

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier  
Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

Imagine you tried a new diet designed for you to lose weight. You did everything the diet instructed you to do, but after two months you did not lose an ounce of weight. Would you continue with it? No.

Or, you bought a brand new car, claimed to be the fastest on four wheels. But, every time you drove it, it just phutt-phutted down the road at no more than 40 miles an hour. Would you get rid of it and complain? Of course you would.

What if your child went to school, and was taught his alphabet... but the teacher left out every other letter? Within just a month or two you realised something was wrong - he could not read, could not understand his books, or what the teacher was saying. Would you complain or get the child schooled somewhere else? I think so.

Maybe you join a very good firm and begin training for a profession. But, the top managers fail to come up with a proper scheme and you see many streak ahead academically and practically. Your training is a disaster, you cannot get a job elsewhere because of it. Bitter? I should think so.

You go to a university in the hope of expanding your intellect with genuine instruction and theoretical pearls of wisdom from your tutors and professors. But, halfway through the course, you realise that what they are teaching is bunkum. You cannot get off the course without penalty, and cannot pass your exams without repeating the same rubbish you are being taught. So, everyone passes if they toe the line set by very biased professors. Do you feel good about your intellectual prowess? I doubt it.

So, why are students taking in the fairy tale of evolution? Why are professors still teaching it? Why are biologists claiming evolution is the basis for their researches, when evolution is itself the playground of blind men? After all, *every* scientific endeavour can continue well enough without a single reference to Darwin or evolution! Try it!

The answer is very simple. As a Dr Enoch said forty years ago, the reason evolution features so strongly in academia, is that arrogant men refuse to accept the existence of a real God, so they

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier  
Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

begin with a false presupposition. They hate the idea of God and creation so much, they produce myths about evolution and its place in science, and against creation. Yet, there is no proof *for* evolution. Therefore, by definition, there can be no proof *against* creation! Yet, evolutionists persist in their folly, and

*force*

all students and researchers to accept the same beliefs! What does that say about the confidence of the teachers?

My son was being taught the rudiments of evolution by his teacher when he was just about 8 years old. He stood up and openly told the teacher, “*Your* mother and father might have been monkeys, but *mine* were human beings!” He could get away with it because of his age – but try that as a college student, and you will be thrown out.

Universities everywhere are no longer places of higher learning. They are just sink-holes where students are forced to believe whatever the college tells them to believe, from acceptance of homosexual lifestyles to their curriculum. It is just poured over them, a pre-mixed solution with no intellectual comebacks allowed. Students are expected to simply let the mess infuse their brains. This should not be! Students who continue their courses whilst being denied the opportunity to think freely are not genuinely educated. They are just clones who will repeat whatever they are taught by ignorant professors and tutors.

It is my view that men should think freely, even if what they think is erroneous, or even disliked by myself. What I *do* resent is people raised on prejudice and falsity, who then force others to comply. Let men’s ideas find their own level in the market place of thought! The apostle Paul walked into Athens and spoke freely of God. Some believed and many did not. That is real life. But, to silence dissident voices is not just repression, it is oppression of a fascist kind.

Today, Christians are crushed for no other reason than that they speak of God. Academics arrogantly strut before them and call them names (see New Scientist journal, which regularly does this, referring to Christian scientists as equal to ‘flat earthers’), or deny them access to top posts, or refuse to publish their findings. These are the actions of men who fear the truth, and who know they are wrong. It is not academic excellence, nor is it wise.

## What Science Has Said

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

New Scientist believes it is at the 'cutting edge' of science reporting. But, its beliefs are rooted in something very old: ancient Greek philosophy. But, not in the better sense. The ancient Greek thinkers wanted to give a rational account of the world, one that relied only on reason, a reason that spent all its time seeking truth, even if the results hurt their beliefs. The trouble is, modern scientists want this truth, but are not willing to pay the price. So, they deny truth. The ancient Greeks also exalted human nature, as is done today.

If modern scientists were driven to seek the truth, which they say they are, that would be no problem for Christians, because God is truth and sound science is also sound theology. That is, nothing in good science can go against scripture. The current fight put up by some scientists against Christian beliefs, as per Bible, is false. Getting rid of all Christian thought does not help science, but holds it back, because their presuppositions deny access to countless important facts and routes of research.

In essence, modern scientists hearken back to Anaximander, who thought land animals developed from fish, and said there was constant change. His ideas controlled and led whole societies. And this is why scientists today must face up to truth, for their beliefs lead society by the nose, allowing no dissent. The unification of all things proposed by science (evolution) is superficial and false. Everything is unified by evolution theory only because scientists say so, not because they have proved it, or because it is true! Indeed, many evidences run counter to what they say.

"... much philosophical thinking is rooted in beliefs which cannot be rationally demonstrated but which are accepted on faith... based on postulates which... cannot (be demonstrated), but (which can only be) preferred to alternative ones."

(John Lewis, Philosopher, 1962).

This is exactly what modern evolutionist scientists do. They prefer evolution to the alternatives. There is no other, and especially no scientific, reason, for them to prefer evolution, other than hatred of God and preference for an irrational liking for faith in Darwin. If they call Christians 'flat-earthers', we can certainly refer to them as intellectual 'flat-liners'!

There was an old Greek philosophy that said we can have different views of something, and yet

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

each is equal and true, even if some of them are false. In my own thinking I repeat this claim, but with an updated reasoning. That is, something can be both false and true at the same time... because of preferences and personal postulates. That is, what one group considers to be true, may, in fact, be false when compared to all other propositions.

A man or group of men considering a particular matter, can postulate that A is truth. Another man or group can postulate that B, the exact opposite, is truth. Now, only one of those postulates can be truth. All else is a lie. Therefore, in the absence of any other postulate, only A or B can be true, but not both. One is genuine and the other is a lie. Yet, even the false postulate can be true, but only within its own developed and expressed set of beliefs. All false religions are founded on this principle, because they do not test their postulates openly. But, only one of them is *really* true.

That is, A can be fully true, but *only* within the bounds of its own postulate. To put it simply, imagine a city with a wall. Inside the wall the city lives and dies happily, relying only on its own beliefs and actions. For example, one aspect of its life is that babies can be murdered without recrimination, and eaten as a delicacy. Those who live inside the walls of city A accept this behaviour and believe it to be good and moral. So, the behaviour is 'true' within the walls of A, because it is not challenged or tested against any other system.

Now, city B says that such behaviour is barbaric and evil, so the citizens do not accept the behaviour found in city A, saying its claims to morality are false. City B, then, has a different set of values and beliefs, and its system reflects it.

Now, if the postulates of city B are added to by the same beliefs in cities C, D, etc., we can say that the 'truth' in city A only remains the truth inside the city, but not outside it, because its beliefs are not universally acceptable. It only has an internal 'truth', which, when tested universally, cannot be sustained, and so appears to be false in the greater field of examination.

### **How Evolutionist Scientists Work, or, 'City A Closes Its Gates'**

This is how evolutionist scientists work. They claim their system of beliefs to be true, but, when tested against universal truth, it is not. So what do scientists do? They ride out from city A and violently overturn and crush all the other cities, who must either accept the imposed 'truth' or die. Then they ride back home and close the gates against all intrusion. In this way, evolutionist scientists crush Christian beliefs and Christian-led science, and shout abuse at them from the

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier  
Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

city walls! And if that does not work, they pour boiling oil over them.

To keep up this myth, the scientists of city A must continually disparage and stop Christian science from developing or being made known. So, laws are made to effect this, because they cannot destroy ideas and truth. It is the equivalent of environmentalists imposing their 'city A' mentality on the world, when their 'truth' is nothing but personal postulates of no value. Homosexuals have done the same thing, as have terrorists. What cannot be proved or maintained in truth, must be imposed by law, and refusal of truth and freedom to think.

You must ask yourself why scientists think it is necessary to *impose* evolution on the world and *stop* creation discussion. In any other historical setting this kind of activity is the mode used by fascism, which fears the existence of an alternative view and free-thinking. By doing this, scientists prove beyond doubt that their 'truth' is a lie, a sham kept going for personal reasons and not because it really is the truth! How do I know all this? Is this just *my* personal postulate? Or, is it universally true?

### **The Crack in the Walls of City A**

A city wall is only as strong as its weakest point. For City A, its weakest point is something every one of its citizens refuse to acknowledge. Why? Because it is the key to all the other cities getting in and destroying it! What is that key? It is the key to evolution itself – the 'mechanism of change'.

This is City A's crack in its wall. So far, the leaders of City A have legislated, so that no other city can come and take advantage of the crack. But, if the crack can be exploited, the wall will be broken down and *will* fall. Just as water in a stone crack will expand as ice and become a mighty wedge, breaking the stone apart, so the real truth will get into City A's defences and destroy it.

Once, many years ago, I challenged a well-known evolutionist scientist in London to carry out a literary argument against a well-known creationist scientist. The results would be published as a printed volume. Until that time (and since) there had been sporadic debates in theatres and lecture halls, or single-article diatribes, where time ran out, or the evolutionist mustered some nasty asides. My idea was simple: for me to start the ball rolling by making a single statement about evolution. Then, the evolutionist could answer the statement with any evidences he

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

thought he had. His answers would then be given to the creationist, for him to answer as fully as he could. His answers would then be passed on to the evolutionist, and so on, until both had used up every known argument. Simple? The best man would win.

But, what happened? Both scientists accepted the challenge. But, a few weeks later, the evolutionist wrote back and said he demanded a huge fee! Of course I could not pay such a fee, and told the man that the proposed book was 'not for profit'. I asked if he feared he would not win. Of course, he rejected such an idea with much pomposity. Finally, he withdrew, saying he "did not have enough time".

What actually happened – and I know because I was given insider information – was that a *very* well known evolutionist scientist had contacted the one I had asked to debate. The younger man was then persuaded to withdraw just in case he did not win... such was the confidence of the evolutionists! I can assure you that if a similar invitation was made today, no evolutionist would have a full and exhaustive debate!

### **The Mechanism of Change**

What is this mechanism of change and why is it so important? (We will keep the statements brief and simple). It is important because without its existence the whole theory of evolution will disappear like a wisp of smoke. And that is why evolutionists never mention it. And even Richard Dawkins says he cannot prove evolution! So, why believe it?

Think of a 'mechanism of change' as a link in a strong chain. The chain lays on the floor, ready to do its work. Whilst laying there, nothing can break it. One day, it is to be used to pull a mighty weight from A to B. The chain is strong enough, and one end is fixed to the mighty weight. The other end is fixed to a very strong engine with a pulley. The engine is started and the pulley turns. It keeps on turning, very carefully, and the length of chain starts to extend itself. But, nothing happens. This is because a link is missing and the chain is in two halves. So, the chain just wraps itself around the pulley and the weight remains static.

The chain was indeed very strong, but without that one link it was useless. Science has very strong characteristics; its observational methods are superb. But, the evolutionist mechanism of change does not exist, so the theory just unravels and does nothing. The theory is useless. It cannot pull the weight of Darwinistic theory behind it.

### That Famous Fish

Think of that fish that became a land animal by getting out of the water. David Attenborough has said it. It is so simple! Schoolteachers say it. College professors say it. They rattle on like an express train and simply say it! So, it must be true. But wait... what is the proof that this occurred? There is none, because there is no known mechanism within a fish that can cause it to just get onto dry land and survive. That is why there are no 'missing links'. They are missing because they do not exist and never will!

Look at it logically. A fish has gills, which sifts water for oxygen. Gills do not work outside of water. So, what would happen if a fish got onto dry land? What would happen is what happens on fishing programs – they die! Their whole body system is driven by a fish-style mechanism. There is no known mechanism that can change a fish to a dry land animal. It does not matter if the assumed process takes one minute or billions of years (though there is no proof for 'billions' of years, either!). A missing mechanism is a missing mechanism! The reason Superman cannot be found is that he never existed in the first place. He seems real on films, but in reality he cannot and does not exist.

Okay, so, *many* fish jump onto land (why should they anyway?). Surely *one* of them will successfully stay alive? Please – think sensibly. How can it stay alive? It cannot! It will die. It does not matter if millions of fish go 'over the top' to try for a bid for land freedom – each one will just die within a few minutes.

The evolutionist, of course, will say that the fish 'adapts' in little stages, and finally manages to emerge as a dry land animal. Hm. That is a bit like saying an old hand cart can 'somehow adapt' and suddenly become a luxurious BMW sports car! It just will not happen! If a fish had even a minor adaptation (and why should it?), it would affect his whole body. And any such change could simply kill it anyway, because an adaptation is not necessary and would not occur. Nowhere in the 'natural' world (that is, the world made by God) do we see even *one* such adaptation that leads to one thing changing into another. Changes yes, but not changes in a process of change from one species to another.

And, even if an adaptation occurs, something has *caused* it to happen. It is this 'something' that is the mechanism of change. Evolutionists **MUST** prove that a mechanism of change exists. If they cannot, everything they say is false, or at least cannot be proved. Either way, none exists right now on this actual earth.

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier  
Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

### What Cause Can There Be?

Now try a bit of logic. Let us assume that evolution is true. Let us also assume that the fish starts to have the first adaptation. Ask yourself a question: Why on earth should the adaptation take place at all? The fish swims in the sea and does fishy things. All is well. So, why have internal changes for it to go onto dry land?

I pedal along on my bicycle, enjoying the country lanes and fresh air. I stop every so often to look at the grand view, and, as I gaze, I eat the very fine pickle and jelly sandwich made by my lovely wife. As with the fish, all is well.

But, then, as I cycle again, a man steps into the road and tells me I must adapt my bicycle. He says he will begin to build a complete protective shield around it, so that I can cycle in a huge container of sulphuric acid. He builds the armour, but it fails, so he continues until he has found a suitable component. Then, I am able to cycle to my heart's content in the acid, without harm. (You know, like a fish going onto dry land after having its parts adapted).

Are you going to ask the question? 'WHY?'

Why should I accept that fellow's idea, and why should I want to cycle in sulphuric acid? There is no valid or rational reason to do it! Would the bicycle have adapted itself? No. It needed that man to design and build it all.

So, Mr Fish – why do you want to get onto dry land? Indeed, I thought that, as a fish, you could not think anyway, but acted on instinct? Needless to say, the fish was silent and swam away to find some food.

There is NO REASON why any animal or man should 'adapt' to such an extent that they change from one species to another. It is irrational. And even if adaptations were possible, they would need to be exceptionally great in number and design, and all occurring at the same time. The evolutionist will then clap his hands with glee and say "Yes, you are right – and that is exactly what happens!"

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier  
Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

The evolutionist can clap until his fingers adapt into large clapper-boards... even with trillions of minor 'adaptations' he would still have to prove, without doubt, that some mechanism was found that caused the adaptations to take place! There is no way he can escape that demand for proof. There MUST be a prompter for adaptation, if such changes actually occurred. As you can see, the argument is circular and cannot come to fruition.

Let us suppose a man has an injured leg, causing him to limp badly. Now, if we truncate the time scales of evolution, the evolutionist would claim that the continual limping would cause an adaptation in the body to compensate. So, the man eventually grows a billion-dollar leg that is super-boosted and stronger. This, of course, flies in the face of reality, for a lousy leg will never become super, it will just get worse and maybe even die. The 'changes' would be detrimental, not better. And any such changes would naturally follow the physiology of an human being. The changes would never move outside of that fixed boundary. Any changes would not somehow grow into a centipede or something alien to being human.

The same goes for animals, all animals. God says they were created as a 'kind', and they reproduce after their own kind. There is no facility for changing from one species into another. It is just fantasy, created by people who cannot tolerate the idea of creation, or God.

There is an urban legend amongst some Christians, that Darwin was a Christian who lost his faith, but later renounced his atheism and returned to Christ. However, if you study his life, his early years were spent couched in the usual Anglicanism, until his mother became an Unitarian, and then the young Darwin followed her. If you know anything about Unitarianism, you will know that it is an example of the "philosophies of men", and not Christian at all. So, if Darwin 'lost his faith' it was not in Christ, but in Unitarianism, or his formalised Anglicanism.

Darwin wrote about a purely 'natural' and ungodly scheme of things because he was an unbeliever to start with. He genuinely thought that he had found the key to nature, but he reckoned without God. And Christians at the time were so intimidated by him and his followers, that they conceded to them, or just remained silent.

Today, many Christians pretend to be intellectual, by siding with evolutionists and their falsity. They do it because they fear being called 'flat-earthers'. Why not, rather, just call evolutionists 'flat-liners', because their intellects are impaired? Remember – they have NO PROOF whatever

## Evolution: A Recap

Written by K B Napier

Tuesday, 02 March 2010 14:33

---

that evolution is true. And even that archdeacon of myth, Dawkins, admits there are no proofs! It is all in their minds, an invention.

In every case of supposed 'evolution', there are alternative explanations. The explanations may not be liked by evolutionists. They might even laugh at them. But, who cares? They have no proofs whatever, so give it your best shot! Anyone can make a jibe. Anyone can laugh. But not one of them can prove their case!

Do not get carried away, though, for creationists cannot prove their case either! So, why say the above? I say it because the likelihood of creation being true is far more plausible than evolution being true! It comes down to weight of evidence – and when we look at it, the evolutionists are like six stone weaklings having sand kicked in their face by the fifteen stone muscle-man.

There is no weight behind evolution claims. None at all. They can shout loudly, kick creationism, or invent reasons why governments 'must' legislate against creation thinking. But, all along, they are in very poor shape, having no proofs for their claims and no real reason to silence critics or alternatives. They are paper tigers with borrowed false teeth.

© May 2009

---oOo---

{loadposition btm\_address}