

How to Disprove Evolution Using Science

http://www.ehow.com/how_5271222_disprove-evolution-using-science.html

[By braniac](#)

Evolution vs. creationism is a popular debate nowadays. The purpose of this article is to point out the fallacies in the theory of evolution using the principles that are meant to support it. I will not use scripture to disprove evolution because it is inviting to attacks from atheists and scientists. Instead I will use the scientific method to point out that believing in evolution is more akin to faith than fact.

Things You'll Need

- critical thought
- an understanding of the principles of evolution
- an understanding of the scientific method

Instructions

1. Use the scientific method. A key part of the scientific method is the finding of evidence that is observable and supports a hypothesis resulting in a theory's development. Here a problem arises in the theory of evolution. Natural selection and genetic variance are commonly used as the observable evidence of evolution. However, this body of evidence only proves that variance exists within a species. From here evolutionists take a major leap of faith to presume that over time a species will change into a different species due to environmental conditions that favor a certain trait or traits than others. No species has ever been observed changing into another one. Indeed environmental conditions may favor specific traits within in a species and a characteristic like color or size may well become dominant over time, but this in no way suggests that it will eventually transform into a separate species. It merely proves that different characteristics should exist within populations that are removed from other populations. Two members of different populations would still be perfectly capable of reproducing with one another no matter how long they have been separated. In fact, natural selection could be used to explain why genetic variance exists within populations that share dominant characteristics but in no way can it be supposed that it results in species transformation. Just look at the diversity within the human race. Small, tall, white, black, 1200cc brain capacity, 1400cc brain capacity- all perfectly able to reproduce with one another and all the same species. The oldest human populations on Earth are scientifically accepted as West African groups. These groups have dominant traits that all members share and are biologically similar in appearance and physical makeup yet among themselves the highest degree of genetic variance in the human race is found. They are not changing into a different species. They carry a genetic code that proves species evolution does not occur.
2. Use examples that are used to prove evolution to challenge it. A popular example evolutionists point to as evidence of for the theory is moths that changed color in England during the Industrial Revolution. The environmental condition of pollution enabled darker moths to become more dominant than lighter moths, as they attained an advantage over predators by becoming harder to see in the polluted environment. Well, what does that prove? Only that the

majority of moths in the area were darker than they were before. They would still be able to reproduce with the lighter moths if the opportunity arose. Evolutionists in fact have very little observances to base their theory on, and this example is still one of the most commonly used-despite the theory itself growing far more complex than such a simple observation as this. With the introduction of genetics into the theory of evolution, they should realize that varying characteristics do not mandate species evolution. Instead, genetics offer evidence for species flowing back and forth between varying traits that are at times more well-suited than others. A trait that has lost its favorability will, through reproduction within a species, once again become dominant if environmental conditions cooperate. This is why a high degree of genetic variability will exist in older and more isolated populations of species. Not because they evolved new characteristics but because they have been around for such a long period of time that they are merely using a trait that was already part of its genetic code. The older population would still be able to reproduce with all members of a species no matter how much time or distinctiveness of environments separates it from the other populations.

3. Use more recent examples. Another favorite piece of evidence used to prove evolution is mutation, which is, in most cases, contrary to the principles of evolution, as their effects are overwhelmingly detrimental to an organism. Commonly the AIDS virus is shown to support this basis in their thinking. People infected with the virus and treated with the anti-viral medications used to combat the infection have seen the disease become resistant to their treatments. This is due to the virus mutating-but it does not change into a new virus altogether. In fact, when a person has developed drug resistant AIDS, the most effective method is to stop taking medication, allowing the virus to change back into its original form because it has been shown that the original strain will gradually replace the mutated strain. Once it reverts back to its original state, the anti-viral drugs will be effective once again. This shows that the variance brought on by the mutation is the only factor contributing to its change, and that given the right environmental conditions, it will once again assume its original dominant characteristics, but will not change into a new virus completely. Bacterial diseases that are antibiotic-resistant work in a similar way. Their resistance derives from a variance that allows a bacterial population to be missing the ribosome an antibiotic attaches to. If the bacteria with the missing ribosome is introduced to a population of bacteria with the ribosome, very quickly will the ribosome-less bacteria be overrun and replaced by the normal bacteria. Their own evidence of mutation sometimes being beneficial is always applied to viruses and bacteria but they fail to recognize that these changes are only temporary variance within a isolated populations that will not result in complete biological change.
4. Use the fossil evidence. There are many factors within the fossil record that are highly suspect when it comes to using it as an example for evolution. Many of the explanations are purely hypothetical and at times contradictory. The problems with dating fossils has recently become so evident that old methods such as carbon dating are not heavily relied upon by anthropologists and paleontologists anymore. They themselves only feel sure about dates if a fossil is found in layers of certain geological tufts. This results in dating based on theories unrelated to evolution and opens itself to criticism. The best way to highlight the tremendous amount of faith evolutionists put into their ideas is relating the anthropological explanation for the fossil record of New World monkeys. They surmise that the only reason monkeys exist on the South American continent is that they are a result of a small population of Old World monkeys in Africa that sailed across the Atlantic ocean on a breakaway piece of land. They subsequently evolved into all the moneys in South America today. What? Evolutionists have to come up with a hypothesis like this because the dates that they ascribe to various fossils force them to. They assume dates are accurate enough to make further conclusions about a fossil.

Here they make a huge scientific mistake. The environmental conditions that allow a bone to fossilize require extremely rare circumstances that allow preservation. The process of the fossilization results in total change from organic matter to inorganic matter that has been so chemically transformed that extracting an accurate date is impossible.

5. Use mathematics. The theory of evolution is driven by so many chance occurrences that once they are totaled it becomes a mathematical impossibility. Think of it this way. Our universe was just formed by chance, on top of that chance luck stuck again with Earth's position from the sun, the luck kept rolling with the life spark of chemical reactions in the primordial ooze, luckier still is the chemical reaction never repeated itself so all living things have a common ancestor, and the best part of it all is that we are the supreme byproduct of these biological lotteries. Or maybe our faith should be placed in something greater than ourselves.

Read more : http://www.ehow.com/how_5271222_disprove-evolution-using-science.html