult women. It is intended to take note that women need loving husbands to guide them and protect them from dangerous errors.) It is the lack of quality mothering that is the main cause of the unstable troubled young generation which we have today; which is reverse evolution. Not to mention the epidemic of suicide among young people that we have in the US today. The complete lack of purpose to life is one of the by-products that go hand-in-hand with evolution. Especially with no chance of life after death, there is NO purpose to life. Without God, there is NO purpose to life.

Not only that, but, the evolutionists who support the theory of "the survival of the fittest" would not dare to stand up against the modern "feminist" movement that teaches the "fittest" educated women to act like men and not do the lowly task of raising and training children at home. It doesn't matter that modern "feminism" contradicts their "theory" of "natural selection", they will stick to both and continue to contradict themselves anyway.

(Both "feminism" and "evolution" originate from the same atheist/communist source. Atheistic communism is primarily a social and educational movement, not a political movement. The extremely powerful effect of these two teach-

ings on our modern society demonstrates the overwhelming dominance of the communist/atheist/anti-Christian influence which has already conquered the entire western modern society. **All** of the supposedly superior “progress” of modern society is really a satanic/deceptive take-over of society by people with very bad intentions. These are the same type of people who pulled the rug out from under the entire country of Venezuela, a few years ago. They corrupt from the inside out. The people who destroyed Venezuela were not an enemy who attacked it from the outside. They were people inside their own government and social structure.)

The day is coming when these people are going to pull the rug out from under all the people who have unwittingly followed along their deceptive trickery. The best example of this is Venezuela, which not only suffered a major economic disaster, but was clearly sabotaged from the inside, a few years ago. The enemy is on the inside, and the majority of the people are blindly following along with no thought of the consequences. (See documentary videos about the recent downfall of Venezuela on places like www.youtube.com.)

What has been happening in the past few decades in the entire western society should be compared to the pre-WW2 Nazi take-over of Germany. And..... the more recent communist take-over and disaster in Venezuela. Better still, how about Bush’s 9-11? (That’s right, **Bush’s** 9-11. He did it, folks. See documentaries: “Loose Change” and “Fahrenheit 9-11”.) Also, see article listed below on: The Consequences of “Women’s Liberation” and “The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible”).

And now, getting back to the subject of “survival of the fittest”..... The world is being over-populated by the least “fit” people of all..... And the theory of “the survival of the fittest” is absurd hokum. In every specie, the least “fit” creatures **do** survive, and continue to have more offspring than any other variation of their own specie. Any particular specie or variation of a specie that has more offspring is always due to their reproductive organs being somehow more active, not due to any other superiority. And, superior variations are usually sterile. They do **not** have more children, they have fewer children. The more superior they are, the fewer children they have.

In the case of humans, the “fittest” women are having the fewest children because modern society (feminism) teaches them that if they don’t act like men and do what men do, then they are inferior. Has there ever existed any specie out in nature that had both genders acting like the male? How could such a specie survive? It couldn’t. It has never happened. Modern “feminism” is doomed; it is like a big fat Titanic, which definitely **will** sink. It is a deceptive propaganda lie from the communists to overthrow our society. They don’t need

atomic bombs to conquer the US. The average American follows their deception like sheep to the slaughter. And none of the highly educated women understand the deceit of modern feminism.

The “theory” of the “survival of the fittest” is kind of like the story of two men in a forest who came across a bear. One of the men knelt down to pray. The other man bent over and tightened his shoe laces getting ready to run. So, the first man said to him, “Are you crazy, you can't out-run a bear.” To which he replied, “I don't have to out-run the bear, all I have to do is out-run you.” (Survival of the fittest) To which he replied, “Most bears normally only chase creatures that run away from them. So, if you run and I don't, the bear will probably ignore me and chase only you. However, if we both back away slowly, the bear will probably not bother either of us, thank God.” (Both survived) (Bears are also known to walk away if you make unpleasant sharp clanging noises, like banging two rocks together, or two pieces of metal together; it irritates their ears.) The theory of “survival of the fittest” must assume that the “least fit” won't survive and won't have children..... but in real life, the “least fit” do survive, and continue having more children than the “fittest”. Superior variations are usually sterile.

The human over-population is also contaminating the world with an abundance of pollution, using the technology created by the supposed “fittest” most advanced people. (Contaminating our own world is reverse evolution.) The human race has had the technology, for a long time now, capable of discontinuing the polluting use of gasoline and replacing it with much cleaner forms of energy, (which would really help reduce global warming, and also improve normal respiration for all air-breathing creatures). (Internet search: replacement energy for gasoline) There's a lot of talk about replacing gasoline. But, you know the old saying: “When all is said and done, there's a lot more said than done.”

Electric cars are a questionable choice, due to the inconvenient characteristic of the required excessive time delay for recharging the batteries. And, electric cars do very bad in cold weather. Also, their resale value is usually about zero. Those light-weight electric vehicles aren't made for heavy loads, especially large cargo semi-trailer trucks for cross-country hauling.

But, in recent years they have made good advancements in battery development, which may change all that. And, they are always trying to develop new types of better batteries. Who knows, maybe those electric cars might surpass our expectations, in the future.

There is also a large amount of pollution involved during the manufacturing process of those electric vehicles. (About the same with all vehicles.) And, the production of electricity itself needs to be examined, because some of the electricity is produced using polluting methods. So, what good is a 0 emissions

electric vehicle, if the electricity itself is produced using polluting methods? However, this is changeable. In the future, it's possible to develop better electricity production using non-polluting methods. We hope. Remember - "When all is said and done, there's a lot more said than done".

Now that electric cars have been around for a while, we know that when the battery goes bad, the entire car is almost worthless. Electric cars must be considered "disposable" cars. Also, as better new models are coming out, the older electric cars lose their resale value. It's practically impossible to sell a used electric car, and get a reasonable price for it.

But, whatever be the case with electric cars, the gasoline cars have been around far too long. Way too much damage from pollution has already been done. And..... the only reason why changes are being made now is that the higher cost of gasoline is forcing them to change. Eventually, all the gasoline will be completely used up. If it wasn't for the decrease in gasoline production and the continuing rise in prices of gasoline they would continue using it.

But, the supposed "fittest" humans are the ones who insist on forcing everyone to use gasoline anyway. (Like the Bush family, who have large investments in the petroleum business.) Then they lie to everyone saying that global warming will never cause any serious problems. (See documentaries called: "An Inconvenient Truth" 2006, "An Inconvenient Sequel: Truth To Power" 2017, "Chasing Coral" 2017, "Chasing Ice" 2012 and "Racing Extinction" 2015. Some are available on YouTube.)

(See youtube video: Are Electric Cars REALLY Better for the Environment?
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G67i_Z8ukD4.)

In the documentary "Racing Extinction", where the main subject is the massive extinction of many species of animals due to either pollution or massive killing and commercializing of certain species, the subject of evolution is constantly mentioned over and over again as merely assumed without any evidence presented whatsoever. The supposed "old age" of the earth is mentioned again and again because it is automatically assumed to be true, without any evidence presented whatsoever. They know they don't need any evidence. The majority of the people are brainless and gullible, who will believe anything they hear. What could possibly be more fun?

This is just like how in the business world, it is well known that constant, constant, constant commercials influence people to buy their products. So it is that many people without even realizing what they are doing have been conditioned (brainwashed) to talk about the earth as being super old..... again, and again,

and again, with no evidence whatsoever.

Why is the old age of the earth so important?..... It isn't..... except for one thing; since nobody ever sees any specie changing into any other specie, the evolutionists have to assume that evolution must have taken a super long, long time to happen. But, the real reason why nobody ever sees it happening is because it never happens. Intermediate forms have **NEVER** been seen. Whereas, if evolution was true, right now there would be more intermediate forms than regular forms. In fact, regular forms wouldn't even exist. **ALL** creatures would be changing into something else. Fixed long lasting "species" would not exist.

They also don't want to think about the earth as being created by God. And, they want to make everyone think that the Bible is false. The main purpose of evolution is to promote atheism. It is an anti-religious attack that most people don't even think about as being what it really is. God created the world in six days approximately six thousand years ago.

In the documentary "An Inconvenient Truth", it is mentioned that the Antarctic ice is 650,000 years old. (at 21 minutes into the film) Well, what ever happened to their millions of years? Are they really saying that 650,000 years ago there was no ice on the Antarctic? Why? They don't say. The most probable reason is that their 650,000 years is twisted evidence that begins with the assumption that the earth absolutely has to be super old. But, somehow they couldn't quite twist it far enough to get the number of years that they really wanted. It ought to be investigated exactly how they came up with their 650,000 years. Rest assured it isn't honest. Oh, sometimes they talk about "continental drift", yet another "theory" with no evidence whatsoever.

In some schools this is called "fudging" the evidence. Kind of like when some people make home-made fudge; they feel free to change around the recipe, however they want, as they go along. Every time they make it, it comes out a little different. They can arrange it however they like. But really, it's all just a bunch of lies. **Lies, lies, lies, lies.** They're all evolutionary scientists who are **always, always, always** falsifying the evidence.

(And, by the way, underneath all that ice on the Antarctic is tropical vegetation. They don't give a rational explanation about that either. Continental drift is illogical and laughable hokum. Continental drift is another lie made to cover up something they can't explain any other way.)

On the subject of the implementation of new forms of energy, there seems to be something very fishy about what's going on. (Even in the documentary "An Inconvenient Truth", this subject is avoided. Al Gore spends all of his time pointing out the negative effects of global warming without offering any real solutions. Contaminating emissions need to be completely stopped, not reduced.

Catalytic converters reduced the automobile emissions for a while, but the problem still continues to increase. The use of gasoline needs to be completely replaced, not reduced.)

Well, maybe these negative comments against Al Gore are not fair. That first documentary was probably just an attention getter. Something to wake people up to the reality of the problem. Since then, he has been occupied doing something about the problem. (See his sequel documentary: An Inconvenient Sequel: Truth To Power.)

Of course, don't forget that other commonly used products are made from petroleum. All plastics and some rubber ingredients are made from petroleum, so if we stopped using petroleum, how would they replace the use of plastics and rubber? Over a hundred years ago plastic and rubber were never used. But now they need to figure out a way to replace them.

As of 2008, world-wide oil production hit its peak. This means that from that point on, oil production will be more expensive, and less will be produced each year. Eventually, stopping the use of petroleum will be forced upon us anyway due to the dwindling supply. Eventually, no more petroleum will exist. But rest assured, they've got something up their sleeve that they're not telling us now. Meanwhile, climate-changing conditions which come from air-polluting gasoline consumption continue causing extreme weather disasters, like floods, hurricanes and droughts. >>> Reverse evolution.

Normally, when any new type of business is started, investors know that it is of utmost importance to be the first. When Bill Gates started Microsoft, he started selling a product before he even had a product. He had nothing! But he knew very well, the importance of being the first to get his foot in the door. (He didn't get his foot in the door first on smart phones, so Microsoft is way down in sales on smart phones. Linux-Android beat Microsoft to the punch on smart-phones. If Gates had not got his foot in the door first on regular OS's, Linux would have beaten him on that one, too.) But, somehow the big, super rich petroleum producers have been dragging their (supposedly "fittest") feet, to get something else started to replace the use of gasoline. A long time ago they knew that it was necessary to replace the use of gasoline.

Disaster is coming, as a result of global warming (using gasoline), and those petroleum people (like the Bush family) can sit back and laugh because nobody has been lifting a finger to stop them for way too much time. Decades ago was the time when new cleaner energy sources should have replaced the use of gasoline, but somehow this mysterious fishiness is causing investors to avoid normal business practices and not invest in the lucrative and environmentally safer venture of replacing the use of gasoline.

Why the fishiness? We should not still be using gasoline. This isn't normal. Nor does it fit into the theory of Evolution. The modern pollution problem is reverse evolution.

Well, it can be said that new technology is replacing the use of gasoline. Yes, but very, very slowly. Gasoline is still used more than anything else. But, they do a lot of talking about changing that. As I said before..... "when all is said and done, there's a lot more said than done".

Another one is the "big bang theory", which is nothing more than a creation without a creator. This is an outright confession that the evidence shows the existence of a creation, but they still deny that it was done by a creator..... they say a big explosion did it..... kind of like a tornado passing through a junk yard, which supposedly produces a lot of vehicles out of old spare parts, functioning **better** than new.

Is there anything more ridiculous than the idea of a large explosion causing organization and beauty? Is there anyone who would organize their house by throwing a grenade into it? (No laughter, please, folks, this is not a comedy.)

The whole universe is gradually running down and slowly corrupting itself (reverse evolution), like stars becoming black holes. Therefore, it must have had a starting point in the past. This means that the universe could not have existed eternally in the past. Well..... whatever happened to the evolutionary concept of everything getting better and better all by itself? (SSShhh don't talk about that.) (It has also never been seen that a new star evolved into existence.)

They could even contradict themselves and say that there are planets and solar systems being formed right now without the big bang. Just like how they changed their teaching that man evolved from apes. The whole reason why they insisted that the "big bang" must have happened is that there are no new planets or new solar systems being formed.

They teach that everything they say is an indisputable fact that is undeniably true. And, many people are falling for it, all the time. They might even have pictures from giant telescopes of new planets evolving all by themselves. Really? I say that those people already have a reputation of lying, and those pictures can easily be falsified. Every year in the movie business, they give out awards for the best "visual effects", which is nothing more than expert falsification of modern photography. They can make things look real in movies that are not real at all.

The only evidence they have that a large explosion happened is the obvious conclusion that there must have been a starting point. Apart from the unmistakable necessity of a starting point there is no other evidence of a giant

explosion ever happening; it is an assumed “theory” with no evidence. They “assumed” there was a large explosion simply because they reject the existence of the creator, God..... and there is obviously no other explanation for that starting point apart from their assumed “big bang”. The existence of a starting point does not rule out that it was caused by a creator. Anyhow, large explosions don't cause order, they cause disorder, just like throwing a grenade into your house.

A large explosion would cause all of the matter involved to move away from the origin of that explosion at high speed with nothing to stop that movement. In space there is no air to slow things down. (Which is why the earth can rotate around the sun for thousands of years at exactly the same speed with nothing to slow it down. If it did slow down, even a little, the sun's gravity would pull it in. The earth would have fallen into the sun many years ago.)

If there was a “big bang”, everything would continually be moving away from the origin of the explosion in different directions, at high speed. This would cause a continual change in the position of all the stars, as seen from the earth. By now, all the stars would have gotten so far away that they would no longer be visible from the earth. (Especially if the explosion happened billions of years ago, as they say it did. Their stated age of the universe is assumed, with no evidence.) (This is yet, more grounds that the old age theory is a bunch of hokum. God created everything approximately 6,000 years ago, not billions of years ago.)

All the stars in the universe have been in the same position for a long time now. Thousands of years ago people saw the constellations in the same formations that they are seen today. For example: the pyramids in Egypt and Mexico (in Teotihuacan) were all positioned according to the constellation Orion, which is seen today exactly the same as when those pyramids were built. (In Teotihuacan there are also other structures that mark exactly the position/distance of all the planets in our own solar system.)

The first question is: how did the people in those days get such perfect information as to the exact positioning of the stars and movement/distances of the planets? It's one thing that primitive man could recognize planets moving across the sky at night, it's quite different that they knew the exact distances of those planets. And then the second question is: how is it that those facts have not changed in such a long time? None of the stars have changed their positions.

The Hopi Indians in Arizona, USA, many years ago built villages, with perfect measurements/distances, in accordance to the constellation Orion. (Which has not changed since then.) (Orion, Orion, Orion, Orion, Orion..... why Orion? That's where the extraterrestrial space visitors came from, who taught them to build the pyramids. And, they taught them astronomy more advanced than our modern technology is capable of.) (See my article listed below on: Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels) The phrase “see article” means to “read that article”.

When people have questions, those questions have been answered in the designated article.

Our solar system is **not** moving through the universe at high speed, nor is the universe expanding..... But, the evolutionists say it's expanding. If the universe was expanding, all of the stars would be continuously changing position. If the big bang is true, then it must be expanding. Not just expanding a little..... expanding a lot. But, it isn't. The stars have **NOT** been moving for a long time. And obviously, there was no "big bang".

A university science professor teaching evolution as being "fact" instead of "theory" is kind of like an American history professor teaching his students that Richard Nixon (tricky Dickey) was the first president of the United States; he can't do it without lying. Sooner or later every evolutionary scientist is faced with the fact that the "theory" of evolution is a lie..... and they have to make a conscious choice to accept and support that lie anyway. They know perfectly well why they throw so much rejected evidence into the trash. And, they know very well why they have to avoid selecting any specific intermediate form fossil as the official ancestor of the human race.

And, they know how to falsify any fossil they want to be millions of years old. They have to avoid using carbon dating. They already know that carbon dating never gives millions of years. And they know that if they used carbon dating they would get a young age for **ALL** of those fossils. They already know that they have to avoid using carbon dating, especially on those "index fossils". Of course, it is possible that they hate God so much that they really do believe their own lies, which is a type of mental illness.

After all, if they deny the existence of God, then where did we come from? They **must** have some kind of explanation that excludes God. Therefore, they came up with their "theory" of evolution, which sounds like it was invented by someone mentally unstable who dishonestly ignores and rejects the majority of the evidence which does not support their "theory". Take a look through their dumpsters at how much contradictory evidence they have thrown out.

Don't forget, they also create false cases of evolution by using the word "evolution" incorrectly. They are always throwing the word "evolution" around and applying it to things that were "created". They use cases of things that were "created" or "developed" by human creators and say it evolved (by itself), like how the computer supposedly "evolved" all by itself. Since they always have a shortage of real evidence they are forced to invent false evidence or twist words or circumstances in order to get some kind of evidence for their false theory. They are experts at lying. Even if robots use AI to develop improvements on new ro-

bots, that's still **not** evolution. Those robots "create" those improvements. They don't "evolve" all by themselves. And AI is always directed by real people.

The people who are at the foundation of teaching evolution always know they are lying. Most people just accept evolution because they trust those people. In the case of those evolutionary experts, they cannot excel in that field without knowing that they're lying. There is no room for honest mistakes, like how the gullible masses believe their lies.

And, why shouldn't people believe them? After all, they are all highly educated people with diplomas from important universities. Well, their diplomas belong in the same dumpster where they threw out all the scientific evidence which disproved evolution.

And, with the help of Photoshop or even MS Paint, anyone can make a diploma that looks even better than theirs. So, their diplomas count for nothing to me. I don't have one of their diplomas, and I don't want one. God will give everyone special wisdom if they reject those diplomas. This is the kind of wisdom those university people will never have.

We need someone to carbon-date those "index fossils". Those "index fossils" are the foundation of the supposed old-age of all of the species that they claim to have lived a long time before the Bible's creation of the earth. This will absolutely disprove evolution. The evolutionary scientists may claim that carbon-dating doesn't work on the oldest fossils. That's because they claim those fossils are beyond 50,000 years old, which is false. Those fossils are younger than 50,000 years old. So, they can give no acceptable reason for that claim. The truth is that their assumed old-age earth is false. The young-age earth is true. The Bible age is true.

(There are web pages about how science supports creation **much** more than evolution. Examples: The Institute for Creation Research at: www.icr.org, The Creation Research Society at: www.creationresearch.org/, Ken Ham at: <https://creation.com/ken-ham>.) (These pages also have lists of recommended books/stuff.) (Also, see 2017 documentaries called: "Is Genesis History?" And: "Genesis Paradise Lost".) And <https://creationmuseum.org>.

(www.youtube.com has many videos on creation vs evolution debates, such as: "Bill Nye vs. Ken Ham debate", "Bill Nye Tours the Ark Encounter with Ken Ham", "The Quest for Noah's Ark" **and** "In Search of Noah's Ark 1976".) <https://answersingenesis.org/>

It should also be pointed out that whenever atheism reigns, purpose in life is always at a minimum. And then, cases of suicide go up. God alone provides purpose to life; especially life after death. If evolution is true, then there is no hope for life after death. **James 4:14** “Whereas ye (y’all) know not what *shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away.*” (See article listed below on: Salvation.)

Recommended **free** Bible software:
www.e-sword.net or www.theword.net

Also **free** Bible audio recordings at:
www.audiotreasure.com

e-mail: pastor_david@tutamail.com

OTHER ARTICLES at
www.pastordavidministries.com

The Messiah for the Jews

The Trinity

The Holy Scriptures

The Lie of Evolution

What About Deborah

Fatherhood

The Role Of Women Throughout History

The Consequences of Using Incorrect Terminology

Domestic Discipline

The Lukewarm Church

Correct Divorce

Baptism

The Consequences of “Women's Liberation”

The New World Order was Prophesied in the Bible

Self-Love and Self-Esteem

Angels are Aliens, Aliens are Angels

Wolves In Sheep's Clothing

Slavery

The Virtues of the Spirit

The Babylonian and Egyptian Captivity

The Suffering Of The Great Depression

Salvation

Marriage Misunderstandings Explained
