

Since Science is constantly discovering new things, surely what we do not understand now will become apparent in the future, such as the gaps in the fossil record and how one creature has become another over time.

It is true that science constantly changes as it discovers new things. This is precisely why it is not wise to give science the mantle of absolute truth. What is thought to be correct today may be disproved tomorrow. Science itself can only describe the physical world around us; it is limited in what it can tell us. We can make predictions that can be tested using scientific theory. Sometimes these predictions are correct, enabling us to do remarkable things like brain surgery and sending men to the moon. Often these predictions fail and then we have to re-assess the theory. Every working scientist will attest to this being the way he/she proceeds on a day by day basis. Scientists can form theories of what happened in the past from what they see around them today – but these cannot be proven – they are in the past.

There is a difference between experimental science where theories can be tested in the laboratory and historical science where history cannot be re-run to test the conjecture and speculations of the evolutionists. In order to construct scientific theories the scientist makes a number of assumptions which are not always apparent to the lay person. If any of the assumptions are incorrect, then the whole theory collapses. We perform practical and experimental science when we dig up fossils. Interpreting how old they are is historical science and dependent on assumptions.

To take one aspect of evolutionary theory for example: the theory of reptile to mammal/bird evolution. The actual scientific evidence before us in the fossil record is that of reptiles and mammals and birds. There are no part-reptile/part-bird creatures in the rocks. There are no fossils of developing feathers – they come fully formed. Even Professor Dawkins, when he was asked to explain why a feather should suddenly develop, could not do so¹. However, he said that the problem is with our understanding, not with evolution. After all, he commented, the feather is here and there is no other way it could have got here but by step-wise development from something else, (currently supposed to be from the scale of a reptile). However, there is no actual fossil evidence for a scale becoming a feather, only a hypothesis that cannot be tested. There are many good reasons scientifically as to why a scale could not become a feather, see 'Hallmarks of Design' by Professor Stuart Burgess, p. 38ff, available from AiG and DayOne Publications; 'The Intricacies of Flight' DVD by Professor Andy McIntosh, available from AiG.

Moving from the fossil record we can consider the issue of irreducible complexity. When we begin considering the intricate systems needed right down to the molecular level, the evidence does not support complex structures evolving by small step-wise means from simpler forms. In fact, all the evidence we have supports the notion that creatures deteriorate over time; They do not produce new functions nor evolve into higher creatures. The direction of the evidence is not in favour of evolutionary progression.

So there is nothing to support the idea that we might find something different in the future. Going from the actual science we do have and do understand, the direction of change is downward, mutations leading to loss of information, not upwards, leading to gain and new function. Scientifically Darwinian evolution is not possible. To illustrate, a train travelling from Leeds to London will not arrive in Edinburgh – it is going in the wrong direction. Some things are just not possible, no matter how much time you supposedly have available.

1

'Brief History of Disbelief' Jonathan Miller BBC2 14th Nov 2005 – see transcript in "Deluded by Dawkins", Andrew Wilson, Kingsway, 2007, pp. 95, 96