

Creationism is wrong

Disproving evolution doesn't prove creationism/Intelligent Design (ID)

Let's say evolution is Theory A, and creationism/ID is Theory B, if Theory A is disproved it does not mean Theory B is proved. Theory B must stand or fall on its own evidence. The reason for this is there might be Theory C which is the actual explanation, but we simply do not know it yet! The evolution/creationism debate is not an either/or debate, they both (theoretically) could be wrong so disproving one does not prove the other. As a result of this the rest of this leaflet will not address the anti-evolution arguments (that is a subject for another leaflet), but the positive argument for creationism/ID.

The 1st Law of Thermodynamics

Creationists state that those who oppose them believe that the Universe came from nothing, however non-creationists don't actually say this. The 1st Law of Thermodynamics basically 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. It is the creationists that believe that their intelligent designer created the Universe out of nothing which flatly contradicts the 1st Law of Thermodynamics which is probably the most tested, verified and (for want of a better word) proven theory in all physics. By the way, what created the creator or designed the designer if nothing can 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 not long after the Big Bang. Also, it is likely that the constants will be different in billions of year time. Physicists have also 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. For a more details of this and the previous argument please refer to the work of physicist Victor Stenger.

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 (humans) and we know of no natural way that these things can come about. However, although a tree, or a human being, or a wing 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 biology (or the recent work by biologists who examine these claims). Every single irreducibly complex system that has been proposed has an evolutionary explanation from bacterial flagella to the blood clotting mechanism to the immune system. Plus 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!

The biblical creation story did not happen

Many creationists believe that the biblical creation story as outlined in Genesis literally happened. There are problems with this argument. Firstly, which biblical creation story, there are two and they are very different. Modern physics explodes (sic) the idea of a six day creation narrative and shows without any reasonable doubt that this did not happen. Why should we trust the Bible anyway, why not use the Islamic creation story, or the Babylonian, or the Australian Aboriginal Dreamtime story? All of these stories cannot be true, yet they were all believed at one time or another (including today) to be literally true.

Calling something science doesn't make it scientific

Creation science and ID 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 superstitious religious assertions, which do not advance human understanding of the cosmos. Simply calling it science doesn't make it so. Where are the formations of hypotheses? Where are the experimentations? Where are the observations? Where is the field work? Where is the lab work? Where is the peer-reviewed publishing of conclusions in respectable science journals? Where is the re-testing of these conclusions by other scientists? Nowhere, there are none. There cannot be any. Creation science/ID is religion and every testable claim that it has made has failed the test.

End

Created and published by

Atheism

www.atheismuk.com

© 2010