

**Good
Science**

**Bad
Science**



**Drawing the lines between
the Science and the Fiction**

Anthony Padgett

From the Ashes Publishing

Presents:

Good Science ***Bad Science***

*Drawing the lines between the
Science and the
Fiction*

*Prepare to be challenged...
Prepare to be changed.*

Anthony Padgett

www.GoodScience-BadScience.com

Good Science, Bad Science

ISBN: 0-9727927-2-4

Copyright © 2016

Anthony Padgett, Author

Printed in the United States

Library of Congress Number: [TBD]

All rights reserved under International Copyright Law. Neither contents nor cover may be reproduced in whole or in part in any form or manner without expressed written consent of the author.

All stylistic emphases in the text and quoted references (bold, italics, etc.) are those of the author.

Cover photography and graphic artwork by Kailah Padgett.
Cover design by Dustin Clark.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
A World of Intimidation	2
The Slide from the Solid to the Speculative	4
Chapter One: Does Faith in God Really Cause Brain Damage?	7
Science History and Biblical Thinking	9
Is Faith Advancing Science?	16
Points to Remember	19
Questions for Discussion and Review	20
Chapter Two: Life from Non-life. Really?	23
Problem #1: Life is way too complex	23
Problem #2: Life requires interdependent systems	24
Problem #3: Complex information systems are never the result of chance	25
Problem #4: The reactions needed to create life have never been observed	27
Problem #5: The lack of an information source for increasingly complex life functions	28
Problem #6: Not enough molecules in the universe	29
Conclusion	31
Points to Remember	33
Questions for Discussion and Review	34
Chapter Three: Indoctrinating Me with the “Big E”?	37
In the Name of Evolution	43
Hitler and Darwinism	44
Eugenics and Darwinism	45
Abortion and Darwinism	47
The Columbine Shooters and Darwinism	48

Racism and Darwinism	50
And this we teach in our schools?	52
Conclusion	55
Points to Remember	58
Questions for Discussion and Review	59
Chapter Four: Bruising My Brain with the Big Bang.....	61
The Flatness Problem.....	64
The Energy-to-Matter Problem.....	65
Conclusion.....	67
Points to Remember	70
Questions for Discussion and Review	71
Chapter Five: Climate Change - Is It Getting Warm in Here?	73
A Brief History of Global Warming.....	74
Are We Melting Down?.....	84
What about the GCM Predictions?	85
Ulterior Motives Perhaps?	85
Can the U.S. Fix the World?	91
More CO ₂ . Is that bad?	92
A Final Word from Dr. Gray.....	93
Points to Remember	95
Questions for Discussion and Review	97
Chapter Six: The New Buzz About the Old Earth	99
What has been the understanding of the age of the earth in recent history?	99
How do you make a fossil anyway?	101
Enter “Naturalistic Uniformitarianism”	106
Where Did “4.6 Billion Years” Come From?.....	111
A Much Younger Earth?	118
What about the Age of the Universe?	124

Why is recorded history so recent?	131
The Bible on the Age of the Earth	132
Conclusion	133
Points to Remember	137
Questions for Discussion and Review	138
Chapter Seven: Rethinking the Dinosaur Deal	139
What's up with the soft tissues?	140
Dinosaurs living next to man?	141
Reptiles of a feather?	150
Conclusion	153
Points to Remember	155
Questions for Discussion and Review	156
Chapter Eight: So, What's the Point?	159
Unconverted	159
De-conversion Strategy	160
Social Experiments in 'Morality-Free' Chaos	162
Dangerous Ground	165
Epilogue: For the Believing	169
What is Your Faith Based On?	169
What Are You Standing For?	169

Introduction

As a mechanical engineering student at Oregon State University, I was introduced to a lot of fascinating science and though I was not a stellar student in my early college years, I enjoyed every minute of my education. As we were schooled in lab techniques, sound engineering methods and the like, one of the important principles taught was that our presentation of experimental data must always include: 1) any assumptions we had made in obtaining the results and 2) the statistical margin of error applicable to the final outcome. My memories are vivid of the day during my sophomore year when my Differential Equations professor introduced the science and mathematics of radioisotope dating to our class. He took the time to explain the molecular physics involved, and then he was careful to go through the assumptions necessary to obtain accurate dates using this method. I remember thinking to myself, “Wow, those are significant assumptions, and there is really little that can be done to confirm them.” As my science education continued, I was bothered when I saw how many of the foundational principles of Biology, Astronomy and other sciences were built on the conclusions that the earth and the universe are billions of years old (based on radiometric dating methods). I was also disturbed at how seldom the critical assumptions were mentioned that are necessary for these ages to hold true. I began to feel that some of the bedrock principles were not supported by sound scientific methodology. This was the beginning of an intellectual dissatisfaction with the mainstream science being presented in the classroom and the media, which has continued to this day.

This book was written for three primary audiences:

- Those seeking a subjective look at the thinking behind the popular scientific ideas of today.
- Those looking for credible scientific evidence that the faith they hold is far better supported by real science than are the ideologies of atheism and secular humanism.

- Parents and others wanting to prepare students for the crucible they will face in the public education curriculum, which in many cases has been designed to dislodge their faith.

There are many excellent works that cover the topics of this book in comprehensive detail, which support the conclusions I am presenting in this volume. My purpose is not to repeat that information here, but rather to boil each topic down to a few points that the reader, whether they are new to or already familiar with the material, can study, commit to memory, and have at the ready to defend what he believes. In this book I want to offer a set of solid scientific facts to help others steer clear of the non-science that is dressed up in credibility and sold to us as real science. I will remove as much of the academic trappings and verbiage common to scientific works as I can and offer solid and simple points that the younger student and the lay person can use to convey scientific credibility for a worldview that is not in conformance with the mainstream. It will not be necessary to master difficult scientific principles to understand the points presented, but at the same time some study will be needed if you aspire to hold to and communicate an intellectually sound and well researched basis for dissonance with the commonly accepted view. In today's culture it is vital that...

Every student of faith must be given a strong foundation in credible science that supports their worldview.

Why is that necessary? It's because our increasingly humanistic education system has re-crafted the presentation of science into a tool designed to surgically remove all vestiges of faith from the hearts and minds of its students.

A World of Intimidation

Whether or not it is intentional, the process of secular education is indeed effective in converting students from theists to atheists. To begin, the atmosphere in the classroom is very intimidating to

students. Teachers are older, armed with extensive preparation for the “discussion,” and they often possess one or more post-graduate degrees. The classroom is their domain and by definition they have the floor. By default, their voice takes on authoritative preeminence. In the typical scenario, they begin science education by laying a groundwork of foundational principles and credible facts, slowly building precept upon precept. Then without a sign that anything is amiss, precepts are over-extended and exaggerated. Theory, speculation and assumption aligning with atheistic and humanistic worldviews begin to be presented as fact, with no fair disclosure of how shallow the observational data is behind them, and most certainly with no presentation of credible evidence that might dispute the commonly accepted predispositions. The long-standing requirement of listing all assumptions and margins of error when presenting theories and conclusions (in order to maintain scientific integrity) has been discarded somewhere along the way. This builds the illusion of fact where fact has not been established according to the rules of science. Suddenly, in today’s classrooms it is fair game to minimize assumptions and omit margins of error, at least when presenting as “fact” speculation in support of humanistic and atheistic doctrines.

At the same time, any work by accomplished scientists in opposition to the commonly accepted worldview is minimized, ridiculed or excluded from lectures and textbooks altogether so that students are allowed to hear only “the sound of one hand clapping.” Predisposed “immovable” conclusions are drawn (e.g., millions and billions of years) to exclude opposing evidence and research and then used as the foundation for further assumptions and “facts.” Rules are drawn to silence dissent and fair discussion. In addition, grades are often used to pressure students to produce work in alignment with the commonly accepted view while work representing thought in opposition to mainstream ideas is considered inferior. (If you still think that academic freedom is alive in America, I highly recommend viewing Ben Stein’s eye-opening documentary, *“Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed”*¹). Only those ideas that are in concert with the preauthorized conclusions are considered

¹ *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*; Nathan Frankowski; Rocky Mountain Pictures, 2008; documentary DVD.

acceptable. All thought supporting the “politically correct” worldview is applauded while dissenters are labeled as unintelligent, or holding to “primitive religious superstitions” regardless of which conclusion the science supports best.

The Slide from the Solid to the Speculative

After first laying a foundation of solid science (or “good” science), quietly a boundary is crossed in the classroom where speculative, unproven and error-riddled theory is presented as indisputable fact (“bad” science). This is according to the pattern of Charles Darwin himself, whose solid work in natural selection was based on observable and repeatable evidence; but the extension of it to explain *The Origin of Species* is a far cry from scientific. Today, this same crowning of speculative theory as reliable fact has been extended to many other disciplines of science (e.g., Geology, Anthropology, Astronomy, etc.). This is why it has become essential that youth of faith are trained to recognize that moment when their teachers cross the line from real, solid science into worldview indoctrination. To do so they will have to have the ability to discern the specific points of departure from fact to speculation. This will require preparation, study and an awareness of the strategies that have been prepared to disassemble their faith. They need not be experts in every aspect of science if they are armed ahead of time with the knowledge of the fallacies that are coming their direction. My hope is that this book will give them the tools to stand their ground and clearly communicate to others that real science quite clearly supports a position of faith rather than invalidates it.

Though the origins of this battle have been brewing for quite some time, this was not a critical issue in the classroom some 50 years ago. The battle lines have certainly moved. If (as our founding fathers stated) “A firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence”² is to again become the mainstream ideology in our culture, turning the tide

² The United States Declaration of Independence, 1776.

and winning the “science war” in the minds of the next generation of American citizens will be a foundational milestone on that path.

While not every mind has a natural affection for science, I believe that you will enjoy learning the information in the following chapters. Much of it will be new to most readers, and it may really surprise you to realize how well unbiased science supports a God-centered worldview. I hope that you will also gain a passion for seeing our youth equipped to go on the offensive, using real science and solid historical fact to support their belief in the supernatural and in God, the creator of all things, rather than to cower defensively when teachers and professors attempt to embarrass them for believing.

This is a winnable war. With a little effort and some well-focused help, our youth can be transformed from the **influenced** to the **influencers** in middle schools, secondary schools and colleges all across our great nation. After they have become victorious over the corrupt morals and bad science so often presented to them, they will be ready and able to lead their generation and our country to new heights of freedom, prosperity and world leadership.

Chapter One:

Does Faith in God Really Cause Brain Damage?

Good Science: *Belief in God and adherence to real science are synergistic and complimentary. They have combined to give us some of the best scientists and scientific work throughout history.*

Bad Science: *Belief in a supernatural God destroys scientific thought and progress.*

Science Fiction: *Scientific knowledge leads to atheism.*

One afternoon I was flipping through our local newspaper while eating lunch and the headline of an article caught my eye:

“Looking to Create New High-Tech Jobs? Teach Evolution.”

“What is the link between high-tech job creation and the evolutionary worldview?” you may ask. The author of the article (a college biology professor) tells us how “organized religion” has been a hindrance to scientific progress since the Roman Catholics persecuted Copernicus for his view that the sun rather than the earth was the center of the universe. He went on to explain that if the educational community would increase their commitment to teaching evolution in our classrooms, we would boost scientific advancement in our country, and this would lead to more good paying high-tech jobs.

*“...at a time when states are struggling to attract new industries—we might **demand** that our students learn about and understand evolution.”³*

³ Rissing, Steve; “Looking to Create New Hi-Tech Jobs? Teach Evolution”; *The Columbus Dispatch*; February 6, 2011.

Hmm... let's read between the lines a little and see if we can summarize what this author is telling us. His points seem to be:

- Belief in God (or religion) is responsible for hindering science. Less religion would lead to greater scientific advancement.
- There is a direct link between the loss of technology jobs in the U.S. and the culture's failure to wholeheartedly embrace evolution. Those resisting this movement are to be blamed for a shortage in technology career opportunities.
- Some groups of citizens have a right to **demand** that the students of other groups of citizens (those who do not share their values and opinions) be taught their worldview because (and here they pause to pat their own backs) their thinking is more intelligent and progressive.
- States could more effectively attract technology companies if they demanded that students learn evolution.

Really? Do religion and belief in an almighty God really erode our nation's scientific edge? Let's take a closer look at this idea. Does history offer us any information that might help us answer this question?

More and more often we hear the spokesmen for the atheistic and humanistic worldviews tell our culture that the advancement of scientific thought in America is being hindered by those citizens who still embrace the belief in a supernatural, creator God. You will hear them saying that faith, religion and especially "creation science" are rotting the brains of the students in our schools, destroying our technological edge, and setting the U.S. up for a dismal economic future as the rest of the (atheistic) world forges ahead. They claim that the advancement of our society and our competitive edge in the world market are being held back by "primitive superstitions" such as the belief in a supernatural, all powerful, loving, invisible God.

Do you think I'm exaggerating? Take a look at the below quotation from the host of one of National Public Radio's science education programs:

*“When you have a portion of society that doesn’t believe in that [evolution], it holds everybody back... Really. ... If you try to ignore [evolution] your worldview becomes crazy... untenable... I say to the grown-ups, if you want to deny evolution and live in your world that is completely inconsistent with everything we observe in the universe, that is fine, **but don’t make your kids do it**, because we need them... we need scientifically literate voters and taxpayers for the future... we need engineers that can build stuff, solve problems.” —Bill Nye, the Science Guy*

Let’s see if we can infer Mr. Nye’s pertinent points:

- Anyone who does not embrace the evolutionary worldview holds a crazy (unintelligent) and untenable (indefensible when challenged) position.
- Those rejecting evolution as truth are scientifically illiterate and are incapable of being engineers or solving technical problems
- Parents should not be allowed to teach their children theistic ideologies (e.g., that the Bible is true and evolution is false) because this will hold us back and harm the future of our society.
- The “real scientists” (evolutionists) among us have a right to dictate what other (dissenting) parents are allowed to teach their children because of their superior intellect.

Ouch! Looks like Mr. Nye’s impression of faith in God is something like *“Remove brain, insert Bible.”*

Science History and Biblical Thinking

But what if Mr. Nye is right? Let’s ask the question “What does history tell us about whether faith in the creator God, destroys scientific thought?” We can start by taking a look at some of those men in history who contributed the most to scientific advancement.

The term “young-earth creationist” describes someone who believes that the earth was created in six twenty-four hour days, approximately 6,000 years ago, according to the biblical account. In the below table, the C/Y/T column on the right indicates the worldview of each scientist listed. (Note that prior to the mid-nineteenth century, nearly all Christians [‘C’] held to the young earth viewpoint [‘Y’] as the age of the earth was commonly understood to be in accordance with the biblical chronology before that time. To remain conservative, the scientists below have been marked as ‘C’ unless their allegiance to a young earth position could be explicitly verified.)

Key: C = Christian
 Y = Confirmed young-earth creationist
 T = Theist

Who?	What?	When?	C/Y/T
Francis Bacon	Inductive reasoning Invented the Scientific Method	1561– 1626	C
Galileo Galilei	Physicist, mathematician, astronomer Developed the Laws of Kinematics (motion of bodies) Along with Copernicus, he showed the sun to be the center of the solar system	1564– 1642	C
Johannes Kepler	Astronomy: laws of planetary motion	1571– 1630	C/Y
René Descartes	Mathematics pioneer Invented the Cartesian coordinate system	1596– 1650	C
Blaise Pascal	Mathematician, physicist, philosopher, child prodigy. Invented the mechanical calculator	1623– 1662	C
Robert Boyle	Physics, chemistry Best known for Boyle’s Law (aka: The Ideal Gas Law) Argued that pursuit of science improves glorification of God	1627– 1691	C
Sir Isaac Newton	Newtonian physics, universal gravitation Pioneered the laws of Dynamics, co-invented calculus Examined and confirmed Bishop James Usher’s age of the earth based on biblical genealogy	1643– 1727	C/Y
Michael Faraday	Pioneered electromagnetics Invented the A/C electric motor	1791– 1867	C

Who?	What?	When?	C/Y/T
James Prescott Joule	Authored the first law of thermodynamics The Joule, a unit of energy commonly used in engineering calculations, was named after him	1818–1889	C
Louis Pasteur	Leading pioneer in medical microbiology First determined that disease is caused by germs Pioneered the science of immunization	1822–1895	C
William Thomson Kelvin	Helped lay the foundation of modern physics Invented the Kelvin scale, a measure of absolute temperature still used in engineering	1824–1907	C
Max Planck	German theoretical physicist who originated quantum theory, won the 1918 Nobel Prize in Physics Though at the end of his life Planck did not believe in a personal or Christian God, the following quotes reveal his recognition of God's hand in the science of physics: <i>"As a man who has devoted his whole life to the most clear headed science, to the study of matter, I can tell you as a result of my research about atoms this much: There is no matter as such. All matter originates and exists only by virtue of a force which brings the particle of an atom to vibration and holds this most minute solar system of the atom together. We must assume behind this force the existence of a conscious and intelligent mind. This mind is the matrix of all matter."</i> <i>"Both Religion and science require a belief in God. For believers, God is in the beginning, and for physicists He is at the end of all considerations... To the former He is the foundation, to the latter, the crown of the edifice of every generalized worldview."</i>	1858–1947	T
George Washington Carver	Brilliant American inventor Famous for his motto: "Science only by faith in Christ"	1864–1943	C

Who?	What?	When?	C/Y/T
Albert Einstein	<p>Major contributor to advancements in our thinking about time, gravity, and the conversion of matter to energy or 'relativity' ($E=mc^2$)</p> <p><i>"I want to know how God created this world. I am not interested in this or that phenomenon, in the spectrum of this or that element. I want to know His thoughts, the rest are details."</i></p> <p><i>"Science without religion is lame, religion without science is blind."</i></p>	1879–1955	T
Guglielmo Marconi	<p>Italian inventor and physicist Inventor of the radio Awarded the Nobel Prize in Physics with Karl Ferdinand Braun for their development of practical wireless telegraphy</p> <p><i>"I am proud to be a Christian. I believe not only as a Christian, but as a scientist as well. A wireless device can deliver a message through the wilderness. In prayer the human spirit can send invisible waves to eternity, waves that achieve their goal in front of God."</i></p>	1874–1937	C
Werner Von Braun	<p>A German-American engineer considered to be the greatest rocket scientist of all time. After WWII he was a pioneer in the application of rocket science toward space exploration.</p> <p><i>"One cannot be exposed to the law and order of the universe without concluding that there must be design and purpose behind it all."⁴</i></p>	1912–1977	C

⁴ All quotes from Von Braun except the last in sequence were taken from the Today In Science History website. http://todayinsci.com/B/Braun_Wernher/BraunWernher-Quotations.htm.

Who?	What?	When?	C/Y/T
Werner Von Braun (cont.)	<p><i>"In this age of space flight, when we use the modern tools of science to advance into new regions of human activity, the Bible ... this grandiose, stirring history of the gradual revelation and unfolding of the moral law ... remains in every way an up-to-date book. ... Science itself does not address the question whether we should use the power at our disposal for good or for evil. The guidelines of what we ought to do are furnished in the moral law of God."</i></p> <p><i>"It is in scientific honesty that I endorse the presentation of alternative theories for the origin of the universe, life and man in the science classroom. It would be an error to overlook the possibility that the universe was planned rather than happening by chance."</i></p> <p><i>"To be forced to believe only one conclusion—that everything in the universe happened by chance—would violate the very objectivity of science itself. Certainly there are those who argue that the universe evolved out of a random process, but what random process could produce the brain of a man or the system of the human eye? Some people say that science has been unable to prove the existence of a Designer... My experiences with science led me to God. They challenge science to prove the existence of God. But, must we really light a candle to see the sun?"⁵</i></p>	1912– 1977	C
Dr. Raymond Damadian	<p>Invented the MRI (1969)</p> <p><i>"I am a young-earth creation scientist and believe that God created the world in six twenty-four hour days just as recorded in the book of Genesis."</i></p>	1936– Present	C/Y

⁵ <http://crev.info/?scientists=wernher-von-braun#sthash.9SNF0WKL.dpuf>.

While there are certainly exceptions, it is inarguable that the great majority of the most accomplished scientists in history were men of faith in God and/or bible-believing Christians.

While today's most popular "science" spokesmen are telling us that faith hinders scientific advancement, history tells us just the opposite. If science is hindered by faith in the supernatural, why is it that so many of the pioneers of science were unashamed believers in God? In addition, many of them also claimed that their faith greatly assisted their work in scientific endeavors. In fact, without the acknowledgement of a great all-knowing God who designed and established an ordered universe, there is no explanation for the existence of universal laws of nature that manifest themselves with flawless consistency across the sciences (e.g., physics, mathematics, chemistry, astronomy). Aside from an ordered mathematical creator, there has never been a credible reason offered that explains why universal physical and mathematical laws and constants should exist at all. If the universe is the result of random processes, why should there be such a pervasive thread of mathematical order running through every aspect of it? Humanists and atheists have yet to offer a satisfactory answer to this fundamental riddle of science.

In addition to the above scientists of history, there are a myriad of other leading PhD-level scientists alive today that are outspoken adherents to the reality of the supernatural and many ascribe to the Christian faith. For instance in his book *In Six Days*⁶, John Ashton PhD has compiled fascinating statements from fifty doctorate level scientists all of whom believe that the earth was created in six literal days, approximately 6,000 years ago. If it is true that "science leads us to atheism" that should not be the case and despite the clamor from the evolution crowd, there is much evidence that the opposite is often true.

Consider the life of Professor Antony Flew, formerly one of the world's most notorious atheists. Of his gradual transition from atheism to deism he says:

⁶ John F Ashton PhD, *In Six Days* (Master Books, Green Forest, Arizona 2000)

*“There were two factors in particular that were decisive. One was my growing empathy with the insight of Einstein and other noted scientists that **there had to be an Intelligence behind the integrated complexity of the physical Universe.** The second was my own insight that the integrated complexity of life itself—which is far more complex than the physical Universe—can only be explained in terms of an Intelligent Source. I believe that **the origin of life and reproduction simply cannot be explained from a biological standpoint** despite numerous efforts to do so. With every passing year, the more that was discovered about the richness and inherent intelligence of life, **the less it seemed likely that a chemical soup could magically generate the genetic code...** “The difference between life and non-life, it became apparent to me, was ontological [metaphysical] and not chemical. The best confirmation of this radical gulf is Richard Dawkins' comical effort to argue in **The God Delusion** that the origin of life can be attributed to a ‘lucky chance.’ If that's the best argument you have, then the game is over. No, I did not hear a Voice. **It was the evidence itself that led me to this conclusion.**” – Antony Flew*

It is also interesting to note the hesitation of Darwin himself to accept the serious shortcomings in the evidence for “Big E” evolution (see Chapter 3) and his doubts around the ability of mutation and natural selection to produce the complexity we see in physiology. For example, after studying the wonder of the human eye with its greater than two million interdependent moving parts, he wrote the following:

*“To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, **absurd in the highest degree.**” – Charles Darwin*

It is also important to realize that Darwin's conception of the cell was by today's standards archaic. He did not have modern nanomicroscopy at his disposal. After examining the structure of the cell using the crude microscopes available to him, Darwin concluded

that the cell was a very simple structure having essentially three basic parts: a membrane, a nucleus, and a nucleolus.

Today we know that the human cell contains the tiniest and most complex information system imaginable. For instance, the storage capacity of DNA of the size that would cover the head of a pin is utterly astounding: equivalent to 100 million 40-gigabyte hard drives!⁷ This storage density is many orders of magnitude greater than the capacities of the most advanced man-made data storage systems, which indeed appear crude in comparison. The cell not only stores vast amounts of coded information, it also copies the information (via RNA), then deploys it to the appropriate local area outside of the nucleus when and where it is needed. The cell then reads and interprets the code to sequentially build the enzymes and proteins required to make possible incredibly complex interactive physiologic systems and capabilities. It is truly a marvel of micro-engineering far beyond the capabilities of any existing technology. To think that this system is the result of chance is as ridiculous as suggesting that the carved faces of Mount Rushmore resulted from random wind and water erosion. It is simply not a rational conclusion. Had Darwin had any understanding of the incredible complexity that exists with each cell of our bodies, chances are that he would never have surmised that they were the result of undirected changes (i.e., chance) over time.

Is Faith Advancing Science?

Finally let's consider this question in a framework of biblical truth. The message of the 66 books of the Bible (written by authors of all walks of life on three different continents over 1,500 years) can be boiled down into the following points:

1. The Creator, God, is alive and well. He is a great, merciful and loving Father.

⁷ Purdom PhD, Georgia; *The Code of Life: DNA, Information, and Mutation*; Creation Library Series, Answers in Genesis; 2007, DVD.

2. It is possible to have a real and intimate love relationship with Him.
3. There is a problem separating men from God. All men are born alienated from the Father's presence and love because He is so powerfully righteous and blameless and we are so unholy (i.e., selfish, immoral, etc.). Like a tissue thrown into a fire, our imperfect and unrighteous nature and His powerful and holy nature are fundamentally incompatible. In our natural state, we would be destroyed by the glory of His raw power if we were to come into His actual presence. In an instant, His holiness would simply consume our un-holiness.
4. God himself provided the solution to this problem when He visited the planet and personally took the severe punishment for our sinful and selfish acts. Having paid the price with His own body and blood, He now offers salvation to us all as a free gift. Those who will simply say "yes" to His gift, no matter who we are or what we have done can be forgiven, reconciled to the Father and have a place in His kingdom.
5. When we accept His gift, we are restored to intimacy with the Father—our life in Him and His life in us—here, today in this life and in the eternal life to come.

If we really can be made one with the Father here in this life, wouldn't it naturally follow that our minds as well as our souls would benefit greatly? Restoration with the Father would settle such important issues as:

- Who is God and what does He want?
- Why I have been born?
- Is there true meaning in life?
- What will happen to me after I die? (The fear of death)
- Will I be condemned in eternity? (The fear of the after-life)

If it is really possible to have peace with God and be right with God, wouldn't that release a man's mind to apply itself to scientific research and endeavor with much greater freedom, insight and capacity? Would not a connection with the God of all creation not only tend to align one's thinking with the scientific secrets of His handiwork, but

also open the possibility that His help can be directly invoked as one attempts to understand His marvelous designs? This is exactly what many of the great men of science have said throughout history... that their faith and their relationship with a supernatural God (or at least their recognition of His existence) has greatly assisted their work in science.

“Everyone who is seriously involved in the pursuit of science becomes convinced that a spirit is manifest in the laws of the universe - a spirit vastly superior to that of man, and one in the face of which we with our modest powers must feel humble.”

—Albert Einstein (1879–1955)

“It was not by accident that the greatest thinkers of all ages were deeply religious souls.” —Max Planck (1858–1947)

“I find it as difficult to understand a scientist who does not acknowledge the presence of a superior rationality behind the existence of the universe as it is to comprehend a theologian who would deny the advances of science.”

—Werner Von Braun (1912–1977)

“This most beautiful system of the sun, planets, and comets, could only proceed from the counsel and dominion of an intelligent and powerful Being.”

—Sir Isaac Newton (1643–1727)

The greatest scientists of history have sent us a consistent message: that the pursuit of science and the evidences of nature reveal a signature of a master designer throughout the created order.

So then, does faith in God and the recognition of His presence and marvelous handiwork hinder scientific progress? Based on the evidence passed down to us throughout history, the most reasonable and intelligent conclusion is that the exact opposite is true.

Points to Remember

1. Among the greatest contributors to scientific knowledge throughout history, most of them were men of faith who held Christian or theist worldviews.
2. A significant number of the leading scientists of history acknowledge that their belief in a Creator assisted or greatly helped them in their scientific endeavors.
3. Aside from the existence of a Creator having vast intelligence, there has been no credible explanation offered by atheists for the existence of the physical laws, universal constants and mathematical order we see throughout the universe.
4. Though some dare not admit it for fear of losing their careers and livelihoods, many of today's leading scientists are Christians or theists.

Questions for Discussion and Review

1. In your opinion, does the significant number of Christians and theists among the leading scientists of history support or contradict the idea that faith in God hinders scientific advancement?
2. Why would Darwin and his colleagues have underestimated the complexity of the cell? Would a much simpler understanding of the cell be more consistent with evolutionary ideas, or less consistent? Explain your reasons why or why not.
3. Many journalists and scientists in recent years have lost their tenure, their jobs and their entire careers for being associated with or even mentioning intelligent design, or creationism in their work. In your opinion, does this mean that we still enjoy academic freedom and free speech in our country?
4. Should students be allowed to question evolutionary and atheistic thinking in the classroom? Should their academic performance (e.g., grades, etc.) be affected when their worldview is not in agreement with that of their teacher, professor or instructor? Why or why not?

5. Do you think that belief in God helps or hinders scientific thought and research? Give reasons why or why not.

Chapter Two:

Life from Non-life. Really?

Good Science: *Based on scientific evidence and history alone, no one can know how life began.*

Bad Science: *Modern science has provided a satisfying naturalistic explanation of how life began.*

Science Fiction: *Life originated by a random combination of elements.*

How did life on Earth begin? The most popular theory that is usually taught in our schools is that life began when the basic elements necessary (carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and iron) happened to be in the right place in the right time in the right quantities in a mud-like mixture known as the “primordial soup.” Then an external source of energy (e.g., lighting) energized the mixture so that the elements happened to combine in just the right sequences to form the basic enzymes and proteins—and poof! The inorganic was transformed into the organic. Once this little life form started wiggling, the forces of mutation and natural selection took over until billions of years later, man evolved and created the space shuttle... and the rest is history.

While at first glance this may seem tenable, there are many insurmountable issues with this idea from a scientific point of view.

Problem #1:

Life is way too complex

Mathematicians consider that anything with a probability less than 1 in 10^{50} is “statistically impossible.” This means that although it is not technically impossible, the probability is low enough so as to not bear mention in a rational, reasonable argument. Considering that the

minimal cell needed for the simplest life form requires 239 protein molecules each with properly sequenced amino acids, the probability of only the first protein occurring via random combination of molecules has been calculated at 1 in 10^{161} .¹⁶¹ Because the proteins required for life function must be in matched sets in order to work properly, the second protein (that must be obtained randomly under this model of origins) is many times more difficult to come by. The probability of the second protein randomly occurring has been calculated to be 238 in 10^{520} .⁵²⁰ The third one could be any of the 237 still needed, so its probability would be 237 in 10^{520} and so on until all 239 needed proteins have been attained. By combining the probabilities for each protein occurring randomly, the final probability of arriving at the simplest life form becomes one in 10^{119850} (see footnote ⁸). Now since the average person requires about four inches to write out 20 zeros, it would take over a third of a mile to write the zeros behind this number by hand! No rational scientist would maintain that something this improbable could occur, but even if it did occur, the problem is far from over.

Problem #2: Life requires interdependent systems

Even if the above stated sequencing did somehow happen by chance, there is no reasonable possibility that the living molecule would magically have the ability to self-replicate which is of course, essential for sustainable life. But even if a living, self-replicating cell did miraculously emerge, a self-copying molecule is in itself not nearly enough. Once we have a simple life form in place, we face a far more complex problem—the sustaining of life. If this problem is not addressed in the initial life form, it will simply die, and we are right back to an entirely inorganic world. The following is a minimum set of bio-systems that must be built into our initial life form in order for life to be sustained:

⁸ Coppedge, Dr. James F.; *Evolution: Possible or Impossible*, Zondervan, 1973; pp. 110–111.

1. Metabolic: The ability to consume food and convert it internally into the heat, sugars and nutrients needed by the organism.
2. Locomotive: The first inorganic organism must be able to move about to find sources of food.
3. Circulatory and Pulmonary: There must be a mechanism in place in order to convert oxygen into a useful form, and distribute oxygen and essential nutrients throughout the organism.
4. Reproduction: The organism must have the ability to multiply and foster future generations.

In addition, more complex mechanisms such as nervous and skeletal systems must eventually come into existence (by chance) and the more complex the organism, the more interdependent these systems are. For instance, lungs will not work for long without a rib cage to protect them and a brain and nervous system to regulate them. The boundaries between these systems are easily defined, but they are intricately interdependent. This could never have occurred by chance. So we now need to further reduce the probability of life by random processes (as described in Problem #1 above) many times over because the first random life forms must somehow have had complex systems already in place in order for the randomly formed life to be sustainable. This idea – that the systems of life require the systems of life – is referred to as “irreversible complexity” because each cannot exist without many other fully functioning interdependent and complimentary counterparts.

Problem #3: Complex information systems are never the result of chance

A huge additional problem stacks the odds against random origins of life even further. With the discovery of DNA in the 1950s, we now understand that all cells have DNA in their nuclei. DNA contains the coded information needed to produce all of the proteins needed by the cell in order for it to perform its overall function. Simply put, DNA is the code of life. Within each cell is a fantastically complex coded

information system, far more sophisticated than any designed and built by mankind. The cell includes an information copying system (RNA), an information interpretation system (ribosomes) and actors that translate the information into the specific proteins needed at the right time and at the right place. Without exception, all information systems have intelligent designers and the systems themselves are always less intelligent than their creators. In addition, no information system of any kind has ever been known to result from chance processes.

In order to illustrate this, consider the following riddle:

You are given a Lear jet, an unlimited number of rolls of paper (the large rolls from which newspapers are printed) and an unlimited number of five-gallon cans of black ink. Your assignment is to fly the Learjet overhead and throw the paper rolls and ink out the door together at the same time. You can do this as many times as necessary in order to produce the desired result. The statistical problem you must solve is this: How many times will you need to repeat this experiment in order to produce—by the chance interaction of the paper and ink—a readable newspaper (without spelling errors) out in the fields where the paper and ink come crashing down?

Never going to happen? Seem too difficult? Ok, let's make it easier: this time you only need to produce a single readable sentence in the English language with no spelling errors. Now how many times will you need to throw the ink and paper out of the jet to achieve the goal?

You see, the English language is a "code system" similar to that recorded in the double helix structure of DNA. It is made up of various combinations of the letters of the alphabet in recognized sequences or "words." The combinations must be in correct patterns (e.g., the words must be spelled correctly and form cohesive sentences) in order to carry useful meaning or information.

Our riddle illustrates a simple truth: ***A code-based information system can never be the result of a random process.*** Yet this is exactly what

one must believe if he accepts that something as complex as a cell (complete with DNA), could ever be produced from random interactions of chemicals.

*"If DNA required intelligent preprogramming, the signs should be unmistakable. The mark of intelligence is not exactly hard to discern. We speak of the genetic code, DNA transcribed into RNA, RNA translated into protein. These are language terms. They are used not just because they are convenient, but because they accurately describe what is going on in the cell. There is a transfer of information... DNA is an informational code, so the connection is readily apparent. **The overwhelming conclusion is that information does not and cannot arise spontaneously by mechanistic processes.** Intelligence appears to be a necessity in the origin of any informational code, including the genetic code, no matter how much time is given."*⁹

Problem #4:

The reactions needed to create life have never been observed

Often today's biology textbooks will refer to the Miller-Urey experiment (which dates back to the 1950s) as an example of how the organic compounds necessary for life could be formed in a laboratory setting simulating the origin of life in the early Earth. Miller combined water, methane and ammonia using an electrical current (simulating lightning) to force the gases to combine. While Miller was successful in creating amino acids, and the results at first seemed promising, there are a number of problems with the experiment:

1. Amino acids come in two configurations: right handed and left handed. The amino acids Miller produced were a combination of right-handed and left-handed acids. This is a huge problem

⁹ Lester, L. and Bohlin, R.; *The Natural Limits to Biological Change*; Probe Books, 1989; p. 157.

because in order to function, the amino acids that comprise the proteins required for life must all be left-handed—without exception. The amino acids that Miller produced are useless for constructing the organic compounds needed for life because of the presence of the right-handed acids.

2. Miller conveniently assumed that, at the time of life's inception, the earth's atmosphere contained no free oxygen. He did this to avoid a significant scientific roadblock inherent in this theory of origins: the fact that amino acid bonds cannot form in the presence of free oxygen.
3. There is no observational evidence to support Miller's assumptions that the necessary gases were present in Earth's early atmosphere or that the original atmosphere had an absence of free oxygen. These assumptions were intentionally imposed in order to avoid scientific roadblocks with the experiment.

Problem #5: The lack of an information source for increasingly complex life functions

If life started from a very simple organism and continued to evolve into more and more complex forms over time, a great deal of information would have to have been added along the way. For instance, the first life forms would not have had eyes. Imagine the amount of new information required in order to add the physical eye with its hundreds of thousands of interdependent moving parts and the overall neuro-physical function of eyesight. As noted in Chapter 3, neither of the evolutionists' change agents (mutation and natural selection) have the capability to add new information to the genome, and they have ever been observed to do so. So where does all the new and complex information required for such new features come from? Because they cannot admit to the need for intelligence, the answer given by evolutionists is "random chance and survival of the fittest." These are hardly satisfying sources of the incredibly complex

information required for producing intricately interdependent systems seen throughout the spectrum of life forms.

*“We have seen that living things are too improbable and too beautifully 'designed' to have come into existence by chance. How, then, did they come into existence? The answer, Darwin's answer, is by gradual, step-by-step transformations from simple beginnings, from primordial entities sufficiently simple to have come into existence by **chance**. Each successive change in the gradual evolutionary process was simple enough, relative to its predecessor, to have arisen by chance. But the whole sequence [of] cumulative steps constitutes anything but a chance process, when you consider the complexity of the final end-product relative to the original starting point. The cumulative process is **directed by nonrandom survival**.”*¹⁰ —Richard Dawkins, *Atheist*

How can the forces of chance and “nonrandom survival” produce complex feature design and add it to the DNA? Dawkins doesn’t give details except he does add that “organized complexity is the thing that we are having difficulty in explaining.”⁴⁵ One can imagine.

Problem #6: Not enough molecules in the universe

While the idea of the spontaneous generation of life (or “biogenesis”) due to random interaction of molecules at first glance seems like a feasible possibility, there are many irresolvable barriers to the production of a sustainable, reproducible, organic, and metabolic life form. One such barrier is demonstrated by the following basic mathematical calculations which show the impossibility of this occurring.

¹⁰ Dawkins, Richard. *The Blind Watchmaker: Why the Evidence Reveals a Universe Without Design*; Norton, 1987; p. 43.

Calculation of the chances of biogenesis actually occurring¹¹:

X	Reasonable upper limit of the number of molecules in the observable universe	10^{80}
Y	Generous upper limit for the average number of interatomic interactions per second per atom	10^{12}
Z	Generous upper limit of the age of the universe	10^{18} seconds (30 Billion Years)
$X*Y*Z$	Generous upper limit of the total number of interatomic reactions that have occurred in the universe since its inception	10^{110}
A $= (X*Y*Z)$	Number of unique molecules in the history of the universe assuming that every interatomic reaction produces a unique molecule (an extremely generous assumption)	10^{110}
B	Number of proteins required for the most basic form of life having the simplest set of capabilities	1000 (10^3)
C	Number of unique amino acids required for living cells (ignoring the requirement that they be of left handed symmetry only)	20
D	Minimum number of amino acids in a basic protein	200
E	Percentage of the amino acids that must in exactly the correct sequence to produce a life protein	50%
F $= (D * E)$	Number of amino acid positions in a basic life protein that must be exactly correct	100
G $= (C^F)$	Number of random interactions needed for a reasonable likelihood (probability) of obtaining an amino acid sequence which is useful for building just one of the 1000 life proteins need for biogenesis to occur	20^{100} (or about 10^{130})
H $= (G/A)$	Ratio of [the number of random interactions needed for a reasonable likelihood of obtaining only one of the 1000 life proteins needed for basic life] to [the total number of interatomic reactions that have occurred in the history of the universe]	10^{20}

¹¹ Baumgardner, John R., PhD from *In Six Days* Masterbooks, 2000; pp. 224-225.

Or to put this result in words... the age of the universe would have to have been **a hundred-billion-billion times** longer than the highest secular old earth estimate (30 Billion years) in order to have a reasonable chance of obtaining **only one** of the 1000 proteins needed for the most basic life function. Add to this the requirement that all 1000 proteins would have to occur at the same time and in the same place for life to spontaneously start in motion. In addition, that place would have to have been (by chance) at location in the universe having an environment that could sustain it (with proper temperature, atmosphere, a source of water, an existing inorganic food supply, etc.). Currently Earth is the only location known having these conditions. On top of this, we would have to consider a very high rate of attrition to account for all the times when this would have happened, but the life form simply returned to inorganic matter (died) within milliseconds, seconds, minutes, hours, etc. Mostly likely this impossible combination would have had to occur millions of times in order to produce sustainable life. It would be difficult to imagine a more implausible scenario.

Put more simply, based on these calculations (whose assumptions are very generously weighted favoring biogenesis) no rational, knowledgeable mind would ever consider biogenesis as a real possibility.

Conclusion

Aside from the acknowledgement of an amazingly intelligent Creator, the question of origins is a very difficult problem indeed. Aside from being woefully inadequate, the mechanisms of Darwin's theory of evolution do not address this question because they apply only after life is already in motion. In order to overcome the huge hurdles of evolution of life from non-living chemicals on earth some scientists such as Francis Crick (co-discoverer of DNA) have theorized that since life is so complex, it must have been seeded on the earth from some

extraterrestrial source.¹² They suggest that evolution then kicked in and life forms became more and more complex. Aside from having no scientific basis whatsoever (other than science fiction) one should realize that this only moves the same question to another planet (or galaxy, etc.) The next obvious question would then be, “How did complex, intelligent life originate on that planet?”

Because it is neither repeatable nor observable, the question of origins does not lend itself to methods of scientific proof. Legal-historic proof is also of little use because there clearly would not have been any human in existence to record the details of his own inception. We do however, have a scriptural account of the origin of mankind. Since the Bible has proven itself to be historically accurate and scientifically credible in every verse, perhaps trusting its account of creation and the beginnings of mankind is the most reasonable and intellectually sound position that one can take. We do have solid reason to believe that the Father Himself has delivered to us His own eyewitness account of origins. In addition, the revealed information fits the observed evidence in a much more satisfying manner than does the alternate theories offered by secular science and pseudoscience.

¹² History of Directed Panspermia, panspermia-theory.com/directed-panspermia, 2009

Points to Remember

1. The biochemistry of life is extremely complex. During Darwin's time, when the cell was thought to be a simple structure, the possibility of creation of a simple life form from random interactions of chemicals may have been tenable, but with our current understanding of the extreme complexity of the cell, this idea is no longer reasonable or feasible.
2. For sustainable life to have occurred spontaneously, several interdependent systems would have had to have popped into existence simultaneously. This further erodes the already minute possibility that life could have originated from chance processes.
3. Life at the cellular level is based on code and a complex information system that reads and acts on that code. No information system has ever been observed to come into existence by chance. To believe that a highly complex information system could be the result of chance interaction of chemicals is plainly absurd.
4. Scientists have never been able to combine the necessary elements to properly form the organic compounds necessary for life. Though sometimes cited as a success, the Miller-Urey experiment from the 1950s produced a combination of right- and left-handed amino acids that are in fact destructive, rather than constructive to organic life.
5. Even if life were to arise spontaneously, evolutionary mechanisms (natural selection and mutation) provide no source (other than random chance) for the huge amounts of additional information needed for life to grow increasingly complex over time. To conclude that complex neurological functions such as eyesight with all of its delicate precision, minute-moving parts and interdependent supporting systems (e.g., muscular, nervous, circulatory, etc.) could arise by chance would be absurd in the highest degree.

Questions for Discussion and Review

1. What was Darwin's understanding of the complexity of the cell? Why would this limited understanding have lent itself to his theory of the origins of species?
2. Explain why the interdependent systems necessary for sustainable life exclude the possibility of spontaneous origination of life from random chemical interactions.
3. Explain how DNA, RNA and ribosomes work together to create proteins within the cell. In your opinion could this system have come into being by chance alone without an intelligent designer?
4. Can code-based information systems be the result of random processes? Why or why not?
5. When conducting the Miller-Urey experiment, why did Miller assume that the earth's atmosphere had no free oxygen when life first came into being? What was this assumption based on?

6. What forces do evolutionists credit for adding the vast amounts of information necessary to evolve from the first simple life form to highly complex creatures such as mankind? In your opinion, is it realistic for these forces to have added the needed information? Why or why not?

Chapter Three:

Indoctrinating Me with the “Big E”?

Good Science: *There is a great variability built into the genetic code of all living things. All species exhibit adaptive change, and there is significant change within kinds over time.*

Bad Science: *Entirely new kinds can result from the variability within previously existing kinds.*

Science Fiction: *All living things have evolved from a single common ancestor - the first living cell.*

The word “evolution” is very slippery. It can have a wide variety of meanings - some representing solid scientific work and others representing unfounded and unscientific theories that are often presented to students as established fact. Let’s break this down into manageable pieces and see if we can begin to “see the forest for the trees.”

Before proceeding further, we need a high-level understanding of the two driving forces behind all evolutionary change: **natural selection** and **mutation**.

Natural Selection Defined: Certain environments favor particular genetic variations over others. For example, dogs will carry genes for various lengths of fur and thickness of their coats. As the dogs breed, some dogs will carry genes for longer hair and thicker coats. In a colder environment, the survival rates of those dogs will exceed those of dogs carrying genes for shorter hair and thinner coats because their physical characteristics are more suitable to their environment. Over time, the dogs less equipped for the cold weather will die out along with more and more of the genetic coding that is in their blood lines for shorter, thinner fur. In simple terms, the cold environment “selects

for” dogs with thicker fur and the fittest (best equipped genetically) will more readily survive. So far we are on good scientific ground. Natural selection is observable and repeatable with an extensive body of sound evidence to support it.

Mutation Defined: Damage to the genetic code can occur within the cells of living organisms. This damage can alter the enzymes and proteins produced, which can result in a change in the cellular makeup, and therefore the behavior of the organism. The genetic damage can be caused by copying errors in the DNA during cell reproduction, or by exposure to external forces such as certain types of radiation. The great majority of mutations cause negative outcomes such as deformity or loss of function (e.g., blindness or deafness), but in rare instances mutation can create a positive outcome in certain environments. These are known as “beneficial” mutations. For example, as a result of mutation damage, some fungi found in the Chernobyl nuclear power plant were found to actually feed on radioactivity rather than be degraded or destroyed by it.

Mutation is also good science. It is observable and repeatable with an extensive body of supporting evidence.

Natural selection and **mutation** are processes that act on existing information in the genetic code. They can produce specific variations in the characteristics of species in some environments. **Neither process, however, can introduce new information into the genetic code**, nor has either process ever been observed to do so. It is also important to distinguish between beneficial outcomes (i.e., better survivability as a result of mutation or natural selection) and new functionality such as fish developing fur or dinosaurs developing wings and becoming birds. Beneficial outcomes are rare, but many examples have been observed. Spontaneous generation of new functionality by which one type of living organism has transformed into a new and distinctive type of organism has never been observed, and evidence for the spawning of new kinds from existing kinds is entirely absent from the fossil record.

“Little e” Evolution Defined: Also known as ‘micro-evolution,’ little “e” evolution is defined as variation within a species over time caused by mutation and natural selection. All of the information necessary to account for the observed variation (e.g., noticeably larger beaks in finches) is pre-existent in the ancestors of the species. This is good science. It is observable and repeatable and is backed by a wealth of evidence. “Little e” evolution relies on no unproven assumptions. Few people realize that biblical theists believe in the occurrence of “Little e” evolution at dramatically higher rates than do evolutionists. In the biblical worldview, all of the variation within a species (e.g., different breeds of dogs) has occurred since two dogs survived the global flood only about 4,300 years ago! Evolutionary timelines require millions and billions of years to account for this same degree of genetic variation. Speciation is an example of “Little e” evolution at work. As some genes are favored in some environments, over time new variations (or ‘breeds’) can arise within the kind. In all cases however, the new breed is still of the same *kind* as its ancestors. Dogs can produce other breeds of dogs over time, but dogs can never produce cats or chickens or alligators. It is not within the capabilities of their genes to do so. It would also require the spontaneous development of new features and functionalities and/or radical changes to existing features. These would necessitate the introduction of lots of **new** and highly ordered information into the genome and this cannot be accounted for by mutation or natural selection.

“Big E” Evolution Defined: Also known as ‘macro-evolution,’ evolution with a big “E” is defined as the belief that all living things have a common ancestor, presumably the first simple living organism that crossed the line from the inorganic (non-living) world to the organic (living) world. Inherent in this belief is the requirement that simple life forms became more and more complex over time as the result of random, undirected (or non-directional) processes. “Big E” evolution requires the complexity of the information in the gene pool to have increased dramatically over millions of years from the simplest life form (e.g., a single-celled bacteria or amoeba swimming around in the primordial soup) to the most complex (e.g., modern man). Evolutionists attribute this increase in genetic information to mutation, natural selection and random chance - none of which have

ever been observed to result in even the slightest increase in genetic information. “Big E” evolution claims that lower (less evolved) life forms morphed into higher (‘more evolved’) life forms through random chance over time with the survival of only the variations most favored by the local environment (survival of the fittest). Again, evidence for these variations or “intermediate forms” is entirely absent from the fossil record.

How did Darwin address the problem of the complete lack of intermediate species (or *transitional forms*) in the fossil record? He believed that the fossil record was simply too limited and incomplete during his time but he assured us that the transitional forms would eventually surface. In his *Origin of Species* he wrote:

*“The number of intermediate varieties which have formerly existed on earth must be truly enormous. Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? **Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain**; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.”*

- Charles Darwin, 1902

Today’s fossil record is vastly more extensive than that of Darwin’s era and yet today **we still have not found one verified example of a transitional species**. Where are the hundreds of millions of them that should be mingled in with other fossil discoveries? They are entirely missing.

“Big E” evolution is simply bad science. It is not observable or repeatable, and there is a glaring absence of evidence for its major tenets. It relies on the application of extensive unproven assumptions for credibility. While there is nothing wrong with discussing it as an unproven theory (however flawed), it should never be considered fact. Great leaps of faith are required of its adherents as well as the intentional avoidance of its empirical gaps. Predisposition against an intelligent designer or any supernatural intervention is also strictly required prior to any interpretation of the evidence. The conclusion of

“millions of years” for the age of the earth was not reached because the evidence supports it, but because the theories and presuppositions of “Big E” evolution require it. The millions of years also provide a handy excuse from the rules for observable evidence because evolution, it is claimed, is happening too slowly to be observed within our short lifetimes. For this reason, the “observable evidence” requirement endemic to other areas of science is waived for evolution researchers. How convenient.

Let me emphasize again that neither mutation nor natural selection has ever been observed to add information to the genetic code, yet “Big E” evolution **requires** that they produce immense amounts of new genetic information. For them to do so would be a marvelous feat indeed not only because of the great complexity of the genetic code itself but also due to the intricacy of the processes by which the code is interpreted at the cellular level and converted into the millions of inter-reliant proteins. Additionally, cell types would have to work together in coordinated harmony to make possible marvelous physiological functions such as sight, hearing, touch, depth perception, etc. These complex functions rely on several interdependent bio-systems (skeletal, muscular, nervous, circulatory, etc.) that must all work together intricately and exactly to support such physiological capabilities. It is self-evident that this marvelous orchestration could never have been the result of random chance or incidental damage at the genetic level. The odds against it are far beyond statistical impossibility. The odds diminish even further with the requirement that these new systems develop in a sequential, coordinated manner (presumably without design) over various independent physiological systems if new functionality is to be added to a species. “Molecules-to-man” (Big E) evolution would require this to happen many thousands or millions of times in coordinated succession. The odds of this occurring by chance are far beyond mathematically absurd.

Individual species are defined by features and physical characteristics (or combinations thereof) that are unique only to that species (e.g., rhinoceroses have large horns; giraffes have long necks, etc.). If a new species came about through a successful series of random changes over time, for each successful new feature or characteristic there

would have had to have been hundreds or thousands of grotesque random growths representing failed variations preserved in the fossil record, such as nostril designs that did not work (e.g., 15 nasal holes, no nasal holes, etc.), stubby appendages with any number of elbows, any number of fingers, any number of fingernails per finger with any number of joints in each finger. “Big E” evolution would require a multitude of such intermediate variations if true, and the fossil record should be full of such short-lived, failed, random and chance growths. How many of these chance, random configurations have anthropologists found? Again, virtually none.

*“Natural selection (done in the wild) and artificial selection (as done by breeders) produce enormous varieties within the different kinds of plants and animals. **It has proved an impossible feat, however, to change one kind of creature into a different kind of plant or animal.** The so-called ‘kind barrier’ has never been crossed. Such evolution has never been observed.”*

- Monty White, PhD¹³

The late Dr. Colin Patterson, formerly the Senior Paleontologist at the prestigious British Museum of Natural History, published a book in 1978, simply called *Evolution*. When challenged as to why he had not shown one single photograph of a transitional fossil in his book, Dr. Patterson responded with the following amazing confession (which was reproduced in its entirety in Luther Sunderland’s book *Darwin’s Enigma*):

*“I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. **If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them.** You suggest that an artist should be used to visualize such transformations, but where would he get the information from? I could not, honestly, provide it, and if I were to leave it to artistic license, would that not mislead the reader?”*

He went on to say:

¹³ A Pocket Guide to Charles Darwin: His Life and Impact; Answers in Genesis, 2009; p. 66.

“...Gould [Stephen J. Gould—the now deceased professor of Paleontology from Harvard University] and the American Museum people are hard to contradict when they say there are no transitional fossils... You say that I should at least ‘show a photo of the fossil from which each type of organism was derived.’ I will lay it on the line—there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument.”

What *do* paleontologists find in the fossil record? Only evidence of very distinct genera or “kinds” with great variability evident only within each kind, and virtually no evidence of variability that could link the kinds in a succession of progressive advancements. Such intermediate forms (chicken-dogs, bat-cats, dolphin-moose, duck-cheetahs, rhinoceros-gazelles, etc.) are entirely absent from the fossil record. Furthermore, the repeating patterns within the creation (two eyes, one elbow per arm, two gills, one mouth, two wings, five fingers, one spine, etc.) are very strong evidence of a common designer of all living things. Random, undirected change completely fails to account for these very commonly repeated patterns.

In the Name of Evolution

One of the best methods of examining the merits of a philosophy or worldview is to see what effect it has had on civilizations and cultures throughout history. At the center of free, democratic societies is the moral underpinning that “All men are created equal” with equal rights to survival, happiness and opportunity. In contrast to this, the central philosophy of fascist governments and political groups is that the ruling race has an innate right to persecute, oppress and forcefully eliminate (murder) other people groups based on some external criteria of superiority (e.g., bloodline, skin color, etc.). Note then that all belief systems based on evolutionary thinking align races and people groups incrementally from least evolved (more primate) to most evolved (more human). It is easy to see how quickly Darwinian thought can be adopted to undergird and justify racial atrocity under the rationalization that the oppressor race is “more highly evolved”

than the oppressed race and is therefore more “fit to survive.” While it is true that racism and fascism certainly existed before Darwinism, so it is also certain that the introduction of evolutionary thinking has greatly fueled the “superior race” mentality and has directly and indirectly resulted in an ocean of human carnage and suffering.

Hitler and Darwinism

“...all this doesn’t mean that Darwinism was the sole cause of Hitler’s barbarism. But it does make clear that Darwinism must shoulder its share of the moral burden, because the connection is undeniable.” - Benjamin Wiker¹⁴

*“Darwinism by itself did not produce the Holocaust, but without Darwinism... neither Hitler nor his Nazi followers would have had the necessary **scientific underpinnings** to convince themselves and their collaborators that one of the world’s greatest atrocities was really morally praiseworthy.”* - Richard Weikart¹⁵

*“National Socialism is nothing but **applied biology**.”*
- Rudolf Hess, Deputy Party Leader of the Nazis¹⁶

“The racial thought of Herr Hitler begins with a popularized conception of Darwin’s evolutionary hypotheses, which are turned to surprising uses.” - Rudolf Hess

“ ... struggle, selection, and survival of the fittest, all notions and observations arrived at ... by Darwin ... but [were] already in

¹⁴ Wiker PhD, Benjamin; “Darwin and Hitler: In Their Own Words”; <http://www.discovery.org/a/5159>.

¹⁵ Weikart, Richard; *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany*; Palgrave-MacMillan, 2004.

¹⁶ Hitler, Adolf; *The Racial Conception of the World*; ed. Charles Grant Robertson (London: Friends of Europe, 1938).

*luxuriant bud in the German social philosophy of the nineteenth century. ... thus developed the doctrine of **Germany's inherent right to rule the world on the basis of superior strength** ... [of a] "hammer and anvil" relationship between the Reich and **the weaker nations**."* - A. Keith¹⁷

*"The pre-requisite for improvement of the species lies not in the union of the superior and the inferior, but in the complete victory of the former. The stronger must dominate and not mix with the weaker, and thereby sacrifice its own greatness. Only the born weakling can feel this to be cruel. He is indeed but a weak and limited creature. If this law did not prevail, **any higher evolution of all organic life** would be unthinkable."* - Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf*

The connection between Hitler and Darwinism is well documented. Hitler relied on Darwinian thought to support and justify the doctrine of the genetic superiority of the Armenian race and its right to rule over—and to kill—other weaker, 'genetically inferior' races.

Eugenics and Darwinism

The term "Eugenics" encompasses the idea that civilizations can improve their "genetic quality" by controlling the breeding of the less fit members of society. In 1863, Sir Francis Galton, a cousin of Charles Darwin, theorized that if talented people only married other talented people, the result would be measurably better offspring. Sadly, eugenics was first practiced in the United States years before Hitler came to power. American eugenics practitioners coercively sterilized some 64,000 citizens, barred the marriage of thousands¹⁸, and

¹⁷ A. Keith, *Evolution and Ethics*, G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1946; p. 230.

¹⁸ America's Hidden History: The Eugenics Movement, Laura Rivard September 18, 2014 <http://www.nature.com/scitable/forums/genetics-generation/america-s-hidden-history-the-eugenics-movement-123919444>

incarcerated thousands into “colonies”¹⁹ in order to prevent them from “eroding the quality of society.”

Though it did not originate with him, eugenics was well aligned with Darwin’s worldview, and he certainly was an actor who greatly extended its influence. He vehemently decries the divergence of man’s behavior with that of animals on this point...

*“With savages, the weak in body or mind are soon eliminated; and those that survive commonly exhibit a vigorous state of health. We civilized men, on the other hand, do our utmost to check the process of elimination; we build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment...Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic **animals** will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of **man**... excepting in the case of man himself, hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst **animals** to breed.”*

—Charles Darwin²⁰

Oh that we should be faster to destroy the weak, the sick, the old and the defenseless among us. If only we were more apt to be “red in tooth and claw” after the fine example of the vultures and scavengers of the animal kingdom, how much better off our civilization would be and how much happier would be the Darwinists among us!

The Nazi regime embraced Galton’s idea of eugenics and Darwin’s extensions of it as a means to separate their citizenry into the classes of the “fit” and the “useless eaters.” Under legislation such as the Law for the Prevention of Hereditarily-Diseased Offspring, Nazi “health courts” ordered **the sterilization of more than 300,000 people** between 1934 and 1945. This led to the next step called “euthanasia” and a program entitled “Aktion T4,” which allowed for the “mercy killing” of incurable patients and the mentally retarded in order to

¹⁹ The Horrifying American Roots of Nazi Eugenics, Edwin Black, September 2003
<http://historynewsnetwork.org/article/1796>

²⁰ Darwin, Charles; *The Descent of Man*; p. 873.

clear hospitals and free up beds and other resources needed by front-line Nazi soldiers. After the German people became aware of what was happening, they raised an outcry of public dissent and Hitler suspended this program in 1941. By that time **80,000 to 100,000 'patient's' lives had been ended**. Selective killing of the unfit continued in German hospitals until the end of the war.

Abortion and Darwinism

Prior to the introduction of Darwinian ideology in the mid-1800s, the belief that all humans were created in the image of God was nearly widely accepted throughout Europe. This truth was the basis for laws against murder, infanticide, abortion and suicide. The underlying concept was that man did not have the right to destroy what God had created in His own image. By the end of the nineteenth century however, public acceptance of this basic tenet had eroded significantly. What were the primary events that lead to this change?

Biologist Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919) first read Darwin's *Origin of Species* while studying single celled marine life. After his beloved first wife suddenly fell ill and died, Haeckel wrote that religion had become a complete farce in his eyes. Later, he became the first German advocate for the killing of the weak and sick members of society in order to promote the overall quality of the whole, and in his mind this practice was the logical succession of his Darwinist worldview.

After studying fetal development, Haeckel theorized that as each individual embryo develops from a fertilized egg to adulthood, it passes through each of the evolutionary stages of its ancestors. Based on this idea, Haeckel argued that newborn infants were in an evolutionary stage equivalent to their animal ancestors. He stated that a newborn child "*not only possesses no consciousness and no reason, but is also dumb and only gradually develops the activity of the senses and of the mind.*" He further concluded that **newborn infants have no soul, so killing them is an amoral act** no different than killing any other animal and therefore should not be considered murder. Since

infanticide had become justified in Haeckel's mind, it will come as no surprise that he also justified the killing of the unborn on similar grounds, even though he did believe that life begins at conception. He even celebrated his 84th birthday nine months early, explaining to his students that a human being is really nine months of age at birth. But since he believed that an embryo represents pre-human stages of evolutionary development, it does not have the full value of humans until it becomes "more highly evolved" as it matures in the womb. Until the embryo reaches this stage, Haeckel reasoned *"that the developing embryo, just as the newborn child, is completely devoid of consciousness, is a pure 'reflex machine,' just like a lower vertebrate."* **and can therefore be killed with impunity any time before birth.** It is alarming that this reasoning is used in nearly its original form to justify the slaughter of millions of unborn children to this day all across the globe.

Noting again that Haeckel attributed his justification of abortion to his Darwinian worldview and that his ideas have carried forward to today, we can largely attribute the loss of 56 million American lives by legalized abortion to Darwinian ideology.

The Columbine Shooters and Darwinism

Columbine High School murderers Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold were strongly influenced by Darwinian and Nazi ideologies, and they selected Hitler's birthday as the occasion of their brutal and bloody crime.

*"Harris wore a 'Natural Selection' T-shirt on the day of the killings. They made remarks on video about helping out the process of **natural selection** by eliminating the weak. They also professed that they had **evolved to a higher level** than their classmates."*²¹

²¹ <http://www.amnation.com/vfr/archives/014745.html>

*"Harris was so firmly convinced a Darwinist as to say that inoculating human beings and plants was an interference in nature's process of eliminating weeds. He even said there should be no warnings on dangerous goods; 'let natural selection take its course. All the fat, ugly, retarded, crippled dumbass, stupid ... in the world would die ... Maybe then the human race can actually be proud of itself.' he said."*²²

*"I read through every single page of Eric Harris's journals; I listened to all of the audio tapes and watched the videotapes ... It became evident to me that **Harris consciously saw his actions as logically arising from what he had learnt about evolution.** Darwinism served as his personal intellectual **rationale for what he did.** There cannot be the slightest doubt that Harris was a worshipper of Darwin and saw himself as acting on Darwinian principles."*²³

*"Harris and Klebold did not just gun down their victims in cold blood. They laughed and hollered while they were doing it, as though they were having the time of their lives."*²⁴

Can there be any doubt that evolutionary ideas such as "survival of the fittest," "natural selection" and "more highly evolved" were central themes in the thinking of these two who laughingly murdered 18 classmates and injured 25 others before destroying their own lives? Could it be that the sanctioning of Darwinian thinking in our classrooms, with its erosion of the sanctity of human life and its denial of the reality of personal accountability to our Creator has opened the way for the flood of violence, bullying, bloodshed and murder that we have seen in our classrooms since its adoption?

²² <http://www.harunyahya.com/en/Articles/159216/the-role-of-the-theory>

²³ <http://www.amnation.com/vfr/archives/014745.html>

²⁴ <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/apr/17/columbine-massacre-gun-crime-us>

Racism and Darwinism

A primary concept in “Big E” evolution is the teaching that all living things have descended from the first living organism. As time progressed, more complex life evolved from the more simple, and higher orders of living organisms developed out of the lower orders. This is sometimes referred to as Darwin’s “Tree of Life.” According to evolutionists, in the more recent history of the human species, apes became further and further evolved until they eventually crossed a line and a new animal (or “kind”) popped into existence: mankind. Presumably, mankind was separate and distinct from the ape-like creatures he evolved from, and the races within the species *homo sapiens* represent different stages of evolutionary development. The later stages of development produced the most intelligent and advanced of the races of man, and they are considered more highly evolved. In view of the hierarchy of the races then, those most resembling their ape-man ancestors are considered the least evolved, and those whose features are the most distinct from the primate ancestors are the more highly evolved. According to this scale, those with black skin and larger facial features are considered lower animals, with the Australian Aborigine being the lowest order of the races. Though today’s mainstream ideology is not directly aligned with this sort of racist thinking, such was not the case at the turn of the twentieth century. At that time Aborigines and African Bushmen specimens were in high demand in museums across the world. High premiums were paid for such specimens, and human poachers captured or killed these men, then sold them on the black market so they could be made part of educational exhibits. They were displayed dead (and sometimes alive) alongside apes and labeled as “degraded,” “savages” and “brutes.”

One such man was Ota Benga who was born in Central Africa. One day after a hunting expedition, Ota returned home to find his wife, two children and his entire village massacred and mutilated by militants from the Belgian government who were conducting a murderous campaign against “the evolutionary inferior natives.” Ota was captured and sold as a slave. Ota was brought to the United States by an African explorer and he became part of a Louisiana Purchase

exhibit in the 1904 world's fair in St. Louis and was placed in a cage with iron bars. Standing less than five feet tall and weighing just over 100 pounds, day after day Ota crouched in a corner of his cage shielding himself as best he could while crowds of people surrounded him laughing and jeering, throwing rocks and coins and yelling insults and obscenities at him. Some came to fight with Ota and the pygmies on display, and many days it was a struggle for the attending officials to keep them from being torn to pieces. Later Ota and his American owner returned to the Congo for a short time where he married a Botwa woman who soon afterward died of a snake bite. After returning to America in 1906, Ota was tricked into being featured in an exhibit at the Bronx zoo, sharing a cage with apes. After his ordeal, Ota was released and cared for in a black community where he learned to read, attended classes at a seminary and was employed in a tobacco factory. Eventually, Ota lost hope of ever returning to his homeland, and he grew more and more lonely and depressed. Finally in 1916, Ota fired a bullet through his chest ending his own life. His tragic life was an example of the immense human suffering and many millions of lives lost because of the racism, dehumanization and genocides that have been the direct or indirect result of Darwinist ideology.

What was not understood in Darwin's era is that the differences in human skin color are not due to degrees of evolutionary development nor are they attributable to fundamental biological differences between races; but they are simply due to variations in levels of melanin in the skin. Melanin is a brown pigment present in the skin of every human being (though melanin production and distribution is inhibited in albinos). The color of one's skin is determined by differences in each individual's genetic makeup. In fact, in rare cases, the twins of parents having the same or similar skin color can be of opposite skin colors.



Biologists have noted that the genetic basis for racial differentiators (facial characteristics, skin tone, etc.) comes from only a 0.012% variation in genetic information. Furthermore, any two people in the world have a 99.8% genetic commonality with only a 0.2% variation! This evidence flies directly in the face of the idea that there are significant differences between the races or that outward “racial characteristics” indicate more advanced or superior development of one ethnic group over another.

And this we teach in our schools?

Many of the destructive core ideologies popularized by Darwin had been in existence long before his work provided a ‘scientific’ basis for their wide acceptance. An honest survey of history however, will easily convince the objective student that the ideologies furthered and popularized by Darwin have been the root of immense oppression, suffering, violence and bloodshed beginning with the later third of the nineteenth century.

Darwinist Ideology	Historical Consequences
<p>Man was not created to be the beloved children of an infinite creator God. Man is rather the descendant of the simplest living organism whose life originated entirely as a result of chance. Men's lives have no divine meaning or destiny and little or no value in the overall scheme of the survival of the fittest. There is no deep meaning or ultimate purpose in life.</p>	<p>Suicide – especially among teens Depression and drug abuse Gangs and street violence</p>
<p>Mankind was not created in the image of God. Man is simply a more highly evolved animal. Therefore the destruction of human life is no more immoral than the extermination of animal life.</p>	<p>Abortion Murder Genocide</p>
<p>Mankind is divided into races, with the more evolved having superiority and rulership rights over the less evolved.</p>	<p>War Racism Slavery Genocide</p>
<p>Because there is no God, there is no basis for an absolute code of morality.</p>	<p>Divorce Rape Incest Fatherlessness Crime Pornography Prostitution</p>

How compatible are Darwin's ideas with those most respected in our culture and the history of our country?

*"We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are **created equal**; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."*

—Thomas Jefferson, U.S. Declaration of Independence

Thomas Jefferson's statement that all men are created equal by their Creator directly implies that they are also entitled to the same set of human rights regardless of their ethnic origin or genetic makeup. This is in direct opposition to the evolution-based idea of the superiority of one race or ethnic group over another even though it took another 100 years before this truth was reflected in U.S. public policy regarding the slavery of blacks.

*"The God who made the world and everything in it is the Lord of heaven and earth... **from one man he made all the nations**, that they should inhabit the whole earth."*

—The Apostle Paul, *Book of Acts*, Chapter 17, (NIV)

Here Paul directly states that the common ancestor of each man is the first man created by God in a beautiful garden, not protoplasm wiggling around in some primordial mud hole. The differences and resulting implications between these two ideas could not be more drastic. If all races are the descendants of the same original, fully human father and mother, then men of all races are indeed brothers of one bloodline, entitled to full respect and equality under God.

"When a Samaritan woman came to draw water, Jesus said to her, 'Will you give me a drink?' (His disciples had gone into the town to buy food.) The Samaritan woman said to him, 'You are a Jew and I am a Samaritan woman. How can you ask me for a drink?' (For Jews do not associate with Samaritans.)"

—The Gospel of John, Chapter 4 (NIV)

Christ himself (whose birth divides history into B.C. and A.D.) during his brief visit to our planet taught the equality of all men. Being a Jew born of Hebrew parents, Christ demonstrated his hatred of racism and his commitment to the respect of women by holding a public conversation with one of the Jew's ethnic enemies—a Samaritan, and a woman at that. In one act he violated the two primary taboos of first-century Hebrew culture. For any man desiring to build a reputation for being a distinguished member of the Jewish hierarchy, this was social suicide. By this radical act Jesus was loudly proclaiming that there is no racial or gender-based favoritism in the eyes of God, but that all men and women are created equal in His sight. Again in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus selected the ethnic enemy of his own people to be the hero of the story and at the same time highlighted the hypocrisy of his own culture's religious elite. Christ's teaching and the example of His life fly in the face of the false idea of the genetic superiority of one race over another.

These are some of the primary foundational ideas that form the basis of equality and human rights in our country. Attempts to teach respect for these time-honored truths alongside Darwinist ideology is contradictory and destructive to the principles that have made our country great among the nations.

Conclusion

Charles Darwin is famous for his work on the Galapagos Islands where he noted the variation in the beaks of finches over time, and cited this as an example of natural selection at work. Had he written a book called *On the Variation Within Species Over Time*, he could have stayed on solid scientific ground. When he extended his findings to account for the origin of all species from a common ancestor, he unapologetically crossed the line from science to speculation. Was there perhaps something in his life experience that predisposed his thinking to a bias against the supernatural as he interpreted the evidence?

Darwin suffered great personal tragedy and loss during the painful disease-related death of his 10-year-old daughter Annie. After this rocked the foundations of his Christian worldview, he later lost another daughter after only a few weeks of life and another son who never reached his second birthday. Though he was once in training to become a preacher, Darwin had an incomplete understanding of man's present condition on Earth, and his belief system could not account for the presence of suffering, evil and death. He eventually became bitter and rejected the God of the Bible. His science speculation continued to deepen until it became a full-fledged atheistic worldview that attempts to explain life on Earth and the existence of mankind without the need for a Creator. Evolution with a big "E" became the scientific excuse Darwin needed to reject the God that he felt had abandoned him.

Darwin fell victim to disappointment with God because of the existence of disease, sorrow, pain, suffering and death on the Earth. He was one of many who failed to understand the stark reality that our present world is under a curse because of the fall of mankind and our rejection of God, His love and His commandments. A careful reading of Genesis will reveal that God did indeed create a perfect world and that His intent was that man should live in a state of intimacy with his Father God, having everything necessary for a joyful and eternal life. God's design excluded disease, pain and death; but because love is impossible without free will, God gave man choices along with clearly stated consequences of those choices. Despite having all he could possibly hope for, man chose what God had forbidden. It was man's rebellion and man's choice to introduce suffering, disease and death into the world, not God's. In His mercy and love, God later came to Earth in person—in the form of Jesus Christ. His purpose was to take on Himself the punishment and consequence of man's disobedience and rebellion so that we as individuals would have the chance to escape the awful consequences of our moral crimes and bad choices. Through the sacrifice He made on our behalf, He took our punishment upon himself so that we could be reconciled to God. He also promised that suffering, disease, sin and death itself would be destroyed and that the earth would one day be restored to a state of beautiful perfection where again "the lion will

lay down with the lamb,” and the fear of death would be forever abolished. Yes, our present world is a mixed bag of beauty and disease, joy and tragedy because it is a perfect world in a fallen, cursed state. But in spite of the reality of the terrible pain we experience in our worst times, we can know that this is a temporary condition and that one day soon the sorrow will end forever. For those who believe and trust in His promise, Christ has left a great hope in our hearts that is a deep and real comfort to carry us through the dark and painful valleys that come our way until that day. Had Darwin understood that God had sent his own Son to free us from the present curse that the world is under, perhaps he would not have felt a need to preclude God from his science and his worldview.

Points to Remember

1. Within kinds, living things exhibit change which may result in new and different breeds over time (speciation). The idea of existing kinds morphing into entirely new kinds by a series of gradual changes, however, is completely unsupported by the fossil record and the tenets of observable biological science.
2. In order for “Big E” evolution (molecules-to-man) to have occurred, the fossil record would have had to be replete with examples of transitional forms, but none have been found after several hundred years of paleontology.
3. Neither of the two driving forces of evolution, neither mutation nor natural selection are capable of adding any information to the genome, much less the extensive amounts of information needed to produce different and distinct new kinds. The (presumed) availability of long periods of time does not resolve this limitation.
4. Evolutionary thinking excludes the truths of
 - an absolute and immutable basis for morality
 - human free will
 - man’s ultimate accountability to God

As a result, it has become the basis for justifying extreme acts of evil such as racism, abortion, genocide and revenge killing (murder). Evolutionary thinking is dangerous to society and has been the root cause of massive amounts of suffering, killing and bloodshed since its advent in history.

Questions for Discussion and Review

1. Define, in your own words, the terms *natural selection*, *mutation*, *micro-evolution* and *macro-evolution*.
2. What are the primary flaws in Darwin's theory of macro-evolution?
3. What life experiences did Darwin suffer that led to his predisposition against the supernatural?
4. In your opinion, was Darwin's bitterness against God justified? Personal tragedies and suffering often result in bitterness against God. Must this always be the case? Why or why not?
5. What are some examples of evil deeds in history that are directly or indirectly traceable to evolutionary thinking? Explain their linkages to evolutionary thought.

6. Would society be justified in preventing those with physical or mental flaws from reproducing in order to create a higher quality gene pool? Should the unwanted members of society (the untimely conceived, the aging, and those with birth defects, mental challenges or incurable diseases) be killed and eliminated from society in order to preserve resources and prevent them from becoming an economic burden? Why or why not?

Chapter Four:

Bruising My Brain with the Big Bang

Good Science: *The universe as we observe it is slowly expanding.*

Bad Science: *Matter can be produced directly from energy without also producing equal quantities of antimatter.*

Science Fiction: *The theory of general relativity can be applied to show that all things we know (including time itself) emerged from a single tiny object approximately 14 billion years ago.*

What exactly is the Big Bang theory, and why has it become the centerpiece of the discussion around the origin of the universe in both secular and theistic circles?

In 1929, Edwin Hubble's experimental observations implied that relative to the earth and all other observed bodies, galaxies are receding (moving outward) in every direction at velocities directly proportional to their distance from the earth and each other. In order to calculate these velocities, he relied on changes in the wavelength of light from the observed bodies known as "redshift." Of deeper significance was Hubble's observation of far off galaxies, which implied that the rate of expansion of the universe is increasing over time.

With this idea of an expanding universe in place, physicists applied Einstein's theory of relativity (that energy can be converted directly into matter) and extrapolated all the way back to a single point of matter (or "singularity") that is infinitely hot, infinitely small and infinitely dense and from which all objects in the universe originated. Purportedly, this "singularity" was smaller than any object we know of in today's world. It contained not only the "stuff" from which all matter of the universe came, but also all of the incredible expanse of space itself. By using Einstein's relative physics, secular scientists

speculate that the original point (or singularity) did not exist in space and time, but it contained all of space and time *within itself*. As all of the universe expanded from this one point, so did all of space and time. Because of this, it becomes inappropriate to ask questions such as “Where was this singularity located relative to our galaxy?” or “Where did the singularity come from in the first place?” or “What happened before the singularity began to expand because space and time did not yet exist?” Is your brain hurting yet?

The first point to make when discussing the Big Bang is that it has only a thin hair of basis in real, observational science. That thin hair is surrounded by an ocean of speculative theory and outright fiction. When the authors of the Big Bang ran out real physics and scientific observation to support their idea, they resorted to an academic principle known as M.S.U. (“Make Something Up”) to explain away the significant gaps and contradictions. Anyone attempting a serious study of the Big Bang will be presented with several new theories of quantum mechanics and physics, that have no instances or examples in the real universe and which are found nowhere else in science. Here are some examples:

Entity	Definition	Observed Instances
Dark Matter	A hypothetical form of matter invisible to electromagnetic radiation postulated to account for gravitational forces observed in the universe.	0
Dark Energy	The theoretical repulsive force that counteracts gravity and causes the universe to expand at an accelerating rate.	0
Monopoles	All magnets have two poles, but magnets created at extremely high temperatures would have only one pole. Physicists agree that under the extreme conditions they would have been present early in the Big Bang, many magnetic monopoles should have been created. Monopoles	0

Entity	Definition	Observed Instances
	are inherently stable and should still be in existence today, but none have ever been found or detected.	
Cosmic Inflation	In an attempt to account for the flatness problem and lack of existing monopoles, scientists have proposed the idea that the universe went through a brief period of accelerated expansion. This is raw conjecture with no supporting observational evidence. Explanations as to what forces would have started the temporary acceleration, and then nearly perfectly reversed it (leaving the system just slightly out of equilibrium), are unsatisfying or missing altogether.	0
Population III or “First” Stars	Since according to the Big Bang theory all matter was converted directly from energy, the first stars would have had compositions made up entirely of hydrogen, helium and lithium only. These theoretical stars are referred to as Population III stars, yet astronomers have failed to find stars having this composition in our observable universe.	0
Big Foot (aka Sasquatch)	The Big Foot legend is actually not related to the Big Bang theory except that they have the word “Big” in their titles. In addition, they have about the same level of supporting observational science and credibility to back them up.	maybe 1

The Flatness Problem

A “flat universe” is one in which the density (amount of matter present) is just sufficient to halt its expansion (because of the pulling-together effect of gravity), but at the same time insufficient to cause it to collapse back on itself (because of too much matter). This measure of density is referred to as the “density parameter” (Ω_0) and the value of Ω_0 is by definition, exactly equal to 1.0000 at the point where the universe is stable (neither expanding nor contracting). Because space is a frictionless vacuum, once something is set in motion there is no natural resistance to the motion, and it will continue to accelerate as long as the force that set it in motion is present. What we find in today’s universe is that the density factor is very slightly out of balance. This means that (as Hubble observed) the universe is very slowly expanding. In addition, Einstein’s work on relativity tells us that once the density parameter is out of balance, it will continue to grow more and more quickly out of balance in much the same way that a marble sitting on top of a beach ball moves slowly away from the balancing point at first, but once it begins to accelerate away from the balance point, its velocity increases very quickly as it moves down the side of the ball.

These facts are firmly founded in the laws of physics and the equations that govern astrophysics (e.g., Kepler’s Law, etc.). This presents two very significant problems for the Big Bang theory.

Problem #1:

The density factor is too close to equilibrium

If the density factor is so slightly out of balance today, it must have been very, very, very close to equilibrium when the Big Bang initially occurred. The density factor is one of several constants of the universe that have to be very finely tuned for life as we know it to exist today. However, there is simply no scientific reason why the density factor should be so close to perfect equilibrium. To accept the Big Bang theory, we would have to believe, in blind faith, that just by chance the density factor turned out to be the

exact right value (or very nearly so) for the universe to have neither flown apart rapidly nor to have collapsed in on itself by now. In fact, the very slight deviation from equilibrium that we see today is strong evidence that the universe is way younger than the 13.8 billion years claimed by secular science. If it were anywhere near that age, the deviation should have long, long ago accelerated way beyond the rate of expansion that we see today.

Problem #2: 'Cosmic Inflation' makes no sense

The current very tiny deviation from equilibrium leaves no possibility that "cosmic inflation" (the notion that the universe was expanding at a much greater rate for a temporary period sometime in the past) could have occurred. Without this period of supposed rapid expansion (and subsequent reversal back to today's rates), Big Bang physics simply are not possible.

The Energy-to-Matter Problem

Einstein's work on relativity tells us that energy can be converted directly to matter. Though evidence of the effect of relativity exists in the universe (e.g., the bending of local space and time in the vicinity of massive stars having enormous amounts of gravity), relativity is still mostly theoretical; and attempts to produce relativistic behavior in physics laboratories are still in their infancy. Still, relativity is good science based on proven mathematics. The Big Bang theory uses the science of relativity in order to claim that all matter was once stored as energy (and later converted from energy into matter). There are two major scientific problems with this idea:

Problem #1:

Where did the heavier elements come from?

While energy can be converted directly into matter according to Einstein's Law of Relativity, this is only true for the lightest three elements on the periodic table (hydrogen, helium and lithium). From where does the Big Bang presume that the other elements originated, you may ask? The theory is that the first stars in the process (known as Population III stars) were created from the three lightest elements listed above. Later, when some of the Population III stars exploded (in supernovas) the heavier elements were created through nuclear fusion in their cores and distributed across the universe in the proportions that we now see them today. This idea is purely theoretical and extremely improbable with no empirical evidence to support it. In addition, if this model were accurate, there is no reason that Population III stars should not still exist today, but no stars of this composition have ever been observed.

Problem #2:

Not enough antimatter

According the laws of relativity, whenever matter is derived directly from energy, equal amounts of matter and antimatter must be created. Today's universe, however, is comprised almost entirely of matter alone with only trace amounts of antimatter. If the Big Bang theory were the true origin of the universe, there should still be exactly equal amounts of matter and antimatter present today.

Conclusion

In the wake of new and significant discoveries, a pattern emerges from the world's scientific communities. Immediately after making a significant breakthrough (such as the fact that the universe is slowly expanding), the new knowledge often gets stretched and combined with other less than mature knowledge and theories and is extrapolated out until the message from science moves quickly from "We have learned **something!**" to "We have learned **everything!**" The Big Bang theory is a prime example of this pattern.

Much like global warming, the Big Bang theory has become one of the darlings of the scientific community, at least until very recently. Mainstream science has endowed this understanding of origins and its underlying worldview with the approval of the consensus despite its thin veneer of solid science and the fictional underpinnings, which are completely unproven but entirely necessary to keep it afloat. The Big Bang is highly favored in peer reviews, and it has become virtually the only secular theory of origins that receives funding for further research. Because of this, it has become self-perpetuating despite its array of significant scientific flaws.

It is of great significance that many secular astrophysicists are now in overt rebellion against the Big Bang theory. Led by Eric J. Lerner in 2004, thirty three top scientists signed an open letter that was published in *New Scientist* magazine expressing their grievances with the Big Bang hypothesis and their disappointment that it alone has been deemed worthy of funding considerations:

"The big bang today relies on a growing number of hypothetical entities, things that we have never observed—inflation, dark matter and dark energy are the most prominent examples. Without them, there would be a fatal contradiction between the observations made by astronomers and the predictions of the big bang theory.

In no other field of physics would this continual recourse to new hypothetical objects be accepted as a way of bridging the gap

*between theory and observation. It would, at the least, raise serious questions about the validity of the underlying theory. But the big bang theory can't survive without these **fudge factors**....*

In cosmology today doubt and dissent are not tolerated, and young scientists learn to remain silent if they have something negative to say about the standard big bang model. Those who doubt the big bang fear that saying so will cost them their funding....

This reflects a growing dogmatic mindset that is alien to the spirit of free scientific enquiry. Today, virtually all financial and experimental resources in cosmology are devoted to big bang studies. Funding comes from only a few sources, and all the peer-review committees that control them are dominated by supporters of the big bang. As a result, the dominance of the big bang within the field has become self-sustaining, irrespective of the scientific validity of the theory.”²⁵

Big Bang thinking is a classic example of an important spiritual principle:

“In the absence of God, there remains only chaos.”

When man attempts to remove God as the author of the universe and the master mind who designed all things and holds them together in harmony, replacing Him with imagined pseudo-science based substitutes, the end result is embarrassingly inconsistent and inadequate. In the end, the exercise will serve only as a monument to the foolishness and feebleness of the mind of man when compared to the infinite knowledge and power possessed by our marvelous creator God.

Like evolution, the Big Bang should be discussed only as a very improbable theory that has serious and fundamental scientific flaws. With only a basic understanding of the associated science it will be clear to the objective student that it does not merit scientific

²⁵ *New Scientist*, May 22–28 issue, 2004; p. 20.

credibility. And like Darwinian evolution, it requires significant leaps of blind faith to bridge its gaping inconsistencies. For the communities of theists who have embraced the Big Bang in the name of modern science and have attempted to reconcile this theory with the teaching of the Bible (which is in plain contradiction regarding the origin of the universe), it will be an embarrassing day when the secular scientific community puts the final nails in the coffin of the Big Bang. Most probably, that day is coming sooner rather than later.

Points to Remember

1. The feasibility of the Big Bang depends on several theoretical entities that are unproven and unobservable.
2. The universe is comprised almost entirely of matter with only trace amounts of antimatter. The Big Bang theory would require exactly equal amounts of matter and antimatter.
3. The range of values for the density factor of the universe, which allow it to be stable, is extremely narrow. Other than chance, the Big Bang theory gives no explanation as to how the density factor came to be so finely tuned to the value necessary for the stability we observe in the universe today—against all odds.
4. In order to account for the vastness of our universe using the Big Bang theory, a period of extreme “cosmic inflation” would have been required sometime in the past. However, today’s very small deviation from equilibrium leaves no possibility that this could have actually occurred.
5. The Big Bang depends on Einstein’s theory of relativity to explain the presence of all the matter in today’s universe. The conversion of energy to matter, however, can account for only the three lightest elements of the periodic table. The Big Bang explanation for the distribution of the other, heavier elements throughout the universe is extremely improbable and unsatisfying.

Questions for Discussion and Review

1. Is the Big Bang theory based on solid science? Why or why not?
2. What do the Big Bang theory and Darwinism have in common? What, if any, is the relationship between the two theories?
3. Does it seem reasonable to you that the heavier elements representing 95% of the periodic table were distributed throughout the universe by exploding supernovae? Why or why not?
4. Why do you think the Big Bang theory has enjoyed such widely acceptance until recent years? What in the Big Bang theory would humanists and atheists find so appealing?
5. Why are many scientists now beginning to doubt the feasibility of the Big Bang?

Chapter Five:

Climate Change - Is It Getting Warm in Here?

- Good Science:** *Global temperatures can rise and fall over periods of months and years with surface temperatures fluctuating in a sinusoidal pattern over time.*
- Bad Science:** *Continued increases in man-made carbon emissions will cause a disastrous global warming effect.*
- Science Fiction:** *Climate change scientists are able to predict the rate of global warming into the future and severe weather systems are attributable to global warming.*

The climate change scenario is presented to us something like this...

"The overuse of fossil fuels (coal, oil, gasoline) to produce electricity, heat our homes and operate our vehicles is causing carbon emission levels in the atmosphere to increase. This is causing an increase in the greenhouse effect, which in turn is overheating the globe, melting the polar ice caps, raising the levels of the world's ocean tides and destroying the habitats of polar bears and marine life. This warming effect is wreaking havoc on the planet's weather patterns causing every form of severe weather from hurricanes to tidal waves and snowstorms. Science has proven that if we allow this to continue we will eventually destroy the planet and all of mankind along with it. Time is running out! If we don't replace our fossil fuels with renewable energy sources immediately we are all doomed!"

Yowza! That's enough to keep us awake at night and feel a twinge of guilt every time the furnace kicks on or we drive to the grocery store! Surely if I don't throw away my gas-guzzling car and buy an electric

scooter I am condemning my children to a future where all of San Diego will be drowning under water!

Let’s see where this global warming scare comes from, and then we will take a look at the science that it is reportedly based on.

A Brief History of Global Warming

Worry over climate change is nothing new. Since the time when scientists began to monitor global temperatures, concern and sometimes panic have been the result. And surprisingly, the consternation has been about global cooling just about as often as it has been about global warming.

Year	Event
1859	<p>Physicist John Tyndall discovers that some gases block infrared radiation. He suggests that changes in the concentration of the gases could bring about climate change.</p> <p>In the same year Darwin publishes his work <i>On the Origin of Species</i>, which promotes the idea that science can explain the mysteries of life. A shift toward humanism and overconfidence in the abilities of scientists accelerates in the developed countries. With this shift, scientists begin to think they can take responsibility for the preservation of planet Earth.</p>
1894	<p>Svante Arrhenius, a Swedish chemist, follows Tyndall with calculations showing the effects of carbon dioxide (CO₂) on the temperature of the atmosphere. Ironically, Arrhenius welcomes the idea of warming thinking it would improve both the weather and agricultural output in Scandinavia.</p>

Year	Event
1938	Guy Stewart Callendar supports Arrhenius' findings and attempts to refine the scientific understanding of the role carbon dioxide plays in climate change. About this time, Arrhenius publishes the first calculation of global warming from human emissions of CO ₂ . Callendar argues that CO ₂ "greenhouse" global warming is underway, but his CO ₂ theory of climate change is never widely accepted and is soon abandoned.
1960	<p>J. Murray Mitchell Jr., a leading government climatologist reports a downturn of global temperatures since the early 1940s.</p> <p>Charles David Keeling accurately measures CO₂ in the earth's atmosphere and detects an annual rise. At this time the CO₂ level is 315 parts per million (ppm).</p>
1967–1968	<p>The International Global Atmospheric Research Program is established, mainly to gather data for better short-range weather prediction but also includes climate change research.</p> <p>Japanese meteorologist Syukuro Manabe and Dr. Richard Wetherald calculate that doubling atmospheric CO₂ would raise world temperatures a couple of degrees. Some studies are published suggesting a possibility of collapse of Antarctic ice sheets, which would raise sea levels catastrophically. Their work formed a major part of the first global assessments of climate change later published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).</p>
1969–1970	Astronauts walk on the moon and broadcast the first images of an "earthrise" from the backside of the moon. The earth is beginning to be seen as more finite. At the same time, estimates of human achievement and the ability to conquer space and the environment are within reason for the first time in history.

Year	Event
	<p>A major debate arises between those who feared global warming and those who feared “global cooling” and the possibility of a new ice age. Computer modeling in the years that follow reinforce the idea of global warming but the programming assumptions of the models remain unproven. These models assume that human activities play a significant role in warming by releasing CO₂ into the atmosphere through combustion of hydrocarbons, and that the elevated levels of CO₂ would cause significant increases in the greenhouse effect and global temperatures, though strong empirical evidence supporting these correlations is lacking.</p> <p>The Nimbus III satellite starts to provide more comprehensive global atmospheric temperature measurements.</p> <p>“Earth Day” is born (1970). The environmental movement attains stronger influence, spreading concern about global degradation with the recurring theme of man’s destructive influence on the planet.</p> <p>The use of aerosols is shown to be increasing swiftly, causing great concern for the loss of the atmospheric ozone layer, which protects Earth from harmful radiation from the sun. Scientist Reid Bryson claims that aerosols are counteracting global warming and could bring serious cooling. While Bryson consents that climate change and a global increase in temperature are real, he does not believe that they are caused by human activity. Rather, he argues that they were part of natural global climate cycles, particularly the end of the “Little Ice Age.”</p> <p><i>“... all this argument [whether] the temperature [is] going up or not, it’s absurd,” Bryson continues. “Of course it’s going up. It has gone up since the early 1800s,</i></p>

Year	Event
	<i>before the Industrial Revolution, because we're coming out of the Little Ice Age, not because we're putting more carbon dioxide into the air."</i> ²⁶ —Reid Bryson
1971	<p>The SMIC (Study of Man's Impact on Climate) conference of global warming scientists reports a danger of rapid and serious global temperature change caused by humans and calls for an organized research effort.</p> <p>Environmentalists attribute droughts in Africa, Ukraine, and India to global warming, spreading fears about climate change. Some scientists continue to suspect that a cooling effect from aerosols is as likely as a warming effect.</p>
1975–1976	<p>Syukuro Manabe and collaborators produce complex but plausible computer models that show a global temperature rise of several degrees if CO₂ levels were to double.</p> <p>Deforestation begins to be raised as a major factor toward global warming.</p> <p>Solar Astronomer John Eddy's work strengthens the link between sunspots and the earth's temperature (rather than fluorocarbon levels).</p>
1979	A report from the U.S. National Academy of Sciences finds it highly credible that doubling CO ₂ will bring a 1.5–4.5°C global warming effect.
1981	<p>The election of President Ronald Reagan brings a backlash against the rise of environmental groups to power. Political conservatism is linked to skepticism about global warming.</p> <p>Reports of strong global warming since the mid-1970s are</p>

²⁶ Hoopman, Dave; "The Faithful Heretic: A Wisconsin Icon Pursues Tough Questions"; Wisconsin Energy *Cooperative News*, 2007; retrieved 2008-04-21.

Year	Event
	circulated, with 1981 reported to be the warmest year on record.
1987–1988	<p>The Montreal Protocol of the Vienna Convention imposes international restrictions on emission of ozone-destroying gases.</p> <p>Delegates at a conference in Toronto call for strict specific limits on greenhouse gas emissions; UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher is the first significant global leader to call for action.</p> <p>The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is set up by the United Nations on the request of member countries in order to assess the climate change situation in a comprehensive manner. Its charter is to periodically prepare reports and provide comprehensive solutions to global warming and its many effects on the planet.</p>
1989–1990	<p>In response to increasing pressure and the prospect of significant increases in UN and EPA regulation, fossil fuel and other U.S. industries form the Global Climate Coalition (GCC) to represent the views of industry in the global warming debate. Their primary message is that climate science is too uncertain to justify regulatory action.</p> <p>The first IPCC report (1990) is released saying that world has been warming and future warming seems likely.</p>
1992	The International Global Warming conference in Rio de Janeiro produces the “UN Framework Convention on Climate Change,” but the U.S. blocks calls for multilateral regulation on the basis that climate sciences are not conclusive enough to warrant the serious impact on economic stability and growth that overregulation would cause.

Year	Event
1995	The second IPCC report detects a "signature" of human-caused greenhouse effect warming and declares that serious warming is likely in the coming century. Exaggerated reports of the breaking up of Antarctic ice shelves, threats to wildlife habitats and other signs of warming in polar regions begin to sway public opinion.
1997–1998	<p>A UN international climate conference produces the “Kyoto Protocol,” which sets specific targets for industrialized nations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The U.S. Senate refuses agreement to the Kyoto treaty citing that it would result in serious harm to the economy of the United States.</p> <p><i>“The Kyoto Protocol would have legally bound the United States to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions to seven percent below 1990 levels by the years 2008 to 2012.... This would have cost the U.S. economy \$400 billion and resulted in the loss of 4.9 million jobs.”²⁷</i></p> <p>The controversy over the arbitrary assumptions built into the IPCC computer models continues as modeling teams dispense with “special adjustments” that had been often introduced to bring overstated warming in the predictions back in sync with the observed climate data.</p>
2000	The Global Climate Coalition dissolves as some corporations cave in to the “green” message that had gained popularity in the U.S. culture.
2001	The third IPCC report states that global warming, unprecedented since the end of last ice age, is “very likely,”

²⁷ Joint Hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Environment and Public Works Committee, July 24, 2002. (The U.S. Senate passed the Byrd-Hagel Resolution 95-0 in July 1997 codifying refusal to ratify U.S. participation after President Bill Clinton authorized Vice President Al Gore to sign the Kyoto Protocol on the behalf of the U.S.).

Year	Event
	<p>with possible severe impact on the planet.</p> <p>The U.S. abstains from a Bonn, Germany conference, which develops mechanisms for working towards the Kyoto Protocol targets.</p> <p>While UN computer models continue to significantly overshoot global warming predictions, warming observed in the deep water of ocean basins is said to indicate “a clear signature of greenhouse effect warming.”</p>
2002	Environmental studies refer to the lack of predicted catastrophic global warming as “global dimming,” and a “retarded arrival of greenhouse warming.”
2005	<p>Hurricane Katrina and other fierce tropical storms spur additional debate over the impact of global warming on storm intensity.</p> <p>The Kyoto treaty goes into effect but without ratification by the U.S., China or India. Kyoto is later considered a failure when Russia, Japan and Canada abstain from a “second round” of carbon cuts, citing that the Kyoto format did not require developing countries (including China, the world’s No. 1 carbon emitter) to make targeted emission cuts. China notes that they will consent to Kyoto targets once they receive adequate funding from Western countries to do so.</p>
2006	Al Gore's documentary "An Inconvenient Truth" is released in theatres and persuades many but also sharpens political polarization. Gore’s documentary includes a simulation of a polar bear’s demise because of the effect of global warming on his arctic habitat.
2007	The fourth IPCC report warns that serious effects of warming have become evident; and it states that the cost of reducing emissions would be far less than the damage they

Year	Event
	<p>will cause.</p> <p>Al Gore is awarded the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize for his work on global warming. In his acceptance speech he reiterates a prediction from environmental scientists that the North Pole would be ice free by 2014.</p> <p><i>“The [Arctic] ice cap is falling off a cliff. It could be completely gone in summer in as little as 7 years from now.” —Al Gore, 2007</i></p>
2009	<p>The 2009 Copenhagen conference fails to negotiate legally binding agreements, further dampening hopes of forcing countries to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Despite environmental experts’ warning that the effects of global warming are arriving at a faster and more dangerous pace, global warming credibility is significantly damaged when excerpts from hacked e-mails of climate scientists fuel public skepticism. The emails reveal that the scientists have been:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doctoring or withholding data that show global cooling trends • Changing data and dates in order to prevent skepticism • Refusing to reveal the basis for their climate change predictions to the public • Spinning data to support foregone conclusions rather than deducing conclusions based on the data • Organizing efforts to blacklist climate change dissidents <p><i>“We do now have hundreds of emails that give every appearance of testifying to concerted and coordinated efforts by leading climatologists to fit the data to their conclusions while attempting to silence and discredit</i></p>

Year	Event
	<i>their critics.</i> " ²⁸
2012	Superstorm Sandy floods parts of the New Jersey coast, lower Manhattan, and other areas in New York. Environmentalists once again claim that the intensity of such storms is attributable to an increasing global warming trend.
2013	<p>Global warming scientists continue to disregard and explain away the global cooling trend that had then been in effect over the previous 15 years, citing that the warming has been concentrating in deep-ocean waters which were continuing to get warmer.</p> <p>Though CO₂ in the atmosphere reaches its highest level in modern history (397 ppm), the corresponding rapid global temperature rise predicted by IPCC models does not materialize.</p>
2014	<p>Al Gore's prediction that there would no longer be summer ice at the North Pole proves to be significantly off base. Data emerges showing the ice cap 60% thicker than in 2006.</p> <p><i>"Despite Al Gore's 2007 apocalyptic predictions that in just 7 more years the Arctic ice cap [would] be 'completely gone,' it has instead dramatically increased by 43% in size since 2012. The North Pole ice cap grew by 1.715 million square kilometers, an area the size of Alaska, in the last two years. In solidarity, the South Pole ice cap has also reached record-breaking levels, and [now] stands at 20 million square kilometers, the highest level since records began."</i>²⁹</p>

²⁸ Global Warming With The Lid Off, The Wall Street Journal, November 24, 2009
<http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704888404574547730924988354>

²⁹ Banescu, Chris; "Al Gore vs. Reality on Planetary Ice Caps and Global Warming";
http://americanthinker.com/blog/2014/09/al_gore_vs_reality_on_planetary_ice_caps_and_global_warming.html.

Year	Event
	<p><i>"Ralph Cicerone, head of the National Academy (of Sciences), said there are lots of things wrong in his movie, and Al Gore asked him to come and explain this to him, and he did come. And [Al Gore] said, 'Well, what's wrong with my movie?' [Cicerone replied] 'Well, lots of things, like the polar bears. We track polar bears. Not a single polar bear has died because of retreating ice.'"</i>³⁰</p> <p><i>"Even as climate alarmists amplify their call for a worldwide tax on carbon dioxide emissions... penguins, polar bears, Himalayan glaciers and Arctic sea ice are all thriving. With dire proclamations of ice-free Arctic summers vehemently debunked... forecasts that Canada's polar bear population would significantly decline due to global warming have been proven completely inaccurate."</i>³¹</p> <p><i>"The amount of floating ice in the Arctic's Bering Sea—which had long been expected to retreat disastrously by climate-Cassandra organizations such as Greenpeace—reached all-time record high levels last month, according to U.S. researchers monitoring the area using satellites. The U.S. National Snow and Ice Data Center announced last week that ice extent in the Bering for the month of March has now been collated and compared, and is the highest seen since records began."</i>³²</p>

In light of this history, let's do some question and answer about the science behind the global warming scare.

³⁰ Johnson, Brad; "Muller Misinformation #3: Al Gore and polar bears"; <http://www.skepticalscience.com/Muller-Misinformation-3-Al-Gore-polar-bears.html>.

³¹ Watson, Paul Joseph; "Penguins, Polar Bears, Glaciers, Arctic Ice All Thriving"; <http://www.infowars.com/penguins-polar-bears-glaciers-arctic-ice-all-thriving>.

³² Page, Lewis; "Amount of ice in Bering Sea reaches all-time record"; http://www.theregister.co.uk/2012/04/11/bering_sea_ice_cover/.

Are We Melting Down?

Q. Is the globe warming and if so, is this warming directly attributable to human causes?

A. Recent global warming and cooling trends are not directly attributable to human causes.

The temperature of the earth goes through unpredictable warming and cooling cycles. When significant warming occurred between 1900 and 1940, no one knew if the warming trend would continue. A global cooling trend followed, lasting from the mid-1940s through about 1975. During this time, concerns over global warming abated, and speculation about a coming ice age took their place. The climate temperature trend reversed again, and warming was observed from the mid-1970s through the late 1990s; and it then began to once again taper off. During this uptrend period, international attention to global warming was at its peak. Since 2002 the earth has seen another downtrend in global temperatures. Since the human factors that are reportedly responsible for global warming (carbon emissions, industrialization, etc.) have increased steadily through these periods, no direct correlation between global temperatures and human factors should be drawn, nor should it be expected that reversals in the increase of CO₂ emission levels would have a defining impact on global temperatures.

A common misunderstanding is that atmospheric CO₂ levels are the only contributor to the earth's greenhouse effect. CO₂ is just one of several gases (including methane [CH₄] and nitrous oxide [N₂O]) that work together to trap heat from the sun in the earth's atmosphere. Increased levels of CO₂ may play a minor factor in atmospheric temperatures, but increased levels of CO₂ since the industrial revolution have not been a major causal factor affecting global temperature cycles.

What about the GCM Predictions?

Q. Can computer models accurately predict future global warming based on CO₂ emissions?

A. No. Global temperature trends and large-scale weather patterns are very unstable and unpredictable. While science continues to provide an increasing knowledge base regarding the factors that affect atmospheric conditions, large-scale weather patterns represent a very complex system that we do not yet understand adequately enough to model accurately. Attempts to predict these trends further than a few weeks out have never demonstrated reliable results. The GCM (Global Climate Model) computer models developed by the IPCC required regular “special adjustments” in order to sync their forecasts with real, observed weather patterns thus betraying errors in the underlying assumptions and calculations. As measured CO₂ levels have increased, the corresponding increases in global temperatures have not materialized. *The models are built on inaccurate assumptions, and they have consistently overstated the warming effects of carbon emissions.* Had they been based on solid proven science, this would not have been the case.

Ulterior Motives Perhaps?

Q. What would motivate environmental scientists to exaggerate global warming data or attempt to suppress critics of their conclusions?

A. Had the global scare been based on solid objective science, forecasts of increasing global temperature changes and melting ice caps would have been accurate. Also, there would have been no need for the environmental scientists to make “special adjustments” to computer models, change dates on data, exaggerate findings or suppress the findings of dissenting scientists.

What might motivate them to stretch or distort their findings?

It is important to realize that there is a great deal of money and political power riding on global warming alarmism. Unfortunately, this sort of research is driven primarily by funding from sources such as the United Nations and the governments of the United States and other countries. The ranks of environmental scientists have swelled as their gloomy predictions of the planet's future have taken root in our political and cultural arenas. Through the scare, politicians and scientists have positioned themselves to be the heroes of the modern world—the progressive thinkers sounding the alarm and preventing the destruction of the planet. Because of this, the climate crisis justifies huge levels of funding and regulatory intervention through political power channels. Without a climate crisis, the need for the political activists, the climate scientists and the professional regulators quickly disappears. It is not an exaggeration to say that many research scientists have built their careers and reputations on their climate change work, both of which are in significant danger if global temperatures cool and observed climate data does not match their predictions.

In addition, because climate change has become a political football, not only do climatologists experience significant financial pressure to conform to the views of those holding the purse strings on research grants, but failure to tow the party line when publishing results could mean risking federal interrogation from the powers that be. If you think this is an exaggeration, consider the recent case of Roger Pielke Jr., a professor of Environmental Studies at University of Colorado-Boulder (UCB). Though Professor Pielke has been an ardent supporter of very restrictive climate change regulations for years, he does not agree with the consensus that carbon emissions are the primary cause of global warming or the increase in the frequency and intensity of natural disasters. In July 2013, he stated on the U.S. Senate floor that:

"It is misleading and just plain incorrect to claim that disasters associated with hurricanes, tornadoes, floods or droughts have increased on climate timescales either in the United States or globally...It is further incorrect to associate the increasing costs of disasters with the emission of greenhouse gases. Hurricanes have not increased in the U.S. in frequency, intensity or normalized

damage since at least 1900.... The same holds for tropical cyclones globally since at least 1970."

If you think that academic freedom is alive and well in America, think again. In response to Pielke's statement, a leading climate change politician Representative Raul Grijalva (D-Arizona), used the weight of his position as a U.S. congressman to institute a congressional investigation of Pielke. Rep. Grijalva sent a letter to Professor Pielke's employer, UCB President Bruce Benson, requesting disclosure of the university's financial policies as they apply to Pielke. Rep. Grijalva also demanded all communications between Pielke and the UCB administration pertinent to his 2013 testimony for the years 2007 through 2015. It is clear that Congressman Grijalva is on a political witch hunt wanting to blow a whistle, associating Pielke with research funding from fossil fuel corporations in an attempt to discredit his congressional testimony. Pielke plainly asserts that he has never received funding from fossil fuel companies but judging from entries in his personal blog, he understood Representative Grijalva's message loud and clear: Fully line up with the agenda, or we will apply the necessary pressure to silence your voice. Pielke's blog notes:

*"The incessant attacks and smears are effective, no doubt, I have already shifted all of my academic work away from climate issues. I am simply not initiating any new research or papers on the topic and I have ring-fenced my slowly diminishing blogging on the subject.... I can't imagine **the message being sent to younger scientists**. Actually, I can: 'When people are producing work **in line with the scientific consensus**, there's no reason to go on a witch hunt.'"*

Congressman Grijalva's investigation also extended to University of Delaware Professor of Geography David Legates who was forced out of his position as Delaware state climatologist because of his skepticism of the global warming predictions of environmental catastrophe. In June of 2014 during congressional testimony, Legates had testified about efforts to silence climate change dissenters and had stated that:

“My overall conclusion is that droughts in the United States are more frequent and more intense during colder periods. Thus, the historical record does not warrant a claim that global warming is likely to negatively impact agricultural activities.”

In reference to the political warfare behind climate change research funding, Legates noted:

“There's a lot more money to be made by saying the world is coming to an end than to say that this is a bunch of hooey.”

Letters similar to the one Representative Grijalva sent to UCB were also sent to the presidents of MIT, Georgia Tech, Pepperdine, Arizona State and the universities of Alabama and Colorado—all schools that have had a climate change researcher appear before Congress. Was this a coincidence, or a tactic meant to pressure academic institutions to conform to the secular consensus?

Debra J. Saunders, a columnist for the *San Francisco Chronicle* states that the position a scientist takes on climate change issues most often makes the difference between them being rich or poor. She further noted in a Townhall.com article:

*“Scientists who reinforce catastrophic predictions continue to get fat government grants...As for Legates, his apostasy forced him out of his post as Delaware state climatologist... I'm just an observer who expects academic disagreements to be settled after passionate debate and civil discourse. What I see instead is an **inquisition** from the side that... build[s] their 'consensus'—**by the heavy-handed use of political muscle and brute intimidation.**”³³*

Additional evidence of the political and financial pressures faced by environmental scientists is found in the number of data manipulation cover-ups that have surfaced around climate change data sources. These issues continue to add to the 2009 email scandal to further

³³ Saunders, Debra J.; “Political Science: Heat’s on Climate Change Dissidents”; <http://townhall.com/columnists/debrajsaunders/2015/03/01/political-science-heats-on-climate-change-dissidents-n1963602/page/full>.

degrade the credibility and trustworthiness of this well-funded community. While there are certainly honest scientists among them, the scientific integrity of the movement as a whole has suffered significant damage.

In her article entitled ***Govt-Funded Research Unit Destroyed Original Climate Data***, Christine Hall, Director of Communications at the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), reported on one of the many incidents contributing to the demise of global warming credibility in 2009:

“In the wake of a revelation by a key research institution that it destroyed its original climate data, the Competitive Enterprise Institute petitioned EPA to reopen a major global warming proceeding.

*In mid-August the University of East Anglia’s Climate Research Unit (CRU) disclosed that it had destroyed the raw data for its global surface temperature data set because of an alleged lack of storage space. The CRU data have been the basis for several of the major international studies that claim we face a global warming crisis. **CRU’s destruction of data, however, severely undercuts the credibility of those studies.***

In a declaration filed with CEI’s petition, Cato Institute scholar and climate scientist Patrick Michaels calls CRU’s revelation ‘a totally new element’ that ‘violates basic scientific principles’, and ‘throws even more doubt’ on the claims of global warming alarmists.

CEI’s petition, filed late Monday with EPA, argues that CRU’s disclosure casts a new cloud of doubt on the science behind EPA’s proposal to regulate carbon dioxide. [The] EPA stopped accepting public comments in late June but has not yet issued its final decision. As CEI’s petition argues, court rulings make it clear that agencies must consider new facts when those facts change the underlying issues.

CEI general counsel Sam Kazman stated, '[The] EPA is resting its case on international studies that in turn relied on CRU data. **But CRU's suspicious destruction of its original data, disclosed at this late date, makes that information totally unreliable.** If [the] EPA doesn't reexamine the implications of this, it's stumbling blindly into the most important regulatory issue we face.'

Among CRU's funders are the EPA and the U.S. Department of Energy—U.S. taxpayers."³⁴

Norman Rogers in his *American Thinker* article entitled ***The Corruption of Science*** adds:

"The intellectual foundation for global warming is computer smoke and mirrors. The predictions of doom rely on computer models of the Earth's climate. The only reason to believe these complicated models is the professional judgment of the very climate scientists whose jobs and reputations depend on the believability of those computer models. It's a fox guarding the hen house situation.

*Because global warming actually stopped about 15 years ago [in the late 1990s], the global warming establishment stopped talking about 'global warming' and started talking about 'climate change' and 'extreme weather'. **The scientific basis for the theory that adding CO₂ to the atmosphere will cause extreme weather is very thin.***"³⁵

³⁴ Hall, Christine; "Govt-Funded Research Unit Destroyed Original Climate Data"; <https://cei.org/news-releases/govt-funded-research-unit-destroyed-original-climate-data>. Michaels, Patrick J.; "The Dog Ate Global Warming"; <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/228291/dog-ate-global-warming/patrick-j-michaels>.

³⁵ Rogers, Norman; "The Corruption of Science"; http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2014/05/the_corruption_of_science.html.

Can the U.S. Fix the World?

Q. If indeed it were a credible problem, could the U.S. solve global warming by significantly lowering its CO₂ emissions?

A. No. The U.S. is responsible for only about 16% of world carbon emissions overall. Keeping in mind that reduction in CO₂ levels will have only a minor, if any, effect at all on global temperatures, serious attempts at worldwide reduction of atmospheric CO₂ levels would require the full commitment of the world's major emitters including China, Russia, India, Japan, Germany and a host of minor players such as Mexico, Canada, Italy, France, Spain, Ukraine, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Brazil, and South Africa. Without a concerted international effort, changes made by any one country or small group of countries would have no measurable impact. The failure of the Kyoto Protocol is a case in point and only a handful of the countries in the above lists are willing to enjoin the economic consequences of reducing carbon emissions. Indeed, most of those are the ones that would have little work to do to meet the proposed guidelines into the future. Because of reduced economic stature, industrialization in those countries is already shrinking and their carbon footprint along with it.

On March 30, 2015, the Obama administration bypassed Congress and formally pledged to cut U.S. greenhouse gas emissions by 28% compared to 2005 levels. This "Clean Power" regulatory plan will cost the U.S. economy an estimated \$479 billion. It is a unilateral pledge that comes in the wake of agreements with China that will allow the Chinese to emit more CO₂ in one month than the Clean Power Plan will reduce in the United States in one year. Other than once again increasing the federal government's power to regulate industry and eliminating thousands of jobs in the coal and other industries, there is no scientific consensus that the latest round of Clean Power regulations will have any net positive effect on the environment, especially in light of its unilateral nature.

More CO₂. Is that bad?

Q. If CO₂ levels continue to increase, is that necessarily bad news?

A. CO₂ is a necessary, beneficial and naturally occurring gas that is consumed by plant life and converted into oxygen through the process of photosynthesis. In one sense, burning fossil fuels is beneficial because it returns dead carbon back to life via the carbon cycle—one of the natural processes on our planet.

Increases in CO₂ levels may indeed have several beneficial environmental effects. Commercial greenhouses add CO₂ up to four times the atmospheric levels as a kind of fertilizer to speed plant growth and reduce their water consumption. Increased CO₂ levels would not be directly harmful to humans. OSHA regulations permit up to 5,000 parts per million (ppm) of CO₂ in work areas before long exposure (more than eight hours) is considered possibly harmful to human health. CO₂ levels are not considered immediately harmful until they reach over 40,000 ppm. Currently atmospheric levels measure approximately 396 ppm, so there is plenty of room for increase before posing direct health risks to humans.

It is also important to note that environmental systems exhibit pushback or balancing mechanisms that maintain a state of equilibrium. Nature itself would most likely enact processes (e.g., increased algae populations) to deal with an imbalance of CO₂ in the atmosphere. With regard to its warming capacity, CO₂'s minor role in the greenhouse effect is counterbalanced by the major role it plays in the upper atmosphere where it reflects heat energy away from the earth, thereby causing an overall net cooling effect.

In addition, global warming itself can have many beneficial results. For instance, moderate reductions in arctic ice would open new shipping lanes. A warmer planet would mean longer growing seasons with healthier plants due to higher CO₂ availability and increased agricultural production. Many areas of the world that are uninhabitable because of harsh, cold temperatures (e.g., Siberia) would be opened for agricultural production and human habitation.

A Final Word from Dr. Gray

In conclusion, let's take a look at some excerpts from the presentation of a leading atmospheric scientist who testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. On September 28, 2005 Dr. William Gray from Colorado State University, who has studied climate and weather forecasting for over 50 years, had this to say regarding global warming:

"Over the last 20 years, I have been dismayed over the bogus science and media-hype associated with the nuclear winter and the human-induced global warming hypotheses. My innate sense of how the atmosphere-ocean functions does not allow me to accept either of these scenarios..."

The human-induced global warming scenarios have a major flaw in that they accept the view that an increase in the global hydrologic cycle will cause enhanced upper-tropospheric water vapor gain and a suppression of outgoing long wave radiation (OLR) to space. The opposite is true. Global Climate Models (GCMs) are also not able to realistically predict the ocean's deep water circulation which is fundamental to any understanding of global temperature change...

Although initially generated by honest scientific questions, this topic has long ago advanced into the political arena and taken on a life of its own. It has been extended and grossly exaggerated and misused by those wishing to make gains from the exploitation of ignorance on this subject...

*When a national government takes a political position on a scientific topic, the wise meteorologist or climatologist either joins the crowd or keeps his/her mouth shut. **Scientists can be punished if they do not accept the current views of their funding agents. An honest and objective scientific debate cannot be held in such a political environment...***

Energy budget studies indicate that if atmospheric water vapor and the rate of condensation were held fixed, a doubling of carbon

dioxide would cause only a small (~ 0.2 - 0.3 degree C) global warming. This can be contrasted to the 2–5 degree C warming projected in the [IPCC] models...

[The Global warming scenario's] positive water vapor feedback assumption allows the small initial warming due to human-induced greenhouse gases to be unrealistically multiplied 8–10 times. This is where much of the global modeling is in error...

*Short-range prediction is possible up to a week or 10 days into the future because there tends to be conservatism in the initial momentum fields which can be extrapolated for short periods. But beyond about 1-2 weeks, the multiple unknown and non-linear energy-moisture exchanges within the earth system become dominant. Model results soon decay in chaos. **Numerical [computer] climate models cannot now and likely never will be able to be accurately forecast more than a few weeks into the future...***

Numerical modeling output gives an air of authenticity which is not warranted by the input physics and long periods of integration. How many more climate scares are we to see from climate models which are not able to realistically predict past and future climate changes let alone future decadal or century changes?

Restricting human-induced greenhouse gas emissions now, on the basis of their assumed influence on global warming, is not a viable economic option, even if it were politically possible. China and India would never restrict their growing fossil fuel usage. Restricting greenhouse gas emissions would have little or no effect on global temperature.”³⁶

³⁶ Gray, Dr. William; U.S. Senate Committee on Environment & Public Works Hearing Statements; http://www.epw.senate.gov/hearing_statements.cfm?id=246768.

Points to Remember

1. Global temperatures fluctuate in several decade-long cycles due to natural causes, which are not well understood and are not predictable. Temperature trends over the last 150 years include cyclic and unpredictable periods of global warming and cooling. Both the warming and the cooling periods have recorded panicked warnings around global climate change from scientists. The most recent global warming period was not the first warming trend that has generated alarmists' warnings. Since peaking sometime around 1999, the warming trend has reversed into a long-term cooling trend. Many scientists are now once again turning their attention to the potential threats to society related to global cooling forecasts.
 2. The correlation between CO₂ emissions and increased warming due to the greenhouse effect is very weak and unproven. Many accomplished climate scientists do not agree that increased warming will result from a rise in atmospheric CO₂ levels. Increased CO₂ levels may even prove to be beneficial to the overall environment.
 3. The Global Climate Model (GCM) and other computer simulations have not been able to predict the global warming trends with any degree of accuracy. The assumptions and calculations built into the models have not produced reliable predictions.
 4. It is clear that estimates of the warming effects from man-made emissions have been significantly overstated. The predicted drastic rise in temperatures has not materialized as CO₂ levels have increased over the past several decades.
 5. It is doubtful that numerical models will be able to predict long-term, large-scale weather patterns and trends any time in the near future. A very qualified and experienced meteorologist has testified to Congress that long-term changes in global temperatures and weather patterns remain very complex with far
-

too many variables to lend themselves to reliable predictive modeling.

6. Even if global temperatures were shown to be directly related to levels of greenhouse gases and if threats to mankind from significant climate change were to actually materialize, collaboration and buy-in from most or all of the major industrialized nations of the world would be necessary in order to make changes on the level that would impact global temperatures. International willingness to make economic sacrifices required is far from being attainable any time soon given the world political situation. Unilateral reductions in emissions by the United States would have no significant impact on world climate conditions.

Questions for Discussion and Review

1. What evidences can you list that global weather patterns are not well understood and cannot be accurately predicted by climate scientists?

2. If the U.S. committed itself to significant reduction in greenhouse emissions, what effect might that decision have on economic growth and stability? Why?

3. If the U.S. were to enact a unilateral reduction in carbon emissions while the leaders of the other industrialized countries did not, when the leaders of the other countries observed the significant negative impact on the U.S. economy, would they be likely to follow our lead? Why or why not?

4. If unilateral U.S. commitment to carbon emission reduction had little observable effect on global temperatures, how would that affect the emissions policies of the other industrialized governments?

5. Global climate alarmists have predicted that the polar ice cap would melt by the year 2014, yet it is much larger today than it was in 2007 when the predictions were first announced. In addition, the rise in global temperatures forecasted by climate change scientists has failed to materialize as CO2 levels have increased. How do these facts affect your view of the necessity for the many expensive environmental regulations that the EPA and other federal regulatory agencies have enacted?

Chapter Six:

The New Buzz About the Old Earth

Good Science: *Radiometric dating can be used to provide information about the relative age of rocks.*

Bad Science: *Rock Samples can be accurately dated by means of radiometric dating.*

Science Fiction: *The age of the earth can be accurately determined using radiometric dating and naturalistic uniformitarianism.*

Before we dive into the fascinating topic of the earth's real age, let's take a quick look at how this question has been viewed over the last few hundred years.

What has been the understanding of the age of the earth in recent history?

Did you know that the idea of an "old earth" is actually a relatively recent one? Prior to the late 1700s, you would have been hard pressed to find anyone espousing the idea that the earth was older than several thousand years. As a matter of fact, the belief that the earth is less than 10,000 years old is remarkably consistent in the traditions of various cultures throughout the world.

Table 1. Age of the Earth Traditions from Various Cultures³⁷

Culture	Date of the Earth's Origination	Authority
Spain	6484 B.C.	Strauchius
Chinese	6157 B.C.	Bailly
Egypt	6081 B.C.	Bailly
India	5369 B.C.	Megasthenes
Persia	5507 B.C.	Bailly
Babylon	5344 B.C.	Petrus Alliacens
Samaria	4427 B.C.	Scaliger
German (Holy Roman Empire)	3993 B.C.	Playfair
Israel/Judea (by computation)	3760 B.C.	Strauchius

Early in the nineteenth century Charles Lyell, a British geologist, began to promote the concept of “uniformitarianism.” He insisted that only present-day rates of change and accumulation can be applied when interpreting the layers of the earth’s crust. In other words, we should simply measure rates of sediment accumulation on the earth today, apply that same rate back through history to the depth of the buildup found today on the bedrock layers, and voila! The age of the earth is several hundred million years old... done deal! Lyell’s work put an end to the “catastrophist” geologists of his day who believed that there was strong evidence in the rock layers for either many local floods or a global flood covering all of the earth. Since Lyell’s conclusion, the majority of the work on the age of the earth (based on the analysis of sedimentary layers) has been done under the presupposition that catastrophic flooding was not a factor in the buildup of the earth’s layers. The thinking began to change from *“Does the archaeological evidence point to a global flood?”* to the more biased *“Since we will not accept a global flood, we will interpret the evidence without considering that possibility.”*

³⁷ Hales, William; *A New Analysis of Chronology and Geography, History and Prophecy* (1830), vol. 1; p. 210.

What is the observable, scientific evidence for the exalted concept of uniformitarianism, which has become the cornerstone of secular geologic studies? Uniformitarianism is simply the assumption that the forces affecting the earth's crust have not changed in nature or intensity since the beginning of time. Is there a method of confirming this assumption using observational science? None at all. In fact, what we observe today in the fossil record, which covers the entire earth, best supports the opposite position: that indeed either the earth has undergone a global flood sometime in the past, or at the very least every part of the earth has been affected by one or more local floods at some point in time. Without such a flood (or floods), the abundance of very detailed fossils all over the earth becomes impossible to explain. This will be easier to grasp after taking a look at the conditions and processes necessary to create the detailed fossil record that paleontologists have made available to us in our museums and textbooks.

How do you make a fossil anyway?

To stimulate your thinking around the conditions required to produce the kind of finely detailed fossils we find today, let me recap a conversation I had on this subject with a National Park Ranger a few years ago. My family and I were on vacation in the Midwest, and we found ourselves deep in the heart of the earth in Mammoth Caves National Park in southern Kentucky. After hiking deep into one of the caves on a guided tour, our National Park Service tour guide pointed out the presence of fossil beds just off the trail. She noted that although the fossils were millions of years old, they still preserved fine details of the plants and animals that had lived there. On our way out of that section of the cave, I had an opportunity to talk with her away from the rest of the group. Our conversation went something like this:

Me: These fossils are truly fascinating. How would you say they came to be deep inside this cave?

Park Ranger: The plants and animals died and were then slowly buried over long periods of time by sediment that

then hardened around them and turned to stone.

Me: Hmmm... Have you ever stopped to think that a fossil cannot be made that way?

Park Ranger: What do you mean?

Me: Well first of all, what happens to plants and animals after they die? Do they stay on the surface of the earth for long periods waiting to be buried by sediment?

Park Ranger: Well wait, the plants would probably disintegrate too fast, but the animals...

Me: Given the chance, the animal carcasses would also rot too quickly to be buried over time, but even before that could happen, nearly 100% of dead animals are consumed by scavengers, often including the bones. Also, if your way of making a fossil were correct, we should see lots of dead things on the earth and at the bottom of the sea being slowly buried in hardening sedimentary layers, but we never see that occurring today.

Park Ranger: Oh my gosh... hmm... that seems to make sense...

Me: The other problem is with the fine detail we see in the fossils. In order for that detail to be preserved, the living things would have to be surrounded in fresh sediment while they are alive or immediately after dying so that the soft tissues would not have time to decay. Isn't it highly likely then that the sediment itself caused their death?

Park Ranger: Wow, let me think that through...

Me: In addition, in order to get the kind of detail we see

preserved in many of the fossils, the sediment has to have a pretty narrow band of moisture content. Too much moisture and the specimen will rot before the sediments can harden into stone. Too little moisture would make the sediments too hard, and the fine imprints we find would not be possible. The hardening also has to happen rapidly, so the entire layer must itself be buried quite quickly under enough local pressure to cause rapid hardening. Do you have any idea what kind of geologic activity is required to produce these conditions?

Park Ranger: Umm...maybe a flood?

Me: That's right. In order to make fossils like these you have to have a significant, catastrophic flood with rapid deep burial of the specimens. It's the only feasible explanation for the fossil layers we find all over the earth. You will never get there using a slow buildup of sediments over long ages.

By applying some straightforward reasoning to the evidence in the fossil record, it would seem obvious that the surface of the earth had to have had a catastrophic past. Another example can be found at the Grand Canyon. The Colorado River runs through the bottom of the massive canyon. We are often asked to believe that this winding river carved out over 448 trillion cubic feet of earth one pebble at a time over millions or billions of years. Had this actually occurred, there should be an expansive river delta at the canyon outlet where this massive amount of earth would have been deposited. Problematically, the massive erosion deposits are nowhere to be found. That the canyon was formed by water erosion is inarguable, but only significant volumes of water crashing through very rapidly could account for the fact the displaced earth is not found anywhere near the mouth of the river. Depending on the local geography, this could have been caused by rapid succession of the floodwaters or quite possibly by a sudden breaching of earth dams that would have formed upstream of the canyon after the apex of the flood.

Does this disprove uniformitarianism? This is a more complex question than it might seem at first glance. It is important that we understand the use of the word “proof” when applied to things that occurred in the past. Most people will think of the “scientific” type of proof when this type of question is asked. Scientific proof however requires an observable, repeatable result that can be accurately simulated mathematically or under controlled laboratory conditions. Catastrophic events of the past can never be proven in this way because they are neither observable nor repeatable. They must be interpreted through the evidence that we have in the present. For instance, it would hardly be feasible to fill in the Grand Canyon with dirt and rock, fill up some huge lakes upstream with water, then break the earth dams and see what happens! So in the scientific sense, no we cannot “prove” that the Grand Canyon was formed rapidly by lots of water, but we can say that the evidence that remains today strongly suggests it. We can safely say that a rapid formation of the canyon is much more probable than a slow formation based on the evidence we see today. In addition, rapid formations of large canyons have also been observed in modern times such as the Step and Loowit Canyons, which were created in just a few months following the major eruption of Mt. St. Helens in May 1980. Both canyons were cut very quickly through 100 feet of solid rock, leaving hundreds of layers of strata exposed. The remarkable Step Canyon is over 700 feet deep and is an amazing example of how quickly major canyons can be formed in the wake of catastrophic geologic events. In addition, during one period on June 12, 1980, during the third explosive eruption on the mountain, sediment 25 feet deep was deposited, having over 100 individual strata in just three hours. This happened due to the onset of wave after wave of pyroclastic flow (rapidly moving flows of superheated mud and ash)—each wave depositing another laminated strata on the surface of the others. This amazed geologists who had previously believed that millions of years were required to produce this kind of layering. While certainly not of the same scale as the Grand Canyon, the similarities in the characteristics of these rapidly formed canyons and deposits are striking.

Even though in most cases scientific proof cannot be used to establish facts of the past, another method is available. The form of proof used

to establish facts of history is known as “legal-historic” proof. This is the kind of proof that is used in courts of law throughout the world to establish beyond reasonable doubt that an event (e.g., a bank robbery) occurred in the past. Since we cannot observe or reproduce them, can past events really be “proven”? For instance, can we state that Abraham Lincoln was murdered in Ford Theatre after the end of the Civil War as a proven historical fact? Certainly we can—by the use of legal-historic proof. This kind of proof depends on eyewitness accounts, written history, the credibility of the witnesses, the availability of manuscripts, and other remaining evidence to establish facts beyond a reasonable doubt. Since there is a marked lack of available eyewitness accounts of the events surrounding the forming of the Grand Canyon, its origin cannot be proven in the legal-historic sense, but this also means that no fact of history can be proven in this way. Many events such as the creation of the earth and the origin of the universe do not qualify for either type of proof. From this, it is clear that theories such as “Big E” evolution (see Chapter 3) or the Big Bang (see Chapter 4) should never be presented as “fact” much less “scientific” fact, as if there were scientific proof available to support them. What we can do, however, is ask ourselves questions such as “Based on what we observe today, which interpretation best fits the available evidence?”

As with evolution and the Big Bang, the idea of uniformitarianism has significant unexplained conflicts with the observable evidence of the past as well as extensive holes in the supporting data. In reality, it is little more than a presupposition that attempts to eliminate other valid logical possibilities without a solid basis of reasoning for doing so. Simply put, it is a bias against the catastrophic and supernatural explanations of past events and ironically, it requires significant leaps of faith in order to overlook its gaps in data and contradictions with reason. Is it the most feasible explanation of past events? Because other possibilities have significantly fewer insurmountable issues, this author’s conclusion is a resounding “No.” The biblical record of the earth’s age fits the evidence in a much more convincing manner (scientifically speaking).

Enter “Naturalistic Uniformitarianism”

To the idea of uniformitarianism, secular geologists then added the notion of “naturalism.” Naturalism was becoming increasingly popular through the nineteenth century and this philosophic position meshed well with the advent and spread of Darwinist thought. Naturalism is a worldview that holds that the cosmos and life itself came into existence through natural processes only. This, by definition, excludes any and all supernatural intervention, and de facto, eliminates large scale, world changing events (such as divine creation and the global flood) from the realm of valid possibilities. So then, the idea of “naturalistic uniformitarianism” can be paraphrased as follows: “Since we know that God could not really exist, we know that He could never have affected the history of the earth. Therefore, what we see today is exactly consistent with the processes that have always been in place and we need not consider supernatural or catastrophic causes.” Much like uniformitarianism, naturalism is a subjective presupposition with no basis in empirical science or evidential history.

How then did “naturalistic uniformitarianism” become so widely accepted as the foundation for geologic studies? In addressing this question, it will be helpful to go back and understand the time in which it was popularized. The significant scientific breakthroughs of the nineteenth century were the foundation for the rapid industrialization of much of the world. It was an era of new technology such as the world had not previously known. Inventions such as gas and electric lighting, the printing press, the steam engine, plastic surgery, photography, Portland cement (the central ingredient in concrete), the typewriter, the sewing machine, the electric motor, the mechanical calculator, the revolver, the telegraph, pasteurization, early plastics, dynamite, the telephone, the fountain pen, the machine gun, the cash register, the first automobiles, the first motorcycles, Marconi radar, smokeless gunpowder, the zipper, motion pictures, the diesel engine and many, many more. Some of the popular themes and slogans of the time were, “It’s a bold new world. Get on board. Don’t get left behind!” and “Out with the old ways, in with the new!” It was into this era that Darwin introduced the theory that the forces of natural selection and mutation could explain the origins of mankind

without the need for a creator God. Out with the crusty old idea that the earth was created supernaturally! In with the era of mankind's superior knowledge of the past!

It was during this era that the young lawyer Charles Lyell turned his interests to science, subscribing to early evolutionary theories. He was considered one of the foremost geologists of his day, and his book entitled *Principles of Geology* promoted the ideas of naturalistic uniformitarianism, which were first introduced by his predecessor James Hutton. Citing as examples the depth of layers of sediment in southern Great Britain and the rates of accumulation occurring through erosion runoff at the mouths of local rivers, Lyell was the first to extend estimates of the earth's age past 300 million years without offering any conclusive reason why the deposits occurred gradually other than a bias or predisposition against the supernatural.

*"Lyell also sold geology some snake oil. He convinced geologists that ... all past processes acted at essentially their current rates (that is, those observed in historical time). This extreme gradualism has led to numerous unfortunate consequences, including the rejection of sudden or catastrophic events in the face of positive evidence for them, **for no reason other than that they were not gradual.**"*³⁸ – W. D. Allmon

Fully aware that his theories of geology directly contradicted the scriptural chronology, he was on an overt mission to "free science of Moses"³⁹ and remove all vestiges of legitimacy from the biblical account of history. In an 1829 letter to a colleague, Geologist Roderick Murchison, (also an old-earth protagonist) Lyell wrote:

*"I trust I shall make my sketch of the progress of geology popular. Old [Rev. John] Fleming is frightened and thinks the age will not stand **my anti-Mosaic conclusions** and at least that the subject will for a time become unpopular and awkward for the clergy, but I*

³⁸ Allmon, W.D., "Post-Gradualism," *Science*, 262:122–123, October 1, 1993.

³⁹ Bailey, E., *British Men of Science: Charles Lyell*; Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962; pp. 77–78.

am not afraid. I shall out with the whole but in as conciliatory a manner as possible."⁴⁰

Darwin was befriended by Lyell and was highly influenced by him. During his famous journey on the H.M.S. Beagle, Darwin studied Lyell's book *Principles of Geology*, which convinced him of the ideology behind naturalistic uniformitarianism (a.k.a. gradualism). Though the voyage is commonly credited with Darwin's breakthroughs in biology, much of his study during this time was actually in the field of geology, largely guided by Lyell's influence which accounts for the strong similarities in the fundamental ideologies of their thinking.

Despite their gaping holes, the theories of Lyell, Darwin, Huxley and the like were consistent with the spirit of the age—that mankind's breakthroughs would soon result in the revolution of all knowledge and radically change our understanding of the world and its history. Lyell and Darwin jumped on the wave of new technological advances and rode the era of new discoveries all in the name of advancing science. Lyell was among the first to refer to his thinly supported scientific theories as "facts". With this era of new ideas in science came the strong and repeated suggestion that the time of mankind's need for religion had passed. Anyone dissenting would be thought of as holding on to primitive and outdated ideas and hindering the progressive wave of new knowledge.

Sadly, most of the Christian church of that time began to integrate evolution and old-earth thinking with their biblical teaching. For instance, Charles Haddon Spurgeon (1834–1892) was England's best-known preacher for most of the second half of the nineteenth century. Spurgeon's sermons remain highly influential among Christians of various denominations today, among whom he is known as the "Prince of Preachers." The strong influence that old-earth ideology had on his thinking is clearly seen in his preaching as exemplified in the following excerpt:

⁴⁰ Mortenson, T., *The Great Turning Point: The Church's Catastrophic Mistake on Geology—Before Darwin*, Master Books, Inc., 2004; pp. 225–226.

"Years ago we thought the beginning of this world was when Adam came upon it; but we have discovered that thousands of years before that God was preparing chaotic matter to make it a fit abode for man, putting races of creatures upon it, who might die and leave behind the marks of his handiwork and marvellous skill, before he tried his hand on man..."⁴¹

Keep in mind that the church in general was still in a somewhat defensive mode at this time regarding issues of scientific knowledge after she erroneously insisted that the discoveries of Galileo and Copernicus (that our solar system was heliocentric [centered around the sun] rather than geocentric [centered around the earth]) were radical and dangerous. The position of the church was that such ideas were heresy punishable by life imprisonment, despite the fact that a heliocentric solar system directly violated no passage of scripture. What an embarrassing period it was for the church to have taken its strong, immovable stance against this new science and then to turn out to be dead wrong in the end. Ouch! What a reputation she earned through that episode for being unwilling to accept new ideas and for a dogmatic holding on to outdated truths! Talk about egg on the face. Nobody wanted that to happen again.

After that incident, perhaps you can see why the church was slow to resist ideas such as evolution and uniformitarianism in the early nineteenth century, even when they came into direct conflict with scripture. These ideas came at a time when the ground was indeed fertile for adoption of new knowledge and scientific "discoveries." At this time many theologians were willing to bend important scriptural doctrines to the point of breaking, choosing to add many extra-scriptural and unfounded ideas into their interpretation of the Bible in order to accommodate popular scientific thought. In order to prevent the "disproving" of scripture, they recast many of its foundational passages to harmonize with the old earth and naturalistic thinking that was growing in popularity so rapidly. So strong was their desire not to get caught again on the wrong side of progressive science (and get caught again looking like outdated ideological dinosaurs) that they

⁴¹ Charles Spurgeon sermon; September 2, 1855.

were bending over backwards to make their theology fit with the new ways of thinking.

To make matters worse, during the years surrounding the work of Lyell and Darwin, secular estimates of the earth's age continued to produce older and older estimates of the planet's age:

Who	When	Estimated Age of the Earth
Comte De Buffon	1779	78,000 years
Abraham Werner	1786	1 million years
Charles Lyell	Early 1800s	More than 300 million years
Arthur Holmes	1913	1.6 billion years

In just over 130 years, estimates of the earth's age increased by a factor of over 20,000 times! The first obvious question that should be asked might be: "If the science used to determine the age of the earth were accurate, why does the number keep getting bigger with time?" The answer lies in part in the dramatic increase in the understanding of the complexity of life at the cellular level in the years following Lyell and Darwin—and it is still increasing today. The greater the complexity of the cell, the greater the number of years needed to achieve that complexity via the slow processes of chance mutation and natural selection. Darwin and his colleagues thought of the cell as a very simple structure and in particular, they vastly underestimated the importance and complexity of the nucleus. For example, Ernst Haeckel (1834–1919), one of Darwin's early ardent followers, called the cell a "simple little lump of albuminous combination of carbon" (see more on Ernst Haeckel in Chapter 3). He could not have been more mistaken. Today with the advances in nanomicroscopy, we know that the cell is anything but simple. How could Darwin have imagined 150 years ago that within each cell were amazingly complex protein assembly 'machines' driven by a full featured, self-replicating information storage and retrieval system far, far tinier than could be detected by the crude microscopes of his day? With each advance in the understanding of the complexity of the cell, Darwin's idea that it was the result of random, undirected changes and chance mutations required more and more time.

To imagine that electronic components (such as wires, batteries and diodes and such) shaken together in a paper bag could randomly combine to result in a working telephone would certainly be a stretch, but to imagine that the end result would be a fully functioning space shuttle is a whole new level of absurdity. Indeed the current secular estimate of 4.6 billion years begins to look like way too short of time to produce the intricate inner workings of the cell with its thousands of interdependent, irreducible components and systems. The idea that such a fantastic system could be the result of chance at all is statistically impossible and plainly ridiculous, regardless of the amount of time allowed for undirected, random interactions to produce marvelously orchestrated living organisms of such incredible complexity.

Where Did “4.6 Billion Years” Come From?

The consensus view among secular scientists is that the earth is around 4.6 billion years old. But how did they arrive at this estimate? Secular scientists use two main methods to arrive at “old-earth” ages.

First, as described earlier, naturalistic uniformitarianism is applied. In simple terms, an estimate of today’s rate of the accumulation of layers of the earth’s crust is calculated. Next, the depth and number of the layers of material that have (supposedly) slowly accumulated on the earth’s bedrock are determined. Then, the assumption that no events have occurred during the earth’s history that would affect rate of accumulation is applied (e.g., no catastrophic floods or other non-gradual events). The assumption that the earth had no accumulated layers to start with is then applied. Finally, simple math is used to determine the number of years necessary to accumulate the layers we see today. Let me again remind you that there is no empirical (evidence-based) foundation for any of the many assumptions that must hold true for this estimate to be accurate.

The second method used to arriving at the 4.6 billion years age is radiometric dating.

Radiometric Dating Demystified

Radiometric dating is based on the fact that some atoms have extra protons in their nuclei causing them to be inherently unstable. This means that if left alone, these molecules will change or “degrade” into other more stable molecules over time at rates that are considered to be constant. Secular scientists presume (based on little or no evidence) that the rates of decay have never changed throughout history. Atoms that exhibit this kind of change are called “radioactive isotopes,” and some of the energy that is emitted during the change can be dangerous and cause damage (or mutations) to a living organism’s DNA. Some real-world examples of this can be found in the terrible residual effects of radiation exposure following the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bomb blasts, and the effects of radiation leakage that occurred at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant in Ukraine in 1986. People exposed to these high levels of radiation have suffered damaging effects including high rates of cancer and leukemia and high incidences of birth defects and deformities due to the damage to their DNA.

When radioactive materials decay, the original isotope is referred to as the “parent” element, and (after the change) the new isotope is referred to as the “daughter” element. The time it takes for half of the parent atoms to change into the daughter isotope is called the radioactive “half life.” Some radioactive elements have half-lives as long as millions or billions of years, while others are relatively short—on the order of thousands of years or even as fast as just a few minutes in some cases.

Below are a few examples of isotopes commonly used in radiometric dating. The number following the element name is the “atomic weight” of the element. This number indicates the number of protons that the atom has in its nucleus, and it is used to compare relative weights between the various atomic elements. Note the very short half of Carbon-14. Carbon-14 is only used to date things that were once living (plants and animals). All of the other isotopes are used to date rock samples that contain one or more of the parent and daughter element pairs.

Parent Element	Daughter Element	Half Life (Years)
Uranium-238	Lead-206	4.468 billion
Uranium-235	Lead-207	704 million
Rubidium-87	Strontium-87	48.8 billion
Potassium-40	Argon-40	1.277 billion
Samarium-147	Neodymium-143	106 billion
Carbon-14	Nitrogen-14	5,730

The core idea behind radiometric (or radioisotope) dating is really quite simple. Rock samples are analyzed to determine the amount (or number) of parent and daughter atoms present. Three major assumptions must then be applied in order to arrive at an age for the rock based on the measured amounts.

Assumption #1: Initial Condition of Zero Daughter Element

In order to arrive at an age of the sample, the first assumption that scientists must apply concerns the initial conditions of the sample. They must assume that no daughter element was present when the rock was first formed and that the entire amount of daughter element present in the sample resulted from the decay of the parent element. Since there is no way to determine what the composition of the rock was when it was originally formed perhaps thousands, millions or billions of years ago, some assumption about the amount of daughter element present must be made if an age of the sample is to be calculated based on the rate of radiometric decay. Note here that there is no scientific basis for determining the original composition of the sample, and that out of the range of possibilities, secular scientists choose the assumption that gives the oldest age for the sample. It is probable that the zero daughter element assumption was chosen in order to lend further credibility to “Big E” evolution because it requires very long ages. Over short, observable periods of time, the changes necessary to support “Big E” evolution have never been witnessed or recorded (e.g., the slow morphing of one kind of animal into a new and distinctive second kind). Indeed many “Big E” evolutionists freely apply the word “science” to the theory, excusing themselves from the need for observable, repeatable evidence because the entire lifespan of modern science is supposedly too short

to observe the evolution of entirely new life forms from existing kinds. The claim is that molecules-to-man evolution is occurring too slowly to be observed.

Assumption #2: Closed Sample Boundaries

The age of a rock sample cannot be determined from amounts of parent and daughter elements present if contamination has occurred. In other words if any amount of parent element has been added or removed over the life of the sample, the ratio of parent to daughter elements becomes meaningless. The same is true for outside influences on the daughter element. Such outside influences might include removal of materials due to erosion or the mixing of the sample with surrounding materials whose composition includes quantities of the parent or daughter elements. Since there is no way to determine outside influences on the content of the sample over its lifetime, secular scientists assume that no contamination has occurred. As with the other assumptions, this is necessary to arrive at an age of the rock but it has no basis in observable science, and it is very unlikely in most cases that outside influences would have had no effect on the amounts of parent and daughter elements over the history of the sample, particularly if it spans very long periods of time.

Assumption #3: Constant Rates of Decay

The third major assumption that must be applied to rock samples in order to determine their age from radiometric dating is that the rates of decay that we observe today have been constant through thousands, millions or billions of years of history. Since there is no way to go back and measure rates of decay in the past, scientists must assume constant rates of decay. Solar flares, however, are known to have an effect on the radioactive decay rates, though researchers have little understanding as to why. In addition there is an abundance of evidence for catastrophic events such as a global flooding, a severe ice age and meteorite impact explosions that would have had significant influence on rates of radioactive decay. Some scientists have presented very convincing evidence that rates of decay were much greater in the past. For instance, patterns of radio halos (tiny “burn” marks left by nuclear decay) in granite crystals have been discovered which have recorded highly elevated rates of radioactive

decay during the lifetime of the samples. Associated work on the rate of helium diffusion through biotite strongly supports an age of the earth of less than 10,000 years, which is remarkably consistent with the biblical chronology of creation.⁴² These 'short age' findings have stood up very well to opposition from secular science and they are excellent evidence for accelerated decay rates in the past, probably due to the cataclysmic geologic events that would have accompanied a worldwide flood.

In conclusion, we see that radiometric dating depends on at least three major assumptions and that we have no empirical basis for assigning real values to those unknowns. Is there any way then to test whether the assumptions made by secular scientists are accurate? Let's apply two simple tests and see how the values hold up.

One of the ways scientists use to test the validity of new measurement methods is to run tests against known values. What if we could find some rock samples whose ages are known and then apply radiometric dating methods to see how the resulting values compare to the true ages of the rocks? A group of PhD-level scientists have done exactly that. A small sampling of their results is summarized in the table on the following page.

⁴² Dan Reynolds PhD, September 2001, Triangle Association for the Science of Creation, <http://tasc-creationscience.org/content/rate-group-finds-strong-evidence-young-earth-and-accelerated-nuclear-decay>

Source of Sample	Actual Age of Sample at the Time of Testing	Laboratory Radiometric Age	Radiometric Dating Error Factor
Mt. St. Helens, USA	Formed: Approx. 1986 Actual Age: Less than 20 years	500,000 to 2,800,000 years ⁴³	25,000 to 140,000 times older than actual
Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand	Formed: 1949–1975 during various eruptions Actual Age: Less than 70 years	270,000 to 3,500,000 years ⁴⁴	3,850 to 50,000 times older than actual

Some secular scientist’s response to the error factors these findings is that the Potassium-Argon method used to age these samples has technical limitations and is known to be inaccurate for samples less than 2 million years old. Based on this reasoning, however, it would be necessary to establish the age of the sample before we know whether we can submit it to various radiometric dating methods in order to determine its age. The need to introduce this type of circular reasoning in order to make the science work is a strong indicator that we are far from solid ground when using these methods to determine the age of the earth. It also seems absurd that we find error factors in the tens of thousands for young samples, but then we are then expected to have confidence in the same dating methods when they are applied to older samples. At the same time we are offered no other concrete scientific evidence in support of the accuracy of the dating method or of the validity of the initial conditions assumed.

It is also interesting to note that rock samples containing more than one set of parent-daughter elements that match a radioisotope dating method can be tested using multiple aging methods. Before we give our confidence to the resulting ages of those methods, shouldn’t we

⁴³ L. Vardiman, *Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth*, vol. 2, Master Books, 2005; p. 420 (as cited in *The New Answers Book* (Ken Ham); Master Books, 2006; p. 118.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

see if they give consistent results when more than one test is applied to a single, common sample? The same group of scientists that dated rocks of known age (see above) has applied various radioisotope dating methods to single samples. Let’s see how the results came back from rock samples from the Beartooth Mountains (located in south central Montana and northwest Wyoming.)⁴⁵

Dating Method	Radioisotope Estimated Age of Samples
Potassium-Argon	1,520,000 to 2,620,000 years
Rubidium-Strontium	2,515,000 to 2,790,000 years
Samarium-Neodymium	2,886,000 years
Lead-Lead	2,689,000 years

If these methods are accurate, why are they producing such a wide variation of estimated ages? Within the Potassium-Argon method alone the results vary by 40%. The results across all methods are varying by as much as 57% for samples that should be returning the same ages for each method. It is clear from this that one or more of the assumptions baked into the aging methods are in significant error.

So then, based on naturalistic uniformitarianism and radiometric dating secular science has been methodically drumming into our minds that the earth is 4.6 billion years old and that dinosaurs roamed the earth between 66 and 230 million years ago. When these supposedly accurate dating methods are closely examined however, we find that they lack substantial consistency and scientific support. We also find strong evidence of bias and presupposition in the underlying assumptions. It is clear that secular scientists have strong incentives to lean toward very old ages for the earth as required by the commonly accepted evolutionary ideology. But is there any science available to support younger ages for the earth?

⁴⁵ Ham, Ken; *The New Answers Book*; Master Books, 2006; p. 121.

A Much Younger Earth?

There are many evidences that point to an age of the earth much younger than the widely accepted 4.6 billion years. While it may be tempting to attribute credibility to the 4.6 billion-year number simply because it is so widely accepted among mainstream scientists, keep in mind that today much of academia (including members who are the research budget decision makers) is driven by scientific communities holding secular humanistic, atheistic and/or Darwinist worldviews wherein presupposition toward long ages for the earth is the rule. The thought culture in these communities allows for no objective or scientifically fair examination of the topic. After many exposures, the secular mantra around this topic sounds something like “We know that the earth is billions of years old because we know that it cannot be less than billions of years old, and we will accept no dissenters or open discussion around this topic.”

But does evidence exist that would point to a younger earth? As it turns out, there is an abundance of evidence that would steer our thinking that way. Let’s look at just a small sampling...

Increasing Oceanic Salt Levels

An internet article entitled “Scientists are Concerned about Mysterious Rise in Ocean Salinity”⁴⁶ addresses problems with the rising salinity levels noted over the past 50 years. As with most environmental changes observed on our planet, the author attributes this phenomenon to global warming (i.e., warmer planet, more evaporation, higher oceanic salt retention). Rising salinity levels are really not all that mysterious, however, if you stop and think through some simple questions on the subject.

⁴⁶ Matthews, Richard; “Scientists Are Concerned about Mysterious Ocean Salinity”; <http://globalwarmingisreal.com/2012/09/12/scientists-are-concerned-about-mysterious-ocean-salinity>.

- Q. How does salt get *into* the oceans?
- A. In the same manner that all other minerals get there. It comes in via runoff from land sources when rivers and streams discharge into the ocean, or via the flow of underwater aquifers.
- Q. How does salt get *out of* the oceans?
- A. Basically it doesn't. This is because only fresh water participates in the ocean-to-land side of the water cycle. Except for small amounts that are buried when the tectonic plates in the bottom of the seas override one another burying some ocean floor sediments, salt entering the oceans remains in the ocean.
- Q. What does this mean to the salt levels in the oceans?
- A. They increase over time.
- Q. What happens to oceans over time as the salt levels increase?
- A. Once salinity and other mineral levels reach a certain threshold they can no longer support life. After that, they become "dead" seas.

This natural process is summarized in the University of California, Santa Barbara's ScienceLine website:

*"The oceans get saltier due to the rivers that flow into them. Water from the ocean evaporates, and then rains over land and forms rivers. As the rivers flow over the land, things like salt dissolve into the river and are carried out to the sea. Since the amount of water in the ocean is more or less constant, the sea keeps picking up more and more salt and doesn't have any place to get rid of it. In certain places, like the Salton Sea in California, the Great Salt Lake in Utah, or the Dead Sea in Israel, rivers flow into lakes that also evaporate—and the salt is concentrated more and more over time until the salt concentration is much higher than in the ocean—and nothing much can live in these lakes."*⁴⁷

⁴⁷ "How did the salt get into the oceans at the beginning of their formation?" UCSB ScienceLine; <http://scienceline.ucsb.edu/getkey.php?key=2968>.

Evolutionary thinking requires long-age timelines with oceans in stable chemical equilibrium, but there is mounting empirical evidence against this assumption. Only about 27% of the quantity of salt entering the oceans escapes each year.^{48,49} This means that the remaining 73% contributes to an increase in ocean salinity over time. This is especially pronounced in smaller oceans where the exchange of warmer and cooler waters prevents overall redistribution of saltiness due to the sinking effect of saltier waters in deeper oceans.

If the oceans as we know them today were more than several millions of years old (using the most liberal assumptions), they would be too full of salt and other minerals to support life. In addition, due to the distinct biological differences between freshwater and saltwater marine life, the oceans must have had significant saline content at their origins. This brings the likely age of the oceans down into the thousands of years range.

Ocean Sediments Are Not Deep Enough

The earth's oceans have hard bedrock floors. About 20 billion tons of sediment is carried into the oceans each year by the runoff of estuary rivers and streams. This sediment then settles on the hard floor of the seas. Only about 1 billion tons of this sediment are removed from the ocean floors annually due to burial as the tectonic plates overlap one another. At this rate, the accumulated sediment on the ocean floors would have to have been several miles deep if these processes had been in motion for the 4.6 billion years proposed by old-age geologists. Because the average depth of the sediment layers found on the ocean floors is actually only around a quarter of a mile,^{50,51} the

⁴⁸ Sayles, F. L., and Mangelsdorf, P. C.; "Cation-exchange characteristics of Amazon River suspended sediment and its reaction with seawater"; *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*; 43:5; 767–779.

⁴⁹ Austin, S. A. and Humphreys, D. R.; "The sea's missing salt: a dilemma for evolutionists"; *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Creationism*, vol. II, Creation Science Fellowship, 1991; pp. 17–33.

⁵⁰ "Total Sediment Thickness of the World's Oceans & Marginal Seas"; <http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/image/sedthick9.jpg>.

maximum age of the oceans would be several millions of years if we assume gradualistic deposits only. Catastrophic causes (i.e., extreme volcanic activity, runoff from massive flooding, etc.) could certainly cause periods of very rapid accumulation of sedimentary deposits, bringing the likely ages of the oceans into the thousands of years range.

The Earth's Magnetic Field Is Too Strong

As a child, I was given a small but very strong magnet that I initially played with almost every day. After the excitement of this wonderful gadget began to wear off, I threw it in a drawer and forgot about it. Sometime later, I was very disappointed when I tried the magnet again only to find that it had lost most of its strength after several months. In a similar way, all magnets slowly lose their strength over time.

The earth's magnetic field is a residual effect of the flow of high-temperature liquid iron below its surface and as magnetic fields go, it is not well arranged in a manner conducive to retaining its strength over time. In fact the earth's magnetic field loses half of its strength every 1400 years or so. Since it first began to be measured by C.F. Gauss in 1845, the strength of the overall total energy of earth's magnetic field has decreased by about 7% in less than 200 years. Assuming a fairly constant rate of decrease over time, one cannot extrapolate more than a few hundred thousand years into the past before the magnetic field would have been so strong that life on earth would not have been possible. Many scientists believe that dates for the earth's magnetic field in the 10,000- to 20,000-year range are much more probable.

"Though complex, this history of the earth's magnetic field agrees with Barnes' basic hypothesis that the field has always freely decayed. I have merely made explicit two features which were

⁵¹ Hay, W. W. et al.; "Mass/age distribution and composition of sediments on the ocean floor and the global rate of sediment subduction"; *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 93(B12):14; 933–14,940.

always implicit in the free-decay theory: (a) that motions in the core fluid can disturb the field, and (b) higher-order modes of decay are possible. Both of these features have a firm basis in theory, experiment, and natural phenomena. In contrast to dynamo theories, the reversals and fluctuations I picture dissipated energy. The field has always been losing energy despite its variations, so it cannot be more than 10,000 years old.”⁵²

– D. Russell Humphreys, PhD

The Moon Spirals Away From Earth Too Quickly

Did you know that due to the forces of tidal interaction, each year the distance from the Earth to the Moon increases by about 4cm (about 1.6 inches)? This was discovered about a century ago by Charles Darwin’s son George, who was an avid astronomer. The same effect also causes the day to slowly lengthen, gaining approximately 0.0016 seconds every 100 years. While at first the increase in the distance to the Moon may seem insignificant, realize that at current rates after only 1.3 billion years (about a third of the supposed age of the Earth), the Moon would have been in contact with the Earth! In addition, only 1 billion years ago, the Moon would have been so close to Earth as to cause regular catastrophic coastal tides. Since studies of coastal sedimentary rocks supposedly representing the last half billion years show no evidence of significant changes in tide levels and there is no geologic evidence to the contrary, this clearly was never the case. Once again the observed rates of change and the geologic evidence do not support long ages for the Earth.

The Sun is Growing Hotter Too Quickly

At the Sun’s core, a nuclear fusion reaction is generating the incredible intensity of light and heat that warms our planet some 93 million miles away. This reaction releases tremendous amounts of energy as it

⁵² D. Russell Humphreys PhD; “The Mystery of Earth’s Magnetic Field. Acts & Facts”; 18(2).

converts Hydrogen to Helium. Such reactions are never in long-term equilibrium and they always exhibit change over time. For instance, the Sun is getting smaller and growing hotter and brighter as the reaction burns through its finite supply of fuel. Extrapolating the change in the reaction back 3.5 billion years ago (when life was supposedly beginning on earth through chance chemical interactions) the average temperature on Earth would have been 16° -18°C cooler because of the lesser intensity of the Sun at that time. This means that the average temperature of the Earth's surface would have been around -1° to -3°C (below the freezing point of water).

Who knew that the (supposed) primordial soup was actually a block of ice? If life spontaneously formed there, it would have had to know how to build an igloo from day one!

Red Blood Cells and DNA in Dinosaur Bones

*"It is now well established that unmineralized dinosaur bone still containing recognizable bone protein exists in many locations around the world. From my own first-hand experience with such material, it is inconceivable that bone containing such well preserved protein could possibly have survived for more than **a few thousand years** in the geological settings in which they are found. I therefore believe **the case is strong from a scientific standpoint to reject radiometric methods as a valid means for dating geological materials.**"*

- John R. Baumgardner, PhD, Sandia National Laboratory

Very recent discoveries of intact DNA and red blood cells in dinosaur bones are very strong evidence that the old-earth assumptions used by secular scientists are in significant error.

*"Natural radioactivity, mutations, and decay degrade DNA and other biological material rapidly. Measurements of the mutation rate of mitochondrial DNA recently forced researchers to revise the age of 'mitochondrial Eve' from a theorized 200,000 years down to possibly **as low as 6,000 years**. DNA experts insist that DNA cannot*

*exist in natural environments longer than 10,000 years, yet intact strands of DNA appear to have been recovered from fossils allegedly much older.*⁵³

Secular scientists have been baffled by these discoveries. Though they will no doubt find reasons to reject this data rather than change their assumptions and presuppositions, this observed evidence directly defies the widely accepted timeframes of the existence of dinosaurs. Very accurate modern cave paintings of dinosaurs⁵⁴ alongside mammoth⁵⁵ and other recognizable creatures, as well as the many “dragon” legends in modern recorded history (note that the word “dinosaur” did not exist before 1841), are among many other strong evidences that dinosaurs roamed the earth alongside mankind.

This is only a very small fraction of the scientific evidence that supports very young ages of the earth when contrasted with the 4.6 billion years currently claimed by old-earth geologists and “Big E” evolutionists. The purpose of this book is not to exhaustively explore all such material, but to encourage you to become familiar with the wealth of additional evidences for a young planet before accepting the popular mantra of billions of years.

What about the Age of the Universe?

But what about the cosmos itself? Is there any scientific evidence that the universe may not be as old as we have been led to believe? Once again, there is a wealth of information on this topic available to the objective learner, and we will examine only a small sampling here.

⁵³ Cherfas, J.; “Ancient DNA: still busy after death”; *Science*, 253:1354–1356. Cano, R. J., H. N. Poinar, et al.; “Amplification and sequencing of DNA from a 120–135-million-year-old weevil”; *Nature*, 363:536–8. Krings, M., Stone, A., et al.; “DNA sequences and the origin of modern humans”; *Cell*, 90:19–30. Lindahl, T.; “Unlocking nature’s ancient secrets”; *Nature*, 413:358–359.

⁵⁴ “Dinosaurs in American Indian Petroglyphs”;

<http://www.bearfabrique.org/Dinoglyphs/dinoglyphs.html>.

⁵⁵ “Ancient Dinosaur Depictions”;

<http://www.genesispark.com/exhibits/evidence/historical/ancient/dinosaur/>.

The Spiral Patterns of the Galaxies Should No Longer Exist

In rotating systems with different inner and outer orbital speeds, the spiral pattern is a temporary condition. To see this for yourself, try this simple experiment. First, make a vanilla milkshake in a blender. After turning off the blender and before pouring it out into a cup, take some chocolate syrup and draw several radial lines outward from the center outward to the edges of the blender (like the spokes of a bicycle wheel). Now turn on the blender again and observe the changes in the lines of chocolate syrup. You will find that after a few seconds of spinning, a spiral pattern much like the wind up of the Milky Way Galaxy will be seen. Next, let the blender run for several more seconds, and soon you will find that the spiral pattern disappears as the syrup is evenly mixed.

Though the reasons for the differing orbital speeds are much different, a very similar dynamic is occurring at the galactic level.

*“The origins and very natures of spiral arms has been a slippery problem. The initial and obvious theory is that the stars are simply arranged in a spiral pattern. Among the original pioneers of the field was Bertil Lindblad who worked on spiral structure steadily from 1927 through 1965. Lindblad realized that the naive idea of stars arranged permanently in spirals was untenable due to the **winding problem**. Since galactic disks rotate differentially over most of their surface ... a radial line object (a spoke) will quickly become curved as the galaxy rotates. However, as the inner particles revolve faster than those at the edge, the spoke will quickly become wrapped around the galaxy in an increasingly tight spiral.”⁵⁶*

“Stars closer to the center of a spiral galaxy don't have as far to go to complete an orbit as stars located farther from the center. Thus, inner stars should orbit more frequently than outer stars, resulting

⁵⁶ Danforth, Charles; “The Origins of Spiral Arms”;
<http://casa.colorado.edu/~danforth/science/spiral/>.

in a spiral that gradually winds up as the galaxy ages. But observations of spiral galaxies at various distances—and thus at different stages in their evolution—have shown that this is not the case.”⁵⁷

Simply put, if the rotational wind-up of the galaxies has been in motion for more than several hundred million years (at the most), the spiral patterns should be much more tightly wound, or even have fully “mixed” and no longer exist at all.

The winding problem is strong, observable evidence that the universe is much younger than reported by Big Bang proponents, and it may indeed be very young, on the order of thousands, rather than billions of years old.

Where are all the supernovas?

When a star reaches the end of its life, it explodes with tremendous energy and most of its mass is blasted outward into space. Such explosions are observed to occur about once in every 25 years in galaxies similar to our own. However, the last supernova observed in our own galaxy, the Milky Way, was in the seventeenth century. When supernovas occur, they leave expanding clouds of gas (or nebulas) that remain as a kind of colossal “grave stone” marking the site where the star once existed. The composition of these clouds is such that they should remain visible for over a million years⁵⁸. Interestingly, astronomers have observed only around 200 supernova nebulas in the parts of our galaxy that we are able to observe. This is a number much lower than would be expected in an old universe that is supposedly 10 to 16 billion years old.⁵⁹ The number of remnants is much more in line with a galaxy less than ten **thousand** years in age.

⁵⁷ Corliss, William R.; “Why do spiral galaxies stay that way? Or do they?”; <http://www.science-frontiers.com/sf055/sf055p07.htm>.

⁵⁸ “Millions of years of missing Supernova Remnants including Stage 3s

”<http://youngearth.com/millions-years-missing-supernova-remnants-including-stage-3s>

⁵⁹ “Missing Supernova Remnants” *Progress of Theoretical Physics* (Impact Factor: 1.45). 10/1980; 64(5):1587-1595. DOI: 10.1143/PTP.64.1587

Why are the moons of our solar system still geologically active?

Without external sources (such as radiation from a star like our sun) all celestial objects will eventually transfer (lose) their heat into outer space and reach an equilibrium temperature of around three degrees above absolute zero (about -457° Fahrenheit). If our solar system is billions of years old, all of her moons should have long ago been geologically inactive. This, however, is not what we observe.

Of Jupiter's 67 moons, at least two exhibit significant geologic activity implying very hot core temperatures.

Europa

In 2013, the Hubble telescope captured images of huge geysers on this icy moon shooting water vapor 120 miles into space. In addition, significant tectonic activity has been detected.

IO

First discovered by Galileo, IO is one of the four largest moons of Jupiter. IO is also the most volcanically active body in our solar system. The Voyager I spacecraft photographed eight active, erupting volcanoes. When Voyager II photographed IO a few months later, four of the volcanoes were still active.

The Earth's Moon

Did you know that our own moon is also still geologically active? The moon is considerably smaller and would therefore cool at a much faster rate than the earth. Unlike the earth it also has no atmosphere serving to trap the radiation heating that it receives from the sun. For these reasons, and having had presumably billions of years to cool, the moon has been assumed to be a geologically dead, cold rock in space. However, NASA and other researchers are now reporting strong evidence that the moon still has a soft core which is far from cold.

“Japanese scientists have determined that a soft, hot core remains in the center of the moon, contrary to expectations. A

*question resulting from a new model of the lunar interior made by scientists at the National Astronomical Observatory of Japan is, "how can the bottom of the lunar mantle maintain its softer state for a long time?" The researchers used measurements from their Selene orbiter to infer a hot core that should not be there. ... Prof. Junichi Haruyama of Institute of Space and Aeronautical Science, Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency, mentioned the significance of this research, saying, 'A smaller celestial body like the Moon cools faster than a larger one like the Earth does. In fact, we had thought that volcanic activities on the Moon had already come to a halt. Therefore, the Moon had been believed to be cool and hard, even in its deeper parts. However, this research tells us that the Moon has not yet cooled and hardened, but is still warm.'*⁶⁰

Because they are generally short lived, geologic events on the moon are known as Transient Lunar Phenomena (or TLPs). In 1968 NASA published a report entitled "Chronological Catalogue of Lunar Events,"⁶¹ which lists 2,254 TLPs dating back to the sixth century. Among the 2,254, there were 645 that were independently confirmed and/or permanently recorded in photographs, spectra, photometry, and polarimetry. Three hundred of these TLPs were noted in the moon's volcanic Aristarchus region alone. NASA's report also included the following detailed 1787 observation of lunar volcanic activity by astronomer William Herschel.

*"April 19, 1787, 10h. 36' sidereal time
I perceive three volcanos in different places of the dark part of the new moon. Two of them are either already nearly extinct, or otherwise in a state of going to break out; which perhaps may be decided next lunation. The third shows an actual eruption of fire, or luminous matter. I measured the distance of the crater from the northern limb of the moon, and found it 3' 57", 3. Its*

⁶⁰ "Moon Still Has Hot Core"; <http://crev.info/2014/08/moon-still-has-hot-core/#sthash.13n2mpjV.dpuf>.

⁶¹ Middlehurst, B.M., Burley, J.M., Moore, P., and Welther, B.L.; "Chronological Catalog of Reported Lunar Events"; NASA Technical Report, NASA-TR-R-277; 1968.

light is much brighter than the nucleus of the comet which M. Méchain discovered at Paris the 10th of this month.

April 20, 1787, 10h. 2' sidereal time

The volcano burns with greater violence than last night. I believe its diameter cannot be less than 3 [miles], by comparing it with that of the Georgian planet; as Jupiter was near at hand, I turned the telescope to his third satellite, and estimated the diameter of the burning part of the volcano to be equal to at least twice that of the satellite. Hence we may compute that the shining or burning matter must be above three miles in diameter. It is of an irregular round figure, and very sharply defined on the edges. The other two volcanos are much farther towards the center of the moon, and resemble large, pretty faint nebulae, that are gradually much brighter in the middle; but no well-defined luminous spot can be discerned in them. These three spots are plainly to be distinguished from the rest of the marks upon the moon; for the reflection of the sun's rays from the earth is, in its present situation, sufficiently bright, with a ten-feet reflector, to show the moon's spots, even the darkest of them: nor did I perceive any similar phenomena last lunation, though I then viewed the same places with the same instrument. The appearance of what I have called the actual fire or eruption of a volcano, exactly resembled a small piece of burning charcoal, when it is covered by a very thin coat of white ashes, which frequently adhere to it when it has been some time ignited; and it had a degree of brightness, about as strong as that with which such a coal would be seen to glow in faint daylight. All the adjacent parts of the volcanic mountain seemed to be faintly illuminated by the eruption, and were gradually more obscure as they lay at a greater distance from the crater. This eruption resembled much that which I saw on the 4th of May, in the year 1783... It differed, however, considerably in magnitude and brightness; for the volcano of the year 1783, though much brighter than that which is now

burning, was not nearly so large in the dimensions of its eruption.”⁶²

Though Herschel lost some credibility with the public because of his later speculations about intelligent life on other celestial bodies (as many main line scientists do today), he was nonetheless considered amongst the top astronomers of his time.

Apollo astronauts confirmed that our moon remains geologically active when they took along seismometers during their visits to the moon’s surface and detected moonquakes originating several miles below the moon’s surface.⁶³

Mercury

According to an article published in *Astrobiology Magazine*, evidence gathered by the Messenger spacecraft implies much more recent volcanism on Mercury than expected. Bright deposits around some volcanic vents indicate very recent activity.

“Volcanoes on Mercury may have been more explosive than previously anticipated, and they may have erupted more recently, as well... In fact, volcanism on the hot planet bears a strong similarity to volcanism on the Moon, which scientists say is surprising because of their differences... Both Mercury and the Moon are a lot smaller than the Earth, and so will have cooled more than Earth since their formation.”⁶⁴

These examples from our solar system and many more (such as Jupiter which gives off three times more energy than it receives from the sun)

⁶² Herschel, LL.D.F.R.S., William; “An Account of Three Volcanos in the Moon”; communicated by Sir Joseph Banks, Bart.P.R.S. (Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Vol. LXXVII, 229–232).

⁶³ “The Moon: 10 Surprising Lunar Facts”; <http://www.space.com/19619-top-10-moon-facts.html>.

⁶⁴ Thomas, R.J., et al.; “Long-lived explosive volcanism on Mercury”; *Geophysical Research Letters*, 2014; 41(17), 6084–6092. (See more at: <http://www.astrobio.net/news-exclusive/violent-eruptions-mercurys-past-hold-clues-formation/#sthash.FPyPPW2i.dpuf>.)

fly in the face of the old universe models that are based on unproven assumptions. Lord Kelvin (creator of the Kelvin temperature scale) calculated that the earth would cool from an initial molten state to its current temperature in only 30,000 years!⁶⁵ According to *Popular Science* magazine if the sun suddenly stopped shining, within a week the average global surface temperature would drop below 0°F, and the earth would cool to -100°F within one year!⁶⁶ Our moon also, even after accounting for heating from meteoric bombardment, would have cooled very rapidly and should have been geologically inactive after only a few thousand years. Indeed if the universe is 16 billion years old as suggested by the Big Bang theory, bodies in our solar system should have long ago dissipated all of their heat into the cosmos and become cold throughout after only several thousand years of cooling.

Why is recorded history so recent?

According to secular anthropologists, mankind has existed on earth for about two hundred thousand years. During this time, men reportedly made very detailed cave drawings, created tuned musical instruments, recorded the phases of the moon and made significant advances in metallurgy. Does it make any sense that such clearly intelligent societies of mankind would not begin to make written records until over 190,000 years later (around 3000 B.C.)? When we realize that the methods used to date artifacts from this time were based on erroneous or poorly calibrated assumptions, then more accurate dates can be calculated, and such glaring contradictions are quickly resolved.

Old-universe thinking has become so entrenched in most scientific and academic communities that clear evidences to the contrary are most often ignored or explained away usually with unfounded constructions of theory or outright speculation. This pattern is repeated across fields of study and the deep bias against a young universe, and a young

⁶⁵ <http://hyperphysics.phy-astr.gsu.edu/hbase/thermo/cootime2.html#c1>.

⁶⁶ Otterbein, Holly; "If the Sun Went Out, How Long Would Life on Earth Survive?"; <http://www.popsoci.com/node/204957>.

earth becomes more and more evident as one looks into the science (or lack thereof) used to arrive at old-earth conclusions.

The Bible on the Age of the Earth

So what about the Bible? Does it give a specific age for the earth?

While the Bible does not give an outright calendar date of the earth's creation per se, one must consider that the creation account in Genesis was recorded around 1500 B.C., long before the Julian calendar (the predecessor of today's Gregorian calendar) was in effect. The Bible does however include extensive genealogical records in several passages that can be used to accurately calculate the date of creation. In the second half of Luke Chapter 3 for example, there is an unbroken listing of all the generations from the first man, Adam through Christ. Using the wealth of detailed genealogical information in the Old Testament together with other ancient historical sources, it is possible to construct a very accurate biblical timeline of the chronology of mankind. Though many have undertaken this task, the most prominent among them was the scholar Archbishop James Ussher (1581–1656). After years of careful analysis and study, Ussher concluded that the year of creation was 4004 B.C., and his work is still highly respected among Old Testament scholars and historians to this day. It is interesting to note that Julius Caesar Scalinger (1484–1558), a humanist scholar from Italy had arrived at a date of creation of 3950 A.D., just 54 years later than Ussher's date. In addition, famed scientists Johannes Kepler and Sir Isaac Newton both confirmed Ussher's work, arriving independently at dates of 3992 and 4000 B.C., respectively. Much earlier, the Venerable Bede (673–735), whose five-volume work *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* is considered the finest historical work of the early Middle Ages, had calculated the date of creation at 3953 B.C. Though their work spans 900 years, the results arrived at by these scholars exhibit remarkable agreement with less than a 1% variation over 6,000 years of history! The credibility of these men, the time span covered by their work and the similarities of

their conclusions bears testimony to the quality and accuracy of their efforts as well as the quality of the many historical and biblical references available to them for establishing the date of creation.

Based on these facts, it is fair to say that, with a very small margin of error, the Bible establishes the date of creation at around 4000 B.C.

Conclusion

This chapter has detailed a significant conflict between the observed evidence and the assumed long ages of the earth and the universe. Secular scientists have used long-age assumptions as a foundation for much of the research and study done over the last couple of hundred years, ignoring or theorizing away blatant evidence to the contrary. Once the possibility of shorter ages of the earth and the cosmos are considered, two significant results become evident:

- Conflicts between old-age assumptions and observed science are quickly resolved.
- Scripture that testifies of a young earth need no longer be rejected, reinterpreted or otherwise made to fit with old-earth assumptions.

In view of the fact that secular and atheistic professors are encouraging or even demanding that students of faith abandon their scriptural views based on the “scientific” evidence, it is startling and alarming to realize that there is such a thin veneer of any real science behind their case.

Proponents of both the biblical chronology and the old-age assumptions share the same difficulty when attempting to “prove” the soundness of their conclusions. As mentioned above, the only legitimate method of proving events of the distant past is through legal-historic proof because the events are neither repeatable, nor observable as would be required to qualify for proof by the scientific method. Legal-historic proof depends on manuscript (written) and oral

evidence as recorded or otherwise transmitted (i.e., through legend, folklore, tradition or word of mouth). There are however, at least four major factors to be weighed strongly in favor of the biblical time scale:

1. There are far fewer conflicts between the biblical timeframe and observed science. The scientific evidence fits the biblical records with much greater harmony and logical satisfaction.
2. The credibility of the Bible as a resource on matters of archaeology and history is astounding. As one author has directly stated:

“Scholars have concluded that no archaeological evidence found to date flat-out contradicts the Bible.” – Lee Strobel⁶⁷

This is a particularly profound statement considering the thousands of references to people, places, times and events of history that are mentioned in detail within the pages of the Bible.

3. The fulfillment of specific and detailed biblical prophecy is unexplainable by other than supernatural and divine means. Consider, for instance, that the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ fulfilled more than 50 very specific Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, including:
 - His unexpected arrival as a newborn baby
 - His birth into poverty
 - The exact location of His birth
 - His Hebrew lineage and ancestry
 - The exact price of His betrayal
 - That He would be rejected by His own people
 - That His hands and feet would be pierced [prophesied long before the introduction of crucifixion as a means of execution by the Romans]
 - His death as a criminal
 - His unlikely burial in a rich man’s tomb

⁶⁷ Strobel, Lee; *The Case for Christ*; Zondervan, 1998; p. 68.

These prophecies were recorded between 400 and 1,000 years before the birth of Christ. In addition to the direct prophecies, there are more than 250 indirect foreshadows of Christ's life in scripture. Major examples of these include:

- The theme of deliverance and redemption through trust in the atoning blood of a sacrificial lamb (compare Exodus 12:7–13 with Romans 5:9 and Revelation 5:9).
- God the Father's sacrifice of His only son (the patriarch Abraham was commanded to offer his only son Isaac on the very same mountain where Christ was later crucified as an offering for sin).

This is an extensive and convincing topic that should be given considerable study before the Bible is discarded as mere mythology, folklore or a book of allegorical stories with no basis in real history.

4. The unity and harmony of biblical doctrine is unexplainable by other than supernatural and divine means. The Bible is contained in 66 books, which were written over a 1,500-year period by over 40 authors from all walks of life (kings, peasants, philosophers, fishermen, poets, statesmen, scholars) who lived in many different countries (Syria, Arabia, Italy, Greece, Babylon, Palestine) on three different continents and in three original languages.

*"Yet despite this, the harmony running through the Bible is exceptional. If you look at all the books you will see that they all teach the same great principles about life and death, sin and salvation. From the first verse of the first book of the Bible through to the last verse of the last book of the Bible there is a one consistent story which steadily unfolds: God has a plan for the earth and the human race and He will see it slowly but surely come to completion."*⁶⁸

⁶⁸ "The Bible—its harmony, contents and message";
<http://www.bridgetothebible.com/12%20reasons/Reason%201.htm>.

The author goes on to reiterate that such harmony does not happen by chance. Like the performance of a mighty orchestra, harmony and resonance do not occur without first being composed. A score and a conductor must be employed to keep each musician in harmony and in beautifully timed sequence. Without a composer, a conductor and a score symphony such as is found in the Bible is simply not possible.

Points to Remember

1. In the overall life of history, the idea of an old earth is fairly new. Prior to the mid-nineteenth century, a young earth aged at less than ten thousand years old, was by far the most widely accepted view in scientific and academic communities and within the public at large.
2. Radiometric dating, one of the two main tenets of old-earth thinking, is based on three major assumptions, none of which have conclusive scientific support. The actual ages of rock samples of known origin differ from their radiometric dating ages by vast amounts. In addition, when the same rock sample is dated by applying several different radiometric dating methods, the resulting ages vary significantly.
3. Naturalistic uniformitarianism, the other main tenet of old-earth thinking, is based on a presupposition against catastrophic events (such as global flooding), particularly if those events are associated with the supernatural. The foundational assumption of naturalistic uniformitarianism is that the rate of accumulation of the earth's crust has always been uniform and has never varied. This is merely presupposition, having no basis whatsoever in observable science.
4. There is extensive scientific evidence that the earth is quite young (less than 100,000 years old) and at many points the evidence strongly suggests an age of the earth less than 10,000 years old.
5. The genealogical records of the Bible put the origin of the earth at around 4,000 B.C. There is much observable science to support this chronology of the earth. There is no scientific evidence that excludes the biblical age for Earth as a credible possibility and again, observable science offers much evidence in favor of it.

Questions for Discussion and Review

1. What is the significance of the geologic activity observed on the earth's moon and more recently on the moons of Jupiter?
2. What are some of the scientific evidences that point to a young earth less than 10,000 years old?
3. The idea that the earth is old came into full swing in the nineteenth century. Prior to that time what would have been the thinking of most people regarding the age of earth?
4. Does the Bible give a specific age of the earth? What would it mean to the credibility of the Bible, if its chronology was proven to be in error?
5. What are some of the evidences that the Bible has a divine origin and supernatural content?

Chapter Seven:

Rethinking the Dinosaur Deal

Good Science: *The fossil record provides significant insight into the history of dinosaurs that once roamed the earth.*

Bad Science: *Dinosaurs have been extinct for 65 million years.*

Science Fiction: *Dinosaurs shed their scales, grew feathers and evolved into birds.*

According to a *Smithsonian* magazine article, entitled “Dinosaur Shocker,”⁶⁹ a field crew chief from the museum of the Rockies was eating his lunch when he discovered one of the best preserved *Tyrannosaurus Rex* specimens ever found. After being encased in plaster to prepare it for shipping, the specimen was found to be too heavy for the helicopter to airlift out, so it was split into two shipments. During the separation process one of the *T. Rex* leg bones was broken in two. This gave paleontologist Mary Schweitzer the unusual opportunity to analyze the structure inside the dinosaur’s bone cavity. Under normal circumstances, such areas are not examined in the lab because it is considered a waste of time. After supposed millions of years of decay, technicians do not expect to find anything worth looking at inside of a dinosaur’s bones and in addition, the process of analyzing the interior bone would be destructive to the overall specimen.

Wanting to study the relationship between a dinosaur’s size and the microscopic structure of its bones, Schweitzer began to attempt breaking down thin slices of the bone material using a weak acid solution. After encountering some trouble in the process, she enlisted the help of molecular biologist Gayle Callis. Later, Callis happened to share some of the slides taken from the *T. Rex* with colleagues at a

⁶⁹ Fields, Helen; “Dinosaur Shocker”; <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/dinosaur-shocker-115306469>.

veterinary conference. It was at this conference that one of the vets first noted the presence of red blood cells in one of the samples.

What's up with the soft tissues?

Though Schweitzer was at first doubtful—because soft tissues and red blood cells should never have survived intact over a period of millions of years—she did some further analysis and went on to find tiny blood vessels in the bone sample that contained round red blood cells, which she labeled “round microstructures” in order to avoid the obvious controversy it would stir. Perhaps she also wanted to steer clear of anything suggesting a younger age of the earth. She also found evidence of heme (part of the oxygen-carrying hemoglobin protein) in the bones. This was further evidence that Schweitzer’s “round microstructures” were indeed red blood cells.

Was Schweitzer’s discovery an isolated fluke? Since her initial findings, she and her lab technician Jennifer Wittmeyer, have found blood vessels, bone-building cells, collagen and connective tissue in another T. Rex specimen and in a supposed 300,000-year-old woolly mammoth. They’ve even found molecules strikingly similar to DNA, though Schweitzer is quick to note that she hasn’t proven that they really are DNA. The presence of these tissues marks the age of the specimens as much younger than previously thought possible—less than several thousands of years old. Collagen for instance, when locked in bone, should not be older than a maximum of 30,000 years according to models built from empirical laboratory results. This is the primary reason that paleontologists over the past 300 years have not bothered to look for such soft organic materials. Biologists also insist that DNA cannot exist in natural environments longer than 10,000 years.

Rather than daring to suggest that the specimens might not be millions of years old, or entering the forbidden territory of calling into question the methods used to date the specimens, these scientists have instead chosen to question our understanding of the processes

of decay. An interesting comment regarding these discoveries was made by Thomas Holtz Jr., of the University of Maryland.

“There’s a lot of really basic stuff in nature that people just make assumptions about.”

Though perhaps misguided, His honesty is refreshing. His comment belies the awareness that something is definitely amiss with the science around these discoveries. After a lifetime of indoctrination, is it possible that the age of the dinosaurs could be one of those basic things in nature that researchers just make assumptions about?

Dinosaurs living next to man?

Though secular scientists are insisting that dinosaurs became extinct 65 million years ago, there is a large body of evidence that dinosaurs and man coexisted only a few thousand and perhaps as recently as hundreds of years ago. While this is a topic that should be studied thoroughly, a synopsis of some of the evidence is presented here.

1. Artifacts and cave paintings from all over the world

The history and culture of the North American Indian is replete with tales and legends of the Thunderbird—a great flying reptile. The Sioux people believed that in old times the Thunderbirds destroyed dangerous reptilian monsters called the Unktehila.

A museum in Manitou Springs, Colorado, has on display an artifact of a carved Indian prayer stick having a crested head, eyes on both sides, and a beaked mouth. This striking relic bears very strong resemblance to pterodactyl fossils.⁷⁰ Zoologist and explorer

⁷⁰ “Ancient Dinosaur Depictions”;
http://www.6000years.org/frame.php?page=dinosaurs_depictions.

A. Hyatt Verrill discovered images on Indian pottery which so accurately depict Pterodactyls that he concluded that they must be based on fossil discoveries, however unlikely it may seem that the Indian tribes would have had paleontologists amongst them.

*"The native American Coclé culture of Panama was discovered by A. Hyatt Verrill. He noticed the oddly pterosaur-like representations on Coclé pottery and suggested it was so realistic that these native Americans must have been influenced by fossil discoveries. He describes the depiction... as having 'beak-like jaws armed with sharp teeth, wings with two curved claws, short, pointed tail, reptilian head crest or appendages, and strong hind feet with five-clawed toes on each.'"*⁷¹

It is uncanny that there are so many such Pterodactyl-like artifacts from various parts of the world that have specific features (e.g., head crests, wings, claws and tails) exactly matching those of the flying reptiles. For instance, there are many accounts of interactions with creatures from the seventeenth century whose descriptions also match the Pterodactyl with detailed accuracy.

*"...[the] drawing is from a 17th century German tract about the dangers of witches and witchcraft....The pterosaurs depicted flying in the background, with characteristic headcrests and tails, were apparently associated with witches."*⁷²

And another remarkable seventeenth-century example from Rome:

*"A dragon was said to live in the wetlands near Rome in December of 1691. This creature lived in a cave and supposedly terrorized the local population... The most remarkable thing about the animal is **the clear head crest***

⁷¹ Verrill, A. Hyatt; *Strange Prehistoric Animals and Their Stories*; L.C. Page, 1948, pp. 132–133.

⁷² Guazzo, Francesco Maria; *Compendium Maleficarum*; 1628; p. 23.

*and the dual piece of skin from the crest. Five digits were clearly visible for each foot, of the proper length and with the first shorter and offset from the rest as is proper for the Scaphognathus. There is a hint of a wing claw on the far wing where it curves forward. The **membrane wings** are in front of the legs, on the vertebrae, matching the fossils. The femur is properly shown as a single bone. The tibia and fibula, the twin lower leg bones, are visible too. Although some have suggested that it could be a fossil or a faked composite, **it is much too accurate to be a fabrication**. The survival of the skin suggests that it is not a fossil since it includes accurate wing features, a head crest, and the ears.”⁷³*

Further evidence is found in some of the beautiful French chateaus built prior to the early 1500s such as Château de Chambord, Château de Blois, and Château Azay-le-Rideau, which have beautiful and detailed dragon illustrations carved into their walls, ceilings and furniture. These illustrations bear remarkable likeness to specific dinosaurs species such as Plateosaurus and Thecodontosaurus. Though in today's culture we think of the word “dragon” to mean a huge flying fire-breathing lizard, remember that the term “dinosaur” (meaning literally “great lizard”) was not coined until 1841. Prior to that, the word “dragon” was used to refer to the variety of giant lizards that were observed in various places on the earth. The word “dragon” only took on the legendary, fire-breathing tones in the years after 1841.

Very accurate depictions of specific species of dinosaurs have been included in the pottery, artwork and other artifacts from all over the world including Greece, Rome, Egypt, Europe, Africa, and from the Shang Dynasty (eighteenth century B.C.) to the foothills of eighteenth-century Zimbabwe.

“A fantastic mystery has developed over a set of cave paintings found in the Gorozomzi Hills, 25 miles from Salisbury. For the paintings include a brontosaurus – the 67-foot, 30-ton-like

⁷³ Goertzen, John; "The Rhamphorhynchoid Pterosaur Scaphognathus crassirostris: A 'Living Fossil' Until the 17th Century"; 1998 ICC Paper.

creature scientists believed became extinct millions of years before man appeared on earth. Yet the bushmen who did the paintings ruled Rhodesia [Zimbabwe] from only 1500 B.C. until a couple of hundred years ago. And the experts agree that the bushmen always painted from life. This belief is borne out by other Gorozomzi Hills cave paintings – accurate representations of the elephant, hippo, buck and giraffe.”⁷⁴

Such depictions of dinosaurs span millennia of time and much of the globe. Unless man coexisted with dinosaurs in recent history, how else can the abundance of accurate and detailed depictions of specific traits of individual dinosaur species from such diverse locations be explained? If not from direct observation of the dinosaurs, are we to imagine that each culture and time period benefited from their own set of paleontologists who independently came to excellent agreement on the soft features of dinosaurs (those feature not apparent from the skeletal remains)? Or was there perhaps an ancient, yet to be unearthed crude form of internet that enabled the accurate sharing of this information across cultures and time? [Aliens, anyone?]

2. Fossilized human and dinosaur footprints side by side

“...dinosaur footprints, side by side with humans. Finding them would counter evidence that humans evolved long after the dinosaurs became extinct and back up...[the] claim that all species, including man, were created at one time.”
- NOVA TV Special: God, Darwin and the Dinosaurs

If humans did coexist with dinosaurs, it would make sense that they would steer clear of the large, terrifying lizards as much as possible and even avoid visiting areas where the dinosaurs were

⁷⁴ Anonymous; "Bushmen's Paintings Baffling to Scientists"; *Evening News*; January 1, 1970, London Express Service. (Printed in *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, January 7, 1970.)

known to frequent (e.g., waterholes, caves, etc.). Despite this, reports of human and dinosaur footprints found side by side with dinosaur tracks have emerged from many areas where fossils have been discovered such as Zapata, New Mexico; Tuba City, Arizona; Glen Rose, Texas, a site in Australia, and a particularly fantastic site in Turkmenistan. Prints taken from the Glen Rose site are particularly interesting in that they also include a well-preserved hand print as if a man was kneeling on one knee and supporting his weight with his right hand while reaching for something in the mud with his left hand. Of the hundreds of human footprints found at the site, some of them are detailed enough to show five distinct toes or to determine that they are from a human who was nearly seven feet tall.

In addition, there have been at least two reports from the Kughitang-Tau Plateau in Turkmenistan describing human and dinosaur footprints found together in the same fossil bed. In 1995, Journalist Alexander Bushev reported that he had journeyed to the plateau near the village of Khodga-Pil, and had seen the fossilized prints of dinosaurs and humans together. Bushev said that every meter of the half-kilometer-wide rock surface is covered by three-toed footprints, which are “made by giant dinosaurs making their morning or evening promenade along the ancient sea-shore. But the most mysterious fact,” Bushev added, “is that among the footprints of dinosaurs, footprints of bare human feet were found!” What was Bushev’s interpretation of the discovery? Following the *“when-long-ages-are-no-longer-defensible,-invoke-Martians”* pattern often used when the evidence does not match secular presuppositions, Bushev suggested that, because “we know” that humans appeared much later than dinosaurs, perhaps there was an extraterrestrial “who walked in his swimming suit along the sea-side.”⁷⁵ Seriously? [E.T. phone home!]

Regardless of whether every footprint found at these sites can be inarguably verified to be human, taken as a whole they constitute

⁷⁵ *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, 31 January 1995 edition.

a convincing body of high-quality evidence that adds significant credibility to the conclusion that dinosaurs and mankind lived together at the same time and in close proximity.

3. The abundance of dinosaurs accounts in folklore and history

Before the term *dinosaur* was coined, dinosaurs were referred to primarily as “dragons” by English-speaking cultures, though it is also important to note that each culture had their own terms for the “great lizards.” In the Chinese culture, they were called “Loong,” in Japan the term was “Ryu,” in Germany they were called “Lindworm,” in India “Neak” and so on. It is fascinating that dragon history is so similar across ancient cultures that were often separated by significant distances, hailing from different continents and spanning long periods of time. Yet there is a remarkable consistency in the detailed descriptions recorded in the history of these diverse cultures. Accounts of dragons were recorded throughout ancient history and mixed in with the stories and legends of ancient and not-so-ancient cultures. Many of them refer to actual first-hand sightings or other actual encounters with the dinosaurs. For instance the account of the death of Morvidus (legendary king of the Britons from the fourth century) is chronicled in the historical work, *History of the Kings of Britain* (c. 1136 A.D.), a highly respected and scholarly reference. The account is written as fact in a straightforward manner alongside other factual events and with none of the poetic language or exaggerations that accompany fictitious legends and folklore.

“In his time a certain king of the Morini arrived with a great force in Northumberland, and began to destroy the country. But Morvidus, with all the strength of the kingdom, marched out against him, and fought him. In this battle he alone did more than the greatest part of this army, and after the victory, suffered none of the enemy to escape alive...During these and other monstrous acts of cruelty, an accident happened which put a period to his wickedness. There came from the coasts of

the Irish sea, a most cruel monster, that was continually devouring the people upon the sea-coasts. As soon as he heard of it, he ventured to go and encounter it alone; when he had in vain spent all his darts upon it, the monster rushed upon him, and with open jaws swallowed him up like a small fish.”⁷⁶

There are a great number of such accounts in history that can be studied. Here are a few more prominent examples:

- When Alexander the Great invaded India, he reported seeing a great hissing dragon living in a cave. Later, Greek rulers reportedly brought back “dragons” alive from Ethiopia.⁷⁷
- Ancient explorers and historians, such as Josephus, told of small flying reptiles in ancient Egypt and Arabia and described their predators, the ibis, as stopping their invasion into Egypt.⁷⁸
- The respected Greek researcher Herodotus has been called “the Father of History” because he was the first historian we know of who collected his materials systematically and then tested them for accuracy. He recorded the following description which matches the characteristics of a Pterosaur with remarkable accuracy:

“There is a place in Arabia, situated very near the city of Buto, to which I went, on hearing of some winged serpents; and when I arrived there, I saw bones and spines of serpents, in such quantities as it would be impossible to describe. The form of the serpent is like that of the water-snake; but he has wings without feathers, and as like as possible to the wings of a bat.”⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Geoffrey of Monmouth; *History of the Kings of Britain*; (c. 1136 A.D.), chapter 15.

⁷⁷ Gould, Charles; *Mythical Monsters*, W.H. Allen & Co., 1886; pp. 382–383.

⁷⁸ Epstein, Perle S.; *Monsters: Their Histories, Homes, and Habits*; Doubleday, 1973; p.43.

⁷⁹ Herodotus, *Historiae*, tr. Henry Clay, 1850; pp. 75–76.

- Marco Polo wrote of his travels to the province of Karajan and reported on huge serpents, which at the fore part had two short legs with three claws.

*"The jaws are wide enough to swallow a man, the teeth are large and sharp, and their whole appearance is so formidable that neither man, nor any kind of animal can approach them without terror."*⁸⁰ He also described the creatures as nocturnal with very large eyes and having massively large bodies.

- The paintings and records of the Australian Aborigine Kuku Yalanji tribe include accounts of a sea and lake monster remarkably similar to a Plesiosaur.
- The Roman historian Cassius Dio recounted the occurrence of the Roman army killing a "dragon". Though the original is now lost, John of Damascus recorded Dio's account in his book *On Dragons and Ghosts*:

"One day, when Regulus, a Roman consul, was fighting against Carthage, a dragon suddenly crept up and settled behind the wall of the Roman army. The Romans killed it by order of Regulus, skinned it and sent the hide to the Roman senate. When the dragon's hide, as Dio says, was measured by order of the senate, it happened to be, amazingly, one hundred and twenty feet long, and the thickness was fitting to the length."

- Dragons were described in reputable zoological treatises published during the Middle Ages. Konrad Gesner, a doctor and Swiss naturalist published a four-volume encyclopedia from 1516 to 1565 entitled *Historiae Animalium*. He describes dragons as "very rare but still living creatures."⁸¹

⁸⁰ Polo, Marco; *The Travels of Marco Polo*; Dell Publishing, 1961; pp. 158–159.

⁸¹ *Historiae Animalium*, 1516–1565; p. 224.

- From the library of Henry VIII, the reptile section of the Aberdeen Bestiary, written in the early 1500s, included the lizard, the salamander, snakes and the dragon:

"The dragon is bigger than all other snakes or all other living things on earth... The dragon, it is said, is often drawn forth from caves into the open air, causing the air to become turbulent. The dragon has a crest, a small mouth, and narrow blow-holes through which it breathes and puts forth its tongue. Its strength lies not in its teeth but in its tail, and it kills with a blow rather than a bite...it kills anything around which it wraps its tail. From the dragon not even the elephant, with its huge size, is safe. For lurking on paths along which elephants are accustomed to pass, the dragon knots its tail around their legs and kills them by suffocation. Dragons are born in Ethiopia and India, where it is hot all year round."

- The seventeenth century writer Athanasius Kircher confirms the veracity of Christopher Schorerum's sighting of a dragon:

"[He] wrote a true history summarizing there all, for by that way, he was able to confirm the truth of the things experienced, and indeed the things truly seen by the eye, written in his own words: 'On a warm night in 1619... I saw a shining dragon of great size in front of Mt. Pilatus, coming from the opposite side of the lake [or 'hollow'], a cave that is named Flue [Hogarth-near Lucerne], moving rapidly in an agitated way, seen flying across; It was of a large Mount Pilatus Dragon by Kirchersize, with a long tail, a long neck, a reptile's head, and ferocious gaping jaws... At first I thought it was a meteor from what I saw. But after I diligently observed it alone, I understood it was indeed a dragon from the motion of the limbs of the entire body.' From the writings of a respected clergyman, in fact a

dragon truly exists in nature it is amply established.”⁸²

These are just a few samples of the great numbers of accounts of dragons (dinosaurs) from credible sources throughout history across many times and cultures. Amazingly, their descriptions exhibit excellent correlation with the size and physical characteristics of dinosaurs found in the fossil records of today. These points of evidence are inexplicable aside from the reality that dinosaurs and man existed together during hundreds of years of modern history.

Reptiles of a feather?

Finally, let’s take a quick look at the claim by many of today’s scientists that the birds in our world today are actually evolved descendants of dinosaurs. There are many reasons that this is simply not feasible, and we will examine a few of them here.

1. Formation of an entirely new kind from another kind is never observed

The term “speciation” refers to the formation of new breeds of dogs (for instance) from other kinds of dogs, but they are of course... still dogs. The development of new species from gradual changes in an existing species is good and observable science that can be rightly attributed to mutation and natural selection (via “Little e” or micro-evolution). The idea of dinosaurs evolving into birds, however, would require major genetic transformation and the formation of an entirely new and different kind (complete with new physiological capabilities, radically different skin and skeletal structures, etc.) from an existing kind. This is science fiction. It has significant scientific roadblocks, it has never been known to happen in the real world, and is not at all supported by the fossil record. Indeed, Darwin’s finches were in the end, despite minor changes within the kind, still finches with no crossing of the “kind” boundary.

⁸² Kircher, Athanasius; *Mundus Subterraneus*; 1665, tr. by Hogarth, “Dragons,” 1979; pp. 179–180.

2. The cellular structure of scales is radically different from feathered skin

Clearly, if dinosaurs had evolved into birds, the fossil record should include “transitional forms” of creatures demonstrating a gradual morphing from very heavy and thick-scaled hides to a variety of lightweight and thin-feathered skins. No such intermediate forms have ever been discovered.

“No transitional structures consisting of feathers that are part feather and part scale, or even feathers that are less [developed] than modern types, have ever been uncovered.”⁸³

In addition, the feathers of a bird are part of an intricate system requiring a delicate muscular subsystem that can make coordinated in-flight adjustments of the rotation and angle of individual or groups of feathers. No such system exists on scaled reptiles. The feather systems of birds also have other functions such as “fluffing up” to make the bird appear larger and more ferocious in the face of an enemy. Many birds also use their feathers in specific ways to attract the opposite sex during mating rituals. Reptile scales have no such functions. In addition, bird feathers are often brightly and individually colored to integrate into detailed and beautiful plumage patterns. This feature is altogether missing in the scales of reptiles.

In summary: Feathers are lightweight and thin, supported by very thin skin. Scales are heavy and quite thick with a very heavy supporting skin structure. Feathers are primarily made for flight. Scales are primarily made for armored protection. Feathers are individually controllable. Scales are not. Feathers are colored and arranged in ornate patterns. Scales are not. Under a microscope, feathers have one of the most detailed substructures found in zoology. By contrast, scales are very crude and simple. Because of their amazing insulating properties, feathers are well suited for endothermic (warm-blooded) animals. Scales have no such

⁸³ Stahl, B.J., *Vertebrate History: Problems in Evolution*; Dover, 1985; p. 350.

properties and are best suited for exothermic (cold-blooded) reptiles. Lastly, birds have amazing underlying muscular and nervous systems supporting their feathers which allow them to control the position of individual or groups feathers during flight. No such detailed subsystems exist in dinosaurs.

Scales and feathers are about as different in biologic structure as they could possibly be. Scales to feathers evolution remains a significant technical roadblock to “Big E” evolutionists. Many contradictory and unsatisfying theories have been offered with none of them having empirical support in the fossil record or other observable evidence.

3. The lung structures of dinosaurs and birds differ radically

Dinosaurs are equipped with inhale-exhale type of lungs similar to humans. Incoming air and outgoing air travel through a single vent—the esophagus. Not so for birds. Birds have a flow-through lung system with incoming and outgoing air traveling through separate airways. The fossil record has produced no evidence whatsoever of gradual evolutionary change of the reptilian lung system into a flow-through, avian type of lung.

4. Dinosaurs are cold blooded, birds are warm blooded

There are two distinct bio-thermal systems in the animal kingdom with no intermediates between them. The thermal and biological make up of warm-blooded kinds are distinctly different from cold-blooded creatures in hundreds of ways. The idea of a slow transition from cold-bloodedness to warm-bloodedness is entirely impractical and would require extensive integration of the two heat management mechanisms. This transition is not observed in any living organism or in the fossil record. In an apparent response to this roadblock, secular scientists have recently suggested that dinosaurs were neither cold nor warm blooded, but “a little bit of both.” This hypothesis, however, is speculative and inadequate and is entirely unsupported by the available

fossilized bones. Needless to say, skeleton fragments are hardly a conclusive source for determining that a creature may have possessed a unique hybrid system of warm and cold bloodedness.

Conclusion

Our media outlets and educational systems have been forcefully drumming into our brains the idea that dinosaurs have not roamed the earth since their extinction some 65 million years ago. For most people today, the possibility of dinosaurs existing in recent history alongside of humans is at first a “bridge too far” for them to consider. Many years ago, I was certainly among them. However, after looking more deeply into the evidence, my thinking began to change. As my research deepened, it became increasingly more credible in my own mind to accept the large body of sound evidence supporting man’s coexistence with dinosaurs and to reject the theories and presuppositions against it. Simply put, once I began to entertain recent dinosaur existence as a real possibility, I became more and more aware of the strong observable evidence for it and in the long run, I became convinced of it as a reality. At the same time, the thin veneer of science supporting the traditional ‘long ago extinct’ notion became increasingly apparent along with the gaping holes in the evidence. The mantra of secular science began to feel more and more like censored propaganda, particularly as I became aware of the many incidents of accomplished scientists losing their jobs, being denied tenure, or even being blacklisted if they dared to disagree with the presuppositions being promoted by mainstream academia.

We should always be suspicious of ideology and “science” that must be promulgated by presupposition, propaganda, intimidation and force. Those resorting to such tactics betray their inability to logically and scientifically defend their conclusions. Their loss of respect for and tolerance of dissenting viewpoints should alert us to the weakness of their argument. Brute force and bully tactics are sure indicators that adherents of an idea have given up winning based on fair intellectual exchange. In a free society, when honest intellectual discussion starts to be willfully excluded and students are required to line up with a

single, preauthorized worldview in order to pass their biology and philosophy classes, the death of intellectual integrity and academic freedom cannot be far behind.

Points to Remember

1. The discoveries of soft tissues, red blood cells and DNA-like molecules in dinosaur bones are very strong evidence that dinosaurs were alive on the earth as recently as few hundred years ago, or at the very most, only a few thousand years ago.
2. Detailed cave paintings strongly resembling individual dinosaur species, fossilized human and dinosaur footprints side by side, and the abundance of dinosaur accounts in modern history are further evidence that dinosaurs were alive on the earth only a few hundred years ago. With this realization in place the argument that dinosaurs are proof of an old earth evaporates.
3. The idea that dinosaurs evolved into birds is fraught with major difficulties and is pure speculation, not credible science. Transformation of any kind into new and distinct kind has never been observed and is not supported by the fossil record. Birds and dinosaurs are vastly different in the composition of their skin, lungs, heat management systems and other major biological characteristics. Solid, observable evidence that dinosaurs evolved into birds over millions or billions of years is entirely absent.

Questions for Discussion and Review

1. Prior to the recent discoveries of intact soft tissues in dinosaur bones by Mary Schweitzer and others, why would paleontologists not have had more opportunities to analyze the insides of dinosaur bones?
 2. Do you consider cave paintings and other artwork from recent history depicting specific details very closely matching known dinosaur species (armored spines, Pterodactyl-like heads, clawed wings, massive tails and teeth, etc.) to be credible evidence that mankind observed living dinosaurs first-hand? Why or why not?
 3. If humans and dinosaurs coexisted in recent history, what might be some reasons that finding evidence of them living together in close proximity would be a rare discovery?
 4. If a dinosaur's very heavy extremities began to slowly transform into the very lightweight ones necessary for sustainable flight, how well would the dinosaur be able to walk, run or defend himself during this half-and-half, transitional period? Would such a creature be vulnerable to predators during this time and selected against (killed off) by its natural enemies? On the other hand, in the period before the transformation was complete, how well would the "dino-bird" be able to fly? How vulnerable would the newly formed,
-

flying version of the dinosaur be to its predators? Keep in mind that since we are assuming here that all the flight characteristics of the new “dino-bird” were the result of chance alone, it would have no source of built-in intelligence on how to use its newly formed flying equipment and there would be a long, failure prone period while the “dino-bird” learned to fly. How vulnerable would the new creature be to its predators during this time and what would be the chances of its survival when all of its combative instincts were based on heavy offensive weapons (e.g., tusks, horns, etc.) and protective scales that were now diminishing or no longer present?

5. What are some reasons that secular scientists and evolutionists might want to suppress evidence of the existence of dinosaurs in recent history?

6. Why is the word dinosaur not found in history prior to the mid-nineteenth century?

Chapter Eight: So, What's the Point?

Unconverted

Dr. William Provine is a professor of biological sciences at Cornell University. He is an atheist and an evolutionist who believes that there is no life after death, that there is no evidence of design in biology and that man has no free will to make moral choices. Early in his life, Dr. Provine was a Christian, but he was unconverted as a young student after listening to the lectures of his biology professor and being indoctrinated with Darwinism. In Ben Stein's documentary *Expelled*,⁸⁴ Dr. Provine describes his un-conversion experience as follows:

*"[My biology professor] started talking about evolution as if it had no design in it whatsoever... and I read that [biology] book so carefully and I could find no sign of there being any design whatsoever in evolution, and I immediately began to doubt the existence of the Deity. But it starts by giving up an active Deity. Then he gives up the hope that there's any life after death. When you give those two up, the rest of it follows fairly easily. You give up the hope that there's an eminent morality. And finally, there's no human free will. **If you believe in Evolution you can't hope for there being any free will. There's no hope whatsoever of there being any deep meaning in life in human life.** We live, we die and we're gone..."*

*[The beliefs that there are] no Gods, no life after death, no ultimate foundation for ethics, no ultimate meaning in life, no human free will **are all deeply connected to an Evolutionary perspective.** You're here today and you're gone tomorrow and that's all there is to it."*

⁸⁴ *Expelled: No Intelligence Allowed*; Nathan Frankowski; Rocky Mountain Pictures, 2008; documentary DVD.

Dr. Provine's testimony of his un-conversion in the biology classroom is tragically common. Since the concepts of "Big E" evolution, the Big Bang theory and 'the origination of life by chance interaction of molecules' (biogenesis) have been widely embraced by academia, much of our secondary and post-secondary schools have become instruments of indoctrination for secular humanism— and all this in the name of "higher science" that proudly claims to have solved the mysteries of the origins of life and the universe without any need for a creator God.

De-conversion Strategy

The strategy to evangelize American youth for atheism and secular humanism has been very effective. According to an article in *USA Today*, 7 out of 10 Protestants ages 18 to 30 (both evangelical and mainline) who went to church regularly in high school said they quit attending church by age 23. The winning strategy that the culture has employed to destroy the faith of America's youth has been twofold:

First:

- Present "factual" evidence that science has explained all mysteries of the universe previously attributed to the hand of God.
- In the name of science, ridicule faith in God and adherence to the Bible as being simplistic, scientifically inaccurate and intellectually flawed.

Second:

- Create strong sexual desire in youth in order to destroy the foundations of moral purity.
- Desensitize youth to moral barriers and the consequences of sexual sin.
- Normalize patterns of repeated sexual encounters and broken relationships until principles such as purity, morality, exclusive commitment and "one love for all of life" have become trite, outdated and meaningless.

The period of adolescence after reaching puberty, but before the season of courtship and marriage, is a very difficult time for nearly all students. Healthy youth have healthy hormones that give them a healthy, natural interest in things sexual, but they are not yet in a season of life that affords them a healthy outlet for their sexuality (marriage). For most of history, cultures around the world encouraged marriage at a young age, much closer to the age of puberty as the norm. This circumvented much of the mess caused by the long periods of waiting between sexual maturity and marriage. Today's society adds to the student's dilemma by exposing them to more and more sources of sexual excitement, arousal, titillation and opportunities for casual emotional and physical connections with the opposite sex. In the middle of this sexually charged season of their lives, our culture's educational system then introduces a powerful idea:

*Since science has now explained away God, you need not worry about standards of moral conduct, or accountability to an eternal Deity. Pay no heed to feelings of duty to your conscience, your parental training or an internal moral code. Such feelings of moral conviction come from intellectually flawed and outdated religious thinking. There is no longer a basis for calling anything "right" or "wrong" in an absolute sense. Because of scientific advancement, we are smarter than all of that now, so... **YOU ARE FREE. PARTY DOWN!** (See the school nurse after class to get your free supply of pills and condoms. Don't worry; if anything goes wrong, we have discount passes to the abortion clinic available.)*

To further address this second arm of the strategy attacking the faith and moral health of our youth parents, ministers and faith-based educators must equip students with a firm understanding of the principles of self-control, proper marriage preparation and the importance of a commitment to a high standard of moral purity. What tool does the enemy use more often and more easily to divert American youth from their living out their faith than a compromised morality? There is a proven pathway for youth and single adults to escape the 'hook-up' culture and find the God-ordained love of their lives without the emotional brokenness and moral messes that so

many students are experiencing. There are many fine resources available on this topic which parents and educators can guide children and students through. I've also written a book addressing this subject entitled, *Journey to Agape*, (which I am currently revising as *Radical, Royal Romance*) to further address this vital topic. For now, let me reiterate that specific instruction in this area must also be an integral part of the training of every faith-honoring student if they are to avoid pitfall, distraction, disaster and shipwreck in their love lives that will diminish or destroy their faith and their potential.

This then, is the "one-two punch" that emboldens the majority of today's students to throw their belief in God out the window and their Bible in the trash can.

"Jesus, Your shed blood no longer has significance in my life. It is become meaningless to me since I learned from science that you are nothing more than a simplistic fairy tale, so now I'm going to do life my way. I no longer want to be laughed at for being different and besides, sex with my boyfriend is a lot more exciting than attending my youth group. So, sorry Jesus, I no longer believe you exist so... this is goodbye."

Social Experiments in 'Morality-Free' Chaos

If, as it is stated in the Bible, God is the author and creator of the universe who "upholds all things by the word of his power,"⁸⁵ then it unavoidably follows that:

In the absence of God, there remains only chaos.

What do I mean by chaos? With the growth of secular humanism comes the message "*Society is much better off without the moral restraints of religion.*" Let's look at recent American history to see if that is the case.

⁸⁵ Hebrews 1:3, *New American Standard Bible*.

In 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court removed prayer from public schools. A year later, devotional Bible reading was discontinued. After more than fifty years, what has been the effect of these changes on today's generation of youth? According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), one in five teenagers in the U.S. seriously considers suicide, and approximately 1,700 die by suicide each year. A friend of my 15-year-old son was recently added to that number for the year 2015. His loss was a devastating shock to his family, his friends, his school, and his community. Both the CDC and the National Mental Health Association (NMHA) point out that suicide rates for teens have **tripled since 1960**—making it **the third leading cause of adolescent death** and the **second leading cause** among college students.

One of the most enriching and fulfilling experiences of human life is being deeply loved and loving others. But the American sexual revolution has been successful in convincing most of our society and our youth in particular, that:

1. Sex = Love. In romantic relationships, sex is the central and all-important factor.
2. There are no negative consequences to immoral behavior.
3. There are no negative consequences to a lifestyle of temporary relationships, each one ending in painful and dysfunctional brokenness.

When youth (or adults for that matter) accept these ideas, as they experience broken relationships and rejection, they are likely to conclude:

1. I just need another relationship with better sex.
2. Since love and sex were supposed to fulfill my life but didn't, there must be something wrong with me—I must not be lovable.

After suffering through one or several broken, dysfunctional relationships, dealing with the guilt of immorality, abortion and perhaps a venereal disease or two, a person loses something fundamentally important to life—the hope of finding lasting joy in loving and being loved. Each person is born with this need, and their heart resonates strongly with the “happily ever after” stories from their childhood and adolescent years. Today's sexualized culture,

however, steals this hope from them at earlier and earlier ages. This leaves many young students deeply wounded, disillusioned and despairing. The 'party down' lifestyle may seem fun and exciting for a time, but it soon leaves people empty and burned out, feeling terrible about themselves and about life itself. Is it any wonder that hopelessness and depression are such huge problems among today's students?

Though the word *religion* has been badly tarnished in modern times, the best definition of *religion* is "having a vital relationship with the living God." Indeed, any exercise of religion that does not include a personal, life-giving and real two-way relationship with God is an empty shadow of what faith was intended to be. Among the many benefits of having a real relationship with God, two of the greatest are:

1. Experiencing His deep, personal and permanent love. Knowing that God is my Father and that He delights in me brings great joy and fullness to my soul.
2. Knowing that He created me for a purpose and that He is actively helping to fulfill the purpose for which I have been created.

In addition, the truth that this life is only a shadow of greater things to come, and the reality of eternal life without death, sorrow and disease provide tremendous perspective when life seems to bring only disappointment, disillusionment and pain. The understanding of ultimate accountability to God who has clearly laid out the guidelines for right living in order to keep us safe in His love, is also vital to keeping oneself on track morally. Without it, being "good for goodness sake" will not be enough when being "bad" along with the crowd seems necessary for receiving the love and acceptance that we long for and need.

Let's look again at the conclusions resulting from Dr. Provine's acceptance of 'Big E' evolution:

- No God
- No life after death
- No ultimate foundation for ethics
- No ultimate meaning in life
- No human “free will” (no moral choices)

Dr. Provine’s life is a clear example that those who accept Evolutionary thinking will be robbed of the foundational truths that can bring deep fulfillment in our lives.

Dangerous Ground

Teaching evolution to students is not just bad science... it is damaging to them and **dangerous**. As stated in Chapter 3, the Columbine shootings were a tragic case in point. On the day of the massacre, Eric Harris wore a white T-shirt with the words "Natural Selection" printed in black. In his journal, Dylan Klebold wrote that he and Harris were "god-like" and “more **highly evolved** than every other human being.” If we have no free will and there is no God, then there is no judgment, and we need not worry about being held accountable for our actions. Without an immutable foundation for ethics, we lose the ability to call anything right or wrong. In the context of evolutionary ideology then...

“If I am ridiculed, hurt or bullied by my classmates, why should I not take violent revenge and give full vent to my anger from behind the trigger of a deadly weapon? I am more ‘fit for survival’ than those who have abused, ridiculed and bullied me, and after all, we are all just animals without purpose or free will that are ‘just gone’ after we die anyway. There is no absolute right or wrong, so on the other side of death I will answer to no one for my actions no matter how selfish, hateful or bloody they may be. If things begin going bad for me after I take my revenge, I can simply escape by ending my own life. Then, let the ‘nothingness’ begin.”

If evolution is a fact and there is indeed no God, this kind of thinking (though obviously twisted and self-centered) starts to make a kind of perverted sense. Evolution becomes the ideological foundation for

eliminating moral restraint and opening the door for a huge increase in violence in our youth and our society.

New Age Thinking Growing Old

Among my favorite quotes from Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is his simple statement that ***"A lie cannot live."*** As time and technology progress, the curtain is being slowly drawn back on the many wrong assumptions lying at the foundation of today's secular thinking. The scientific hypocrisy of the little wizard behind the curtain spinning the wheels, pressing the buttons and using a big microphone in order to sound important is becoming increasingly evident, and more and more scientists (like Antony Flew) are beginning to agree that the evidence for design in creation is too profound to be ignored and far more satisfying than the cardboard theories that humanist scientists have set up to preclude it. In a recent article in *The Wall Street Journal*, author, speaker and TV host Eric Metaxas made the following comment:

*"Many have accepted the cultural narrative that [God is] obsolete—that as science progresses, there is less need for a 'God' to explain the universe. Yet it turns out that the rumors of God's death were premature. More amazing is that the relatively recent case for his existence comes from a surprising place—**science itself.**"*

New evidence emerging from the progression of science itself is making it more difficult and ludicrous to maintain the illusion that life and the universe can be accounted for aside from the actions of a powerful designer. Would Darwin have concluded that the basic structures of life popped into existence through random processes if he had had any idea of the incredibly tiny, code-based information system that so masterfully directs the millions of intricate life sustaining processes inside of each living cell?

Even Dr. William Provine has recently abandoned Neo-Darwinism and proclaimed that he no longer believes in natural selection!

*"I no longer see natural selection as a mechanism, or an active cause of evolution."*⁸⁶

Referring to Dr. Provine's presentation at The World Summit on Evolution held in the Galapagos Islands, American science columnist Michael Shermer reported that the gist of Dr. Provine's talk was that we need a new theory of evolution, after which he listed 11 problems with the theory of evolution including the statement that:

*"Natural selection does not shape an adaptation or cause a gene to spread over a population or really do anything at all."*⁸⁷

Clearly Dr. Provine is rethinking the foundational assumptions of 'Big E' evolution.

What Should We Then Believe?

For many years, Christians have been accused of rejecting modern science and having to commit "intellectual suicide" in order to believe the biblical accounts of a supernatural origin of life and the universe. After many years of studying both the science and the Bible, I have found the following to be true:

1. Both the biblical and the evolutionist worldviews require acceptance of causal factors that we do not fully comprehend and most likely will never fully understand. I have found that the evolutionist worldview often requires overlooking gaps and contradictions in the evidence and logic as well as the acceptance of unproven assumptions and often raw speculation as fact.
2. Most of the scientific contradictions introduced by "Big E" evolution and its associated theories (e.g., the Big Bang) are

⁸⁶ <http://www.evolutionnews.org/2005/04/>.

⁸⁷ Shermer, Michael; "The Woodstock of Evolution"; <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-woodstock-of-evolutio>.

resolved when one accepts the reality of a young earth and universe that were designed by a Master Creator.

3. The biblical worldview fits the observable and historical evidence much more cleanly and accurately, with far greater intellectual satisfaction and without contradicting the raw (assumption-free) scientific evidence.

Regarding the Bible, the key questions are whether or not it is divinely directed, divinely inspired and infallible. After one reads and studies the Bible and finds that there is satisfying, verifiable and scientifically sound evidence for the vast majority of its claims, and that significant portions of its content cannot be explained other than by the supernatural hand of God (e.g., fulfilled prophecy, remarkable historical and archaeological accuracy, amazing theological consistency across millennia, continents and cultures, etc.) it then becomes an intelligent and reasonable position to assume that those parts of the biblical record that cannot be verified from evidence (such as the Creation history of Genesis) are also trustworthy sources of truth.

Are You Prepared for the Assault? (Are your children?)

In today's classrooms, students will continue to be subjected to a great deal of presupposition, unproven theory and outright science fiction masquerading as fact. Unless they understand where the science ends and the science fiction begins, they are very likely to accept ideologies fatal to their faith, dangerous to society and adapt a worldview that is damaging to their lives and the future of our nation. Individuals and parents of students are encouraged to use the information in this book and the many other resources available to prevent the progression of bad science and half-truths that could destroy the foundations of faith and turn them from eager young learners excited about life's opportunities, to hopeless and despairing victims of the bad "scientific" Kool-Aid which has become standard fare in so many of today's classrooms.

Epilogue: For the Believing

What is Your Faith Based On?

As religious persecution is growing around the world in all of its ugly forms, many theists and followers of Jesus Christ, (such as the twenty one Egyptian Christians murdered by ISIS in Libya in 2015), are facing a decision whether to hold on to their lives, their homes, their families and their employment or to stay true to their faith—at great personal cost. In times of incredible pressure, suffering and loss, the above question becomes much more than an intellectual exercise. How they've answered this question has either carried them through the storms of persecution and compelled them to hold to their faith with tremendous strength, loving the truth more than even their own lives, or to an experience of horrendous emptiness in the wake of a cowardly denial of the One who loved them and gave His all for them. In recent years and throughout history, countless faithful overcomers have exhibited a powerful and unshakable faith in the face of indescribable evil. What kind of faith is it that carried them through the crucible they were forced to endure?

What Are You Standing For?

Jesus commissioned His church to be a light in the world so that people who have no idea who God is can be introduced to a few simple, life-changing truths:

1. Every man has a sin problem that makes him entirely incompatible with the presence of the perfect and holy God of creation—in this life and in eternity.

2. God has visited planet Earth in the form of a sinless man, Jesus Christ.
3. Jesus willingly gave Himself to prolonged abuse and torture followed by a horrendous death by crucifixion so that His blood sacrifice could become the solution to our sin problem. He offered his own life as a substitutionary payment for our crimes against God. When we accept His gift, He removes the looming sentence of judgement and punishment against us and freely gives us his perfect righteousness (right standing with God) in exchange.
4. Our sin problem having been resolved through Christ's offering, we are then invited to enjoy full access to intimacy with the Father, now in this life and for all of eternity. Wow! If you have experienced the power of this reality, you know you have been forever changed.

What ought to be happening then, is that believing students in high schools and colleges are influencing their peers and introducing them to the above truths by their words and the example of their radically different lives—and having a great time doing it. For the most part, this has not been happening. Instead, the very opposite is occurring. The culture has been quite successful at convincing our high school and college students that the above truths are shallow, religious fairytales. As a result, Christian students between the ages of 15 and 25 are being de-converted (like Dr. Provine) and leaving the church at an alarming rate. The world is winning and the church in America is, for the most part, dying a slow death. Within a few short years she will face extinction if this trend is not reversed.

Now... take a minute to ponder a vital and fundamental question:

What is my faith based on?

Boil your answer down to one word or a short sentence.

Based on his writings, I suggest that the Apostle Paul's answer to this question would be short and simple. I think he would say something like,

"My faith is based on fact. Because the historical fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead will never change, my faith also will never change."

Paul had an immovable conviction of an infallible fact of history, but this was also a fact that he had experienced in a deeply personal way due to his face-to-face encounter with the resurrected Christ. Subsequently, Paul sacrificed a lucrative career and a position of high social status in order to live a life true to the God that he knew to be real. His commitment resulted in a lifetime of personal hardship and extensive suffering. He had encountered the risen Christ and had become 150% convinced that he had risen from the dead. In the end, for his allegiance to this fact He willingly gave his life and died as a Christian martyr.

To summarize, Paul's amazing life and deep commitment resulted from two primary ingredients:

1. The historical fact of the resurrection of Christ, the ultimate proof that Jesus was indeed "God made known in the flesh" (see 1 Timothy 3:16)
2. Paul's personal, powerful and undeniable encounter with the resurrected Christ.

I have written this book in order to inform the reader that a position of faith is an educated and scientifically sound and defensible viewpoint. I have also written to arm Christian parents and students not only to win the battle for their faith that is raging in our society, but also to give them information so that they can unashamedly influence their peers and their educators toward a reliable and credible faith based on **fact**.

The strategy for impacting others is simple:

- Learn something
- Influence someone

In our present culture with its largely atheism-based educational curricula, we are being systematically indoctrinated with such ideas as:

- Science has disproven the existence of God and displaced any need for Him when addressing the vital questions of life (e.g., Why am I here? How can I find my purpose in life? What will happen to me after I die?).
- Science and faith are mutually exclusive opposites.
- Having faith in a Creator is a simplistic, antiquated, unrealistic, childish and backward (or non-progressive) mindset.
- Dissent from the accepted worldview (evolution and atheism) is responsible for the hindering scientific advancement and achievement and therefore should not be tolerated.
- Adherents to the commonly accepted worldview (e.g., public educators, governmental officials and agencies, college professors, etc) have the right to determine what parents holding opposing worldviews are allowed to teach their own children, presumably because their position is more intelligent and better for the good of society.

Freedom of religion and “firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence” have been the foundational principles of our country and essential elements of the greatness of “America the Beautiful.” Unless we begin raising a generation of young citizens prepared to stand up against the false science and indoctrination agendas of the atheists and evolutionists, our country will continue its rapid decline into moral and economic disarray.

So come on. Now it's up to you...

Learn something...
Influence someone!

