

# Science Is Not God, so Why Do so Many People Keep Trying to Turn It Into a Religion?

This article is likely to get a lot of people out there quite angry. In our world today, many have become convinced that science has all of the answers to humanity's most important questions, and those that question the high priests of this new religion (scientists) are often accused of a form of "blasphemy."

We saw this clearly on display last Saturday when protesters gathered in Washington D.C. and in about 600 other cities worldwide for "the March for Science." Those of us who are skeptical and that don't necessarily buy into the scientific orthodoxy of the day were accused of "ignoring facts" and being "climate deniers" by various speakers at these protests. But of course, the truth is that scientific theories have always been in flux all throughout history, and this will continue to be the case as time moves forward.

But in recent years, many in the scientific community have elevated "theory" to the same level as "fact," and those that dare to question the most cherished theories of the scientific priesthood are often persecuted greatly.

I have studied the scientific evidence that both sides have produced, and I have become entirely convinced that climate change is not primarily caused by human activity. Does that make me a "heretic" according to these science zealots?

According to some of the more radical adherents of "scientism," it should actually be a crime to deny that man-made climate change is happening, and those who do so should be put into prison.

But as a lawyer, I was trained to be skeptical and to consider the evidence on both sides. And to me, the evidence seems quite clear that solar activity and other factors have much more to do with our changing climate than human activity does.

Does thinking for myself make me “evil”?

It amazes me that so many “scientific minds” are now labeling carbon dioxide as a pollutant.

Do you know what would happen if we got rid of all carbon dioxide on the entire planet?

Every single plant would die, and all life on Earth would cease to exist shortly thereafter.

So please don’t try to tell me that carbon dioxide is a pollutant.

In fact, there were times in the history of our planet when levels of carbon dioxide were far, far higher than they are today, and the world obviously did not end.

The climate of this planet has always been changing, and it always will be changing, and there is next to nothing that humanity can do to stop this process.

If that statement offends you, that is OK, because the free exchange of ideas is healthy for scientific debate.

That is one reason I am so alarmed by the rhetoric coming from some of these scientific zealots that seem to be absolutely determined to silence everyone that disagrees with them.

One of the “high priests” of this new religion is “Bill Nye the Science Guy”. He only has a B.S. in mechanical engineering, and he is best known for hosting a ridiculous kid’s show in the 90s, but today he is treated as a rock star by those that have embraced “scientism.”

Just because you have been on television a lot does not make you an “expert” on anything.

One of the things that Bill Nye is best known for is his ardent defense of the theory of evolution.

Personally, I don’t understand how anyone can possibly believe that men came from monkeys, but unfortunately there are millions of people out there who have been brainwashed into believing such nonsense.

To end this article, I would like to share with you a list of 44 reasons why the theory of evolution is not true that I included in a previous article. If you just use a little common sense, it is easy to see that what Bill Nye and others are telling you simply cannot be the truth.

1, If the theory of evolution were true, we should have discovered millions upon millions of transitional fossils that show the development of one species into another species. Instead, we have zero.

2. When Charles Darwin came up with his theory, he admitted that no transitional forms had been found at that time, but he believed that huge numbers certainly existed and would eventually be discovered.

3. Even some of the most famous evolutionists in the world acknowledge the complete absence of transitional fossils in the fossil record. For example, Dr. Colin Patterson, former senior paleontologist of the British Museum of Natural History and author of “*Evolution*” once wrote the following:

*“I fully agree with your comments about the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them .... I will lay it on the line— there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument.”*

4. Stephen Jay Gould, professor of geology and paleontology at Harvard University, once wrote the following about the lack of transitional forms...

*"The absence of fossil evidence for intermediary stages between major transitions in organic design, indeed our inability, even in our imagination, to construct functional intermediates in many cases, has been a persistent and nagging problem for gradualistic accounts of evolution."*

5. Evolutionist Stephen M. Stanley of Johns Hopkins University has also commented on the stunning lack of transitional forms in the fossil record..

*"In fact, the fossil record does not convincingly document a single transition from one species to another."*

6. If evolution were happening right now, there would be millions of creatures out there with partially developed features and organs. But instead there are none.

7. If the theory of evolution were true, we should not see a sudden explosion of fully formed complex life in the fossil record. Instead, that is precisely what we find.

8. Paleontologist Mark Czarnecki, an evolutionist, once commented on the fact that complex life appears very suddenly in the fossil record:

*"A major problem in proving the theory has been the fossil record; the imprints of vanished species preserved in the earth's geological formations. This record has never revealed traces of Darwin's hypothetical intermediate variants—instead, species appear and disappear abruptly, and this anomaly has fueled the creationist argument that each species was created by God."*

9. The sudden appearance of complex life in the fossil record is so undeniable that even Richard Dawkins has been forced to admit it:

*It is as though they [fossils] were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists. Both schools of thought (Punctuationalists and Gradualists) despise so-called scientific creationists equally, and both agree that the major gaps are real, that they are true imperfections in the fossil record. The only alternative explanation of the sudden appearance of so many complex animal types in the Cambrian era is divine creation, and both reject this alternative.*

10. Nobody has ever observed macroevolution take place in the laboratory or in nature. In other words, nobody has ever observed one kind of creature turn into another kind of creature. The entire theory of evolution is based on blind faith.

11. Evolutionist Jeffrey Schwartz, a professor of anthropology at the University of Pittsburgh, openly admits that “the formation of a new species, by any mechanism, has never been observed.”

12 Even evolutionist Stephen J. Gould of Harvard University has admitted that the record shows that species do not change. The following is how he put it during a lecture at Hobart & William Smith College...

*“Every paleontologist knows that most species don’t change. That’s bothersome. ... brings terrible distress. ... They may get a little bigger or bumpier but they remain the same species, and that’s not due to imperfection and gaps, but stasis. And yet this remarkable stasis has generally been ignored as no data. If they don’t change, it’s not evolution, so you don’t talk about it.”*

13. Anyone who believes that the theory of evolution has “scientific origins” is fooling themselves. It is actually a deeply pagan religious philosophy that can be traced back for thousands of years.

14. Anything we dig up that is supposedly more than 250,000 years old should have absolutely no detectable radiocarbon in it whatsoever. But instead, we find it in everything we dig up—even dinosaur bones. This is clear evidence that the “millions of years” theory is simply a bunch of nonsense:

*It's long been known that radiocarbon (which should disappear in only a few tens of thousands of years at the most) keeps popping up reliably in samples (like coal, oil, gas, etc.) which are supposed to be 'millions of years' old. For instance, CMI has over the years commissioned and funded the radiocarbon testing of a number of wood samples from 'old' sites (e.g. with Jurassic fossils, inside Triassic sandstone, burnt by Tertiary basalt) and these were published (by then staff geologist Dr. Andrew Snelling) in Creation magazine and Journal of Creation. In each case, with contamination eliminated, the result has been in the thousands of years, i.e. C-14 was present when it 'shouldn't have been'. These results encouraged the rest of the RATE team to investigate C-14 further, building on the literature reviews of creationist M.D. Dr. Paul Giam.*

*In another very important paper presented at this year's ICC, scientists from the RATE group summarized the pertinent facts and presented further experimental data. The bottom line is that virtually all biological specimens, no matter how 'old' they are supposed to be, show measurable C-14 levels. This effectively limits the age of all buried biota to less than (at most) 250,000 years.*

15. The odds of even a single sell “assembling itself” by chance are so low that they aren't even worth talking about.

You can read Jonathan Gray's book entitled *The Forbidden Secret* for more information.

16. How did life learn to reproduce itself? This is a question that evolutionists do not have an answer for.

17. In 2007, fishermen caught a very rare creature known as a Coelacanth. Evolutionists originally told us that this "living fossil" had gone extinct 70 million years ago. It turns out that they were only off by 70 million years.

18. According to evolutionists, the Ancient Greenling Damsel fly last showed up in the fossil record about 300 million years ago. But it still exists today. So why hasn't it evolved at all over that time frame?

19. Darwinists believe that the human brain developed without the assistance of any designer. This is so laughable it is amazing that there are any people out there who still believe this stuff. The truth is that the human brain is amazingly complex. The following is how a PBS documentary described the complexity of the human brain: "It contains over 100 billion cells, each with over 50,000 neuron connections to other brain cells."

20. The following is how one evolutionist pessimistically assessed the lack of evidence for the evolution of humanity:

*"Even with DNA sequence data, we have no direct access to the processes of evolution, so objective reconstruction of the vanished past can be achieved only by creative imagination."*

21. Perhaps the most famous fossil in the history of the theory of evolution, "Piltdown Man", turned out to be a giant hoax.

22. If the neutron were not about times the mass of the proton, all protons would have decayed into neutrons or all neutrons would have decayed into protons, and therefore life

would not be possible. How can we account for this?

23. If gravity were stronger or weaker by the slimmest of margins, then life-sustaining stars like the sun could not exist. This would also make life impossible. How can we account for this?

24. Why did evolutionist Dr. Lyall Watson make the following statement?:

*"The fossils that decorate our family tree are so scarce that there are still more scientists than specimens. The remarkable fact is that all of the physical evidence we have for human evolution can still be placed, with room to spare, inside a single coffin!"*

25. Apes and humans are very different genetically. As explains, "the human Y chromosome has twice as many genes as the chimpanzee Y chromosome, and the chromosome structures are not at all similar."

26. How can we explain the creation of new information that is required for one animal to turn into another animal? No evolutionary process has ever been shown to be able to create new biological information. One scientist described the incredible amount of new information that would be required to transform microbes into men this way.

27. Evolutionists would have us believe that there are nice, neat fossil layers with older fossils being found in the deepest layers and newer fossils being found in the newest layers. This simply is not true.

28. Evolutionists believe the ancestors of birds developed hollow bones over thousands of generations so that they would eventually be light enough to fly. This makes absolutely no sense and is beyond ridiculous.

29. If dinosaurs really are tens of millions of years old, why

have scientists found dinosaur bones with soft tissue still in them? Just read this *NBC News* report about one of these discoveries.

30. Which evolved first: blood, the heart or the blood vessels for the blood to travel through?

31. Which evolved first: the mouth, the stomach, the digestive fluids., or the ability to poop?

32. Which evolved first: the windpipe, the lungs or the ability of the body to use oxygen?

3.3 Which evolved first: the bones, ligaments, tendons, blood supply or the muscles to move the bones?

34 In order for blood to clot, more than 20 complex steps need to successfully be completed. How in the world did that process possibly evolve?

35. DNA is so incredibly complex that it is absolutely absurd to suggest that such a language system could have “evolved” all by itself by accident.

36. Can you solve the following riddle by Perry Marshall?...

*1. DNA is not merely a molecule with a pattern; it is a code, a language and an information storage mechanism.*

*2. All codes are created by a conscious mind; there is no natural process known to science that creates coded information.*

*3. Therefore DNA was designed by a mind.*

*If you can provide an empirical example of a code or language that occurs naturally, you’ve toppled my proof. All you need is one.*

37. Evolutionists simply cannot explain why our planet is so

perfectly suited to support life.

38. Shells from living snails have been “carbon dated” to be 27,000 years old.

39. If humans have been around for so long, where are all of the bones and all of the graves? Just check out this excerpt from an article by Don Batten.

40. Evolutionists claim that just because it looks like we were designed that does not mean that we actually were. They often speak of the “illusion of design,” but that is kind of like saying that it is an “illusion” that a 747 airplane or an Apple iPhone were designed. And of course, the human body is far more complex than a 747 or an iPhone.

41. If you want to be part of the “scientific community” today, you must accept the theory of evolution no matter how absurd it may seem to you. Richard Lewontin of Harvard once made the following comment regarding this harsh reality:

*We take the side of science in spite of the patent absurdity of some of its constructs, ... in spite of the tolerance of the scientific community for unsubstantiated commitment to materialism. ... we are forced by our a priori adherence to material causes to create an apparatus of investigation and set of concepts that produce material explanations, no matter how counterintuitive, no matter how mystifying to the uninitiated. Moreover, that materialism is absolute, for we cannot allow a Divine Foot in the door.*

42. Time magazine once made the following statement about the lack of evidence for the theory of evolution...

*“Yet despite more than a century of digging, the fossil record remains maddeningly sparse. With so few clues, even a single bone that doesn’t fit into the picture can upset everything. Virtually every major discovery has put deep*

*cracks in the conventional wisdom and forced scientists to concoct new theories, amid furious debate."*

43. Malcolm Muggeridge, the world-famous journalist and philosopher, once made the following statement about the absurdity of the theory of evolution:

*"I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it's been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books of the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious a hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has."*

44 In order to believe the theory of evolution, you must have enough blind faith to believe that life just popped into existence from non-life, and that such life just happened to have the ability to take in the nourishment it needed, to expel waste and to reproduce itself, all the while having everything it needed to survive in the environment in which it suddenly found itself. Do you have that much blind faith?

So what do you believe about the origin of life? {eoa}