

***“Creationism is nothing more than religion dressed up as a pseudo-science.”***

***“Creation pseudo-science has not advanced human understanding of life or the cosmos in any way.”***

## **Atheology**

Atheism has created this leaflet as part of our Atheology campaign to refute the false claims of religions. We aim to provide a scientific and rational view of the world based on evidence and critical thinking, rather than one based on religious dogma, myth and superstition.

Other titles include:

*Evolution is true*  
*Faith: the invalid argument*  
*God does not exist*  
*Mormonism is not true*

You can find all this information and much more on our web site at:

**[www.atheismuk.com](http://www.atheismuk.com)**

Created and published by:

# **Atheism**

**[www.atheismuk.com](http://www.atheismuk.com)**

*Please dispose of this leaflet thoughtfully,  
by passing it on or recycling. Thank you.*

© 2010 - Atheism - Registered company no. 06855404  
Registered office - 145-157 St John Street, London EC1V 4PY

## **Creationism is wrong**

### **Disproving evolution can't prove creationism**

Say evolution is Theory A, and creationism is Theory B, if Theory A is disproved it does not mean Theory B is correct. Theory B must stand or fall on its own evidence. The evolution/creationism debate is not an either/or debate, they both could be wrong so disproving one does not prove the other. Therefore, the rest of this leaflet will only address the argument for creationism.



Many creationists believe that the biblical creation story as described in Genesis literally happened. There are problems with this argument - which creation story? There are two and they are very different. Modern physics explodes the idea of a six day creation story and shows beyond all reasonable doubt that this did not happen. Why should we trust the Bible anyway? Why not use the Islamic, Babylonian, or the Australian Aboriginal creation story? These stories cannot all be true, yet they were all believed at one time or another to be literal truth.

## Saying something looks designed doesn't mean it was

## It's not science

### **The 1<sup>st</sup> Law of Thermodynamics**

Creationists state that those who oppose them believe that the Universe came from nothing - this is wrong. The 1<sup>st</sup> Law of Thermodynamics states that mass/energy cannot be created or destroyed, merely converted into other forms. The Universe did not come from nothing, but the pre-existing and (possibly) eternal mass/energy that already existed. Creationists believe that their intelligent designer created the Universe from nothing - this flatly contradicts the 1<sup>st</sup> Law, which is probably the most tested and verified theory in all physics. Think - what created the creator if it cannot come from nothing?

### **The Universe is not fine tuned for life**

Creationists claim that as the physical constants of the Universe are fine tuned for life, therefore, there must have been a fine tuner. This is actually not correct. Physicists have now determined that there are other values of the physical constants that can actually support life. Also they have determined that the physical constants aren't actually constant; some of the values were different during the early life of the Universe. It is likely that the constants will be different in billions of year's time. Physicists have determined that it is possible that other universes exist which have different physical constants. The physical constants suit our form of life in our Universe now.

### **The design inference is wrong**

Just because something looks designed it does not mean that it was designed. A car or a painting looks designed and built by an intelligent designer, this is because they are! We know this because we know how these things are designed by intelligent beings (us) and we know of no natural way that these things can come about. However, although a tree, a human being, or an eye look designed it does not mean there was intelligence behind it. We know of no way they can be designed by intelligence and we also know that there is a natural way that these things come about. So just saying something looks designed does not mean it was.

### **Irreducible complexity is not a valid argument**

Those who state that irreducibly complex biological systems exist, and that they cannot be produced naturally have not studied enough of the recent work by biologists who examine these claims. Every single irreducibly complex system that has ever been proposed has an evolutionary explanation. Importantly, anyone who claims the eye is irreducibly complex is so stunningly ignorant of biology they aren't worth arguing with and should be directed to take a basic course in the subject immediately!

### **Calling creationism (or Intelligent Design) science does not make it scientific**

Creation science (also known as Intelligent Design) is not science. It does not use the agreed methods of scientific enquiry. It has been shown (and proven in countless courts of law) to be no more than a collection of superstitious religious assertions, which do not advance human understanding of life or the cosmos in any way.



Simply calling creationism a science doesn't make it so. How has the scientific method been applied? Where is the re-testing of these conclusions by other scientists? Nowhere! Creationism is nothing more than religion dressed up as a pseudo-science. Every testable claim made by creationists trying to refute evolution has failed every test applied by credible scientists.