

THE CRAZY THEORIES OF EVOLUTION



Silvio Famularo

This highly entertaining book exposes the theories of evolution for what they are: 'far-fetched fantasies'.

The
CRAZY
Theories
of Evolution

by Silvio Famularo



Strategic Book Group

Copyright © 2011

All rights reserved – Silvio Famularo

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, or by any information storage retrieval system, without the permission, in writing, from the publisher.

Strategic Book Group

P. O. Box 333

Durham, CT 06422

www.StrategicBookClub.com

ISBN: 978-1-61204-742-3

This book analyses and comprehensively challenges the many theories of evolution stage by stage. It is written purely from a layman's point of view. My background is not in science or any other academic field, but in small business and entertainment, both on stage and on television. I invite readers to do their own thinking on the subject and to draw their own conclusions after considering the evidence for and against evolution. I believe that most people have never really given much serious thought to the vital question of whether we were created or whether we evolved from lower forms of life, but have accepted that we did evolve simply because that is what they have been taught to believe.

This book emphasises that the theories are still nothing more than theories, and points out that every single stage of supposed evolution is an imagined one where the suggested supportive evidence has not been substantiated.

Although the style of writing is very informal and at times chatty, I have felt the need to cram in a lot of what I believe to be interesting and thought provoking facts that I have gleaned from the extensive number of books I have read, both for and against the theories of evolution.

Index

Introduction.
Darwinism.
Why We Should Be Mute About Mutations.
Adaptations.
The Ape Men.
Where Have All The People Gone?
Noah's Flood.
Flood Legends.
Noah's Ark.
Fossiling For Evidence.
Carbon Dating.
Thermodynamics.
The Horse Tree of Evolution.
Vestigial Organs.
Embryology.
The Mental Link.
Theistic Evolution.
Conclusion.

Introduction

It's high time that people stopped fostering the utterly nonsensical theory that human beings evolved from lower forms of life. Not just because every one of the many theories is based on nothing more than sheer fantasy, but because of all the negative consequences that follow when people are considered to be only a stage away from being animals. It is vitally important that we know the truth of our origins because it affects not only our understanding of the meaning of our own lives but also how we view the lives of others and the world in general.

At all levels of education, and particularly at universities, a considerable amount of money is spent and an enormous amount of time is wasted attempting to prove that a lot of "wacky" theories are, indeed, facts. There is hardly a significant museum anywhere in the world that does not place a lot of importance, space, time and money into perpetuating the myth that humans evolved from so-called ape-men. Yet, as we shall see, the truth is that ape-men never existed.

Every university seems to uphold the false belief that the theory of evolution is a proven fact. But the very proclamation is a curious one. If it is a fact, why is it still called a theory? More appropriately, why is it called just "The Theory" when there are masses of theories, all of which are not only unproven, but also completely illogical? As we ponder on these theories it will soon become overtly apparent that every single one of them is a figment of the imagination.

Some time ago I read in a newspaper that one of the world's foremost evolutionists, Stephen Hawking, a man hailed as the rightful successor to Newton and Einstein, put forth the theory that the whole universe may have evolved from a substance as small as a pea. Now, I'm not averse to anyone wondering whether the Universe with its hundreds of billions of galaxies in perpetual motion evolved from a substance as small as a pea, provided that they concluded that the only possible answer is, "No. It couldn't have." But when the worldwide media network proposes that such a theory be given serious consideration, it only goes to prove that if one does not want to believe that there is a God who created the heavens and the earth, one is prepared to believe anything.

One of the main purposes of this book is to get people to do their own thinking and rely on their own conclusions. Fortunately there is no law that prohibits us from doing that. Unfortunately, it would seem that few people who have accepted these theories have bothered to think them through for themselves; otherwise they wouldn't be sucked in to believing them. I would like the reader to proceed from here with a completely open mind that is ready to do some fresh thinking. If you are at a stage where you believe that the theories of evolution are correct, I will venture to make an assertion that you didn't come to this conclusion from the workings of your own mind, but simply by believing what you have read or what others have told you. I also hope that your end conclusion will not be swayed by what I personally think, but by what you yourself think after pondering over some crucial facts that I will have brought to your notice and which you might not have considered before.

Let's commence by thinking about the "Big Bang Theory". This theory that postulates that the whole world started with a big bang now seems to be universally accepted. People are able to say that they believe this, and even propagate the idea without expecting to be ridiculed. But whether the acknowledgment is warranted is another thing. Let me remind readers that bangs never start anything; they always follow something. Perhaps it would be more appropriate to assume that it all started with a big explosion. But we have a massive problem here before we even get started. To have an explosion, you have to have two things; something to explode and something to cause the explosion. Is that not true? So it couldn't have all started with an explosion. Can an explosion be caused by nothing at all? Aren't explosions caused by gases or other substances expanding? What caused nothing to expand? Glossing over these matters in the hope that one day there will be an answer will not solve the problem. There is no answer because it is plainly obvious that it couldn't happen.

Let us for a moment pretend that something was already in existence to explode. My next question is, "Can any reader point to anything of the slightest practical use that was ever produced by an explosion?" Move things? Yes! But produce or improve things, never! Could an explosion in a printing factory produce a sentence? Not likely. So does it seem feasible to you that an explosion could produce the most perplexingly complex creation in the whole Cosmos - the Universe itself? I know that explosions can set things in motion, but I've never heard of an explosion putting anything in perpetual motion. Have

you? The atomic bombs dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki during *World War Two* were powerful and created very big bangs. But was anything created apart from exceptional chaos? Did any of the dust and debris that went up with the smoke not come back down again? When we know that explosions, whether massive or slight, cannot produce any kind of order, cannot shape anything into something better, or produce anything of any practical use, why is it that this crazy "Big Bang Theory" continues to be promoted?

Having written what I have, above, please don't get me wrong, I am not insisting that there wasn't a loud noise when God created the universe and put all the stars, planets and moons in the galaxies in perpetual motion. There may well have been one. But if there were one, it wouldn't have been the sort of noise that derives from explosions, which are always destructive.

The next theory we should look at is the one that suggests that all life arose from a single living cell. Such a theory is so easy to say, and hardly more difficult to write. But to substantiate it is a different matter. What we are expected to believe is that all living things arose by natural processes by chance from this single original cell which, if evolution is the rule, could only have come into creation from an inanimate lifeless world. This is all supposed to have taken place many billions of years ago, but no one can pinpoint exactly when the process started. This extraordinary supposition generally avoids the mention of the insurmountable obstacles that would have to be overcome for this to take place, even today, when we have such extremely advanced technology at our disposal.

To make this incredibly far-fetched theory easier to swallow, this original cell has been classified as "The Simple Living Cell". Before we proceed further, let us get something clear. There is nothing simple about a living cell. Only a simpleton could come to that conclusion. It would be more appropriate to call it "The Incredibly Complex Living Cell". The structure of each single one of them is said to be more complex than the world's largest city. The more the cell is studied, the more complex it is found to be. Scientists have said that its physical-chemical organisation is beyond their capacity to grasp. There is not a laboratory in the world that can compete with its chemical activity. The neuron, or nerve cell, is said to be more complicated than the most complex computers. Now, most people would unmercifully ridicule anybody who presumed that a pocket calculator could have possibly come into existence by accident. So does it not seem astounding that anyone could believe that the original cell, a microscopic unit having all its component parts contained in a membrane, and having the ability to reproduce itself, could have got there by a fluke of nature? For this is the only alternative to its coming into existence without God.

So far we have only touched on the complex structure of the cell. But this is not just a physical cell; it is a "living" cell. How did it get life? It requires no mental strain to work out that life only comes from life. Not only can life not come about by accident from an inanimate object, but life also cannot be put back into a perfectly formed dead body that has become lifeless. Not even in this day and age with the incredible amount of accumulated knowledge and technology we have available. Bill Gates, one of the world's richest men, has a fortune once estimated to be approaching a hundred billion American dollars. Suppose he wrote in his will that when he died, the money he left behind was to be used to bring him back to life. You and I know that it wouldn't matter how many billions of dollars were spent, or how many doctors and scientists were employed, and no matter how long they took trying to make it happen, it just wouldn't eventuate. Not even with every single organ in his body undamaged. All the king's horses and all the king's men would have more likelihood of putting Humpty Dumpty together again, yolk and all. This gives us some idea of the improbability of life coming about by chance.

Then there is a theory that initial life came about by electrical discharges. Well, I suppose if we want to exclude God from the system, we have got to try to imagine how else life could have come about. But, that one should postulate that it might have come about as the result of an electrical discharge indicates just how desperate some evolutionists are for facts. When one is charged by electricity, one gets an electric shock, not more life. The greater the charge, the greater the shock, and the weaker the recipient of the charge, the more it will be harmed. As with the "Big Bang Theory", some people keep trying to explain that a disruptive force developed life. The reality is that never ever before was there ever more electricity generated and used than there is in this day and age; most people employ it in some way or other when they cook, when they work, when they read, when they wash, when they drive, when they are being entertained, when they cleanse, dry and press their clothes, etc. Did you ever hear of the breath of life being injected into anything as a result of all this electrical activity? The indisputable fact is that life can only come from life. It can't be produced by power, by might, by technology or by accident. God only can bestow it.

At this point the argument for the evolution theory should be over and finished for good. If the process couldn't possibly commence, how could it progress?

Overlooking the fact that the living cell couldn't in a billion, billion years have come about by accident, and the fact that one couldn't have survived for a minute, if it ever did, without the provisions for sustenance it would have needed, we are now confronted with an even bigger hurdle: how could it have learned how to reproduce itself? Living single cell organisms don't mate. They are asexual. They reproduce by a method called binary fission. Once they grow to capacity, which is usually smaller in size than a thousandth of an inch, they split into equal parts. They develop into smaller models of themselves. I would say that the chances of these developments coming about by a fluke must be about equal to the possibility that an explosion in a printing house could produce a dictionary that gave birth to another dictionary.

If what promoters of the evolutionary theory would have us believe is true, it would seem that unlike the sterile, lifeless dictionary, the living cells, with no intelligent power to guide them, hung around for a few million years continually reproducing themselves. Then after originally having acquired, by a complete fluke of nature, an inbuilt code that guided their reproduction process, they would have had to have implanted the same code into their offspring so that successive generations could do exactly the same thing. Then, keeping in harmony with the reasoning of the upholders of the overall theory, a phenomenal new stage must have taken place that by contrast made the previous ones seem not so extraordinary; the single cell organisms must suddenly have evolved into creatures comprising over twenty cells. Should this impossible outcome have ever eventuated, it could only have happened suddenly, because although there are a great many single cell forms of life, there are no forms of life with two, three, four, or even twenty cells. If organic evolution is the rule, these forms of life should exist in great abundance; but none do. If they do, where are they? The world still abounds with single cell organisms. Why aren't some evolving towards two, three and four cell organisms? It's not just a case of a link being missing; there are a great many chains of links that have never materialised.

So here we are. What we need to do is: multiply the fact that there is no chance of an original living cell coming into being by accident by the fact that there would be no possible chance of it being able to survive if it did. Next, multiply this by the fact that there is no possible way that it could accidentally reproduce itself, or do so by its own efforts. Now multiply this by the fact that the regeneration code couldn't possibly be programmed into the seed of the offspring just by chance. Finally, multiply this by the sheer impossibility that a single cell organism could suddenly have acquired, by a fluke of nature, the coded information needed to develop from a single cell organism to a vast range of organisms comprised of over twenty cells and then embed that code into its offspring for regeneration. You will now have arrived at the precise amount of chances that creatures could have evolved from nothing at all into the incredibly vast range of ones that have now acquired perfectly developed shells, fins, feathers, eyes, brains, and hearts, totally by quirks of nature.

If there were no God, the above would have to be the only possible explanation for how all these creatures, including the reader and myself, have come into being.

Is it not also astounding that if the Theory of Evolution is indeed the "Fact" of Evolution, that creatures never developed any useless uncomplicated organs, but only highly complex ones? Evolutionists will, I'm sure, agree, because before the functions of some human organs such as the appendix and the tonsils were known, they were considered by evolutionists to be vestigial organs; meaning that they were inherited from our previous lower life ancestors, but were of no practical use to us in our evolved state. Consistent with the theory, we have to believe that all of these significantly complex organs must have sprouted instantly and in perfect condition, because although we still have incalculable billions of single cell organisms, many thousands of kinds of creatures and millions of various types of species, there has never been found one species that is growing a new kind of organ. Neither has there been found one organ that is non-functional; not even Charles Darwin found one. If one is prepared to believe this astounding theory, one would need to accept that the fish scale turned into a feather instantly, and the fin turned into a leg or a wing instantly, because no family of creatures, dead or alive, has been discovered with legs or wings partly developed. What confounds me is that with all the knowledge, resources and the incentives available to us, we humans cannot change the colour of one hair on our heads, stop one hair from going grey, or even grow a hair back on a bald head, where the conditions for growth are ideal. Yet, "hey presto", whole families of fishes supposedly grew feathers and wings at the same time. The fish that could thrive in salt water but couldn't survive in salt less water is believed to

have come out of the sea and survived on land simply by altering its complete respiratory system, which involved turning its gills into fully developed lungs!

As I write, I have to pause and shake my head. Do intelligent people actually believe these things? Yet, anybody who seriously believes the evolutionary theories has to believe them because there is no possible alternative. Does any reader think that eventually we humans will develop eyes in the back of our heads so that we will be able to drive more safely? Surely this improbability is no crazier than the ones we have been pondering over for the evolutionary process to eventuate. Just think, every year scores of millions of human babies are born, billions of farm animals are reared, tens of billions of eggs are hatched and several times as many fish are caught, all under human supervision. Whatever the total, the number could be multiplied at least thirty times over the last half century. Is it an unfair question to ask, "Why, out of all those hundreds of billions of creatures handled by human beings, have we not discovered one that is evolving?"

If evolution has never been observed, and reason makes it plain that it is not even vaguely possible, why do people persist in perpetuating this inane theory? If the study of the Theory of Evolution can be called a science, then it is the only science where all the evidence is based on changes that took place billions of years before anyone was around to witness them, or are taking place hundreds of millions of miles away in space where no one can venture for evidence to dispute them. This is the only science where every single stage and facet of development is a product of imagination.

Let us not be misled to believe that the study of evolutionary theories comes within the spheres of science. Science is the systematic study of the nature and behaviour of things through observance, experiment and measurement. Therefore, since the evolution of creatures and plants cannot be observed, cannot be tested by means of experiment and cannot be measured, evolutionary study belongs no more the field of science than it does to the fields of accountancy or law.

The allowance of billions of years for things to happen does not provide an opportunity for the impossible to become a possibility. Anything that is left alone does not become superior with age; the rule of nature is that it deteriorates.

Evolution doesn't just allow for a few unexplainable chance happenings. For a single cell to eventually give rise to a human being that can produce a seed that will grow into another human being in only nine months would require an incalculable amount of impossible chance happenings to occur. And this is only to produce a human being. What about all the other hundreds of thousands of species of both flora and fauna? Do you really think that the twenty-one day incubation process that can transform a lifeless egg into a living chicken is a consequence of chance happenings over billions of years? No sincere person can possibly deny that the deeper one thinks about the Theory of Evolution the more illogical it becomes.

If the thought that a single living cell organism gradually evolved through a series of chance happenings into a myriad of varieties of animal creatures is nonsense, the thought that plant life evolved in a similar manner is even more so. For instance, with no brain, no imagination, and nothing to guide it or advise it, how does an acorn know how to grow into an oak tree? If it is the consequence of chance happenings, how come it never grows by chance into anything else? How come the acorn never grows into a pine tree or an apple tree? They are able to absorb the same soil, the same water, the same carbon dioxide, and can flourish side by side in the same fields under the same climatic conditions.

We have already covered a range of reasons why we can be absolutely sure that it would be impossible for animal life to have evolved. To suggest that yet another complete set of almost identical, impossible chance happenings led to the multitudinous range of species of flora that exists, is stretching the imagination well beyond the practical purposes for which God gave it to us.

An action can only happen by chance if there is at least one chance that it won't happen; otherwise it is not a chance happening but a controlled one. Since there is no chance that a plum tree will produce any fruit other than plums, no chance that anything but a chicken will be hatched from a hen's egg, and no chance that the sun will rise at any second other than at the precise one it is pre-ordained to rise at each day, it is obvious that the rule of nature is that everything happens in the way it is designed to happen. Things are not designed to eventuate by chance. What's more, everything that is designed has to have a designer. No sane person would suggest that a painted picture of an animal, or any other being, resulted from a series of chance happenings. So by what logic can one explain the belief that an actual living animal evolved by chance?

Would the reader be foolish enough to bet that the sun won't rise on this date next year at precisely the same time as it did today? If you are, I'll be happy to accept your bets and you can name the odds you want. I'm not in favour of gambling, but in this case it wouldn't be a gamble because there would be no chance of me losing.

Something controls the Universe; that is indisputable. That something can only be the one we have never seen but know as God. If the only alternative to God is chance, haven't we just proved that there is no alternative?

I believe that it is time evolutionists gave in. The deeper we think about evolution, the greater the complexities we are confronted with and the deeper the mire we get stuck in.

Astoundingly, as it unquestionably is, there is only one alternative if we didn't get here by a series of accidents of nature. That alternative is that we are the offspring of a man and a woman who were created in a state of maturity by God.

Some believers say that the existence of God is not something that can be proved through experiment. They say that one can only accept His existence by faith. This may be so, but on the other hand, it is impossible to disprove that God exists while all the other alternatives are easily disproved. This to me is all the proof I need. As the apostle Paul wrote in his letter to the Romans, "*For since the creation of the world, God's invisible qualities, His eternal power and divine nature have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse*". (Romans 1: 20)

But who made God? The question is pointless. If there were an answer then we would be left with another question, "Who made whoever made God?" Then we would want to know who made whoever made whoever made God. Something must have come first. A fact that only a fool would dispute is that nothing created can understand its creator. A table cannot understand a furniture maker, a reflection in a mirror cannot understand what it reflects, Mickey Mouse could not understand Walt Disney and we cannot understand our creator.

The Fishy Theory

It amuses me that evolutionists glibly talk about how life supposedly started in the sea from whence fish turned into amphibians and then into air breathing reptiles. They also apparently seriously believe that dolphins and whales evolved from land inhabiting mammals, as we will read further on.

Have you ever considered what the odds against this sort of thing ever happening are? Let's do an exercise. Let us suppose that the average person eats one fish per month. There are at least six billion people in the world so we can assume that about seventy-two billion fish are caught every year. Multiply this annual catch, say, 25 times and we could presume that about one thousand, eight hundred billion fish have been caught, sold, cooked and eaten over the last twenty-five to thirty years. How many of these fish do you think lived out of the water longer than a few minutes after being caught, let alone started to evolve? If one survived out of water, don't you think the world would have heard about it? Suppose one did. What do you think the chances are that it would have survived long enough to develop lungs? If it did, what would be the chances that another similar species of fish, but of the opposite gender, also survived and developed lungs at exactly the same time? (Forget about all the other changes that would have to take place concurrently, such as developing a blood system, a mobility system, a new nourishment system, etc.) Next ask yourself what would be the likelihood that they both, by mere chance, happened to evolve in exactly the same location, as would be necessary to breed? Now compound this with the chances that they were so much at ease on land that they decided to mate and breed offspring. Now compound this with the chances that they were able to programme their offspring with the coded information on how to inherit all their newly acquired organs and do the same for the benefit of their offspring. Would you agree that it is a bit difficult believing that it could possibly have ever happened? If you don't agree, then congratulations; you are now an evolutionist.

If the evolutionary process wasn't terminated by the sheer impossibility of the so-called simple cell being developed by accident, or the even greater impossibility of it getting life by mere chance, then surely this highly far-fetched theory, at last, has to be ditched with the smelly dead fish. There is no logical sense in pursuing it further.

What I want to know is how are the fish supposed to have come out of the sea anyway? Did they volunteer? After all, there were no humans to take them out; we are told that humans didn't evolve till billions of years after the fish eventually evolved into animals of a lower form than humans. No birds could have plucked them out of the water either, because at that stage they also didn't exist. Birds, we are told, evolved from reptiles that evolved from amphibians. Maybe some fish were washed ashore, as some are from time to time. But surely any fish smart enough to turn into an amphibian would be able to work its way back to the sea! Why would they want to depart from the security of the territory in which they felt safe? Are the survival chances of an amphibian any better than that of a fish? Is being a frog a step up from being a flounder? If the fish, or amphibian, wasn't happy with what it was before it evolved into a land inhabiting creature, why didn't it tend to take the safer option of evolving into something else that could survive in the water?

When I was a child, one of my heroes was the film actor Johnny Weismuller, who starred in numerous Tarzan films. The story goes that when Johnny was a boy he had health problems. So his doctor advised his mother to encourage the boy to learn how to swim in order to make him stronger. Johnny didn't just learn to swim; he practically lived in the water, practicing for hours every day. He eventually went on to become the fastest swimmer in the world at that time, and broke several Olympic and world records. Now, after all those years of attempting to survive in the water and trying to reduce the need to take in air, how many indications do you think there were on his body that either gills or fish scales were developing? Have you ever heard of any one of the tens of thousands of competitive swimmers who train in the water for hours every day for years and years ever undergoing a skin change or starting to develop gills? Okay, it might appear to be a dopey question, but is the thought that fish could have turned their scales into fur after a number of attempts to survive out of water any less ridiculous? To alter the scaly covering of the fish to fur would require a great number of biological changes, not just exterior changes, but also internal ones.

We tend to take skin for granted. Superficially, it is just a thin layer of tissue that surrounds the body. But when we reflect on just a few of its functions we start to recognise what an incredibly complex

piece of engineering this magnificently designed tissue is. It is not just a covering; it prevents bacteria and chemicals from entering the body; it allows water, in the form of perspiration, to pass out through it, but doesn't allow it to penetrate from the outside in. It helps keep the internal temperatures of the body at normal levels, it contains many nerve endings that are sensitive to heat, cold, pain, pressure and touch, it is elastic and it allows hair to grow through it. But most extraordinarily; if it is damaged it heals itself. It can even be grafted from one part of the body to another with no noticeable signs of intervention. Like the fishes' scales and the animals' fur, God designed skin so that its texture cannot be permanently altered to perform other functions as a result of use, accident or intention.

In 1939, lungfish, once thought to be extinct, were found alive and well and living in very deep water off the coast of Africa. This fish is supposed to have shed some light on the evolution of vertebrates, including man. It can breathe air as well as water; it has gills like other fish, and also has an air bladder, which it uses as a lung. But if you think that this is the missing link between the fish and the amphibian, as proponents of the evolution theory like to point out, it might be wise to think again. The skeleton of the lungfish consists of cartilage. Therefore it can equally be presumed to be the missing link between the invertebrates (the jelly fish, the shellfish etc.) and the fish, whose skeleton consists of bones. Moreover, the lungfish is eel shaped.

The shark, by the way, is also cartilaginous. Yet shark fossils are usually found buried in rock strata higher in the geological column than fish. So now we have another contradiction to the theory, because we are taught that the pattern was to evolve from invertebrate to vertebrate. But the so-called "geologic column" would suggest that the pattern was to regress to the softer fabrication of cartilage. Another interesting point is that the lungfish hasn't changed during an assumed sixty million years.

Buy the B&N ePub version at:-

<http://www.barnesandnoble.com/w/the-crazy-theories-of-evolution-silvio-famularo/1104028304?ean=2940012799197>

Buy the Kindle version at:-

<http://www.amazon.com/The-Crazy-Theories-Evolution-ebook/dp/B0058DIFA6/ref>