

Hello, my name is Brooks Harris.
I'd like to welcome you to this lecture entitled:
CREATIVE VIEWS OF SCIENCE
which is
A Review of Scientific Theories on Origins &
A Review of Scientific Evidence for Origins

Introduction

The first part of this lecture may seem a bit boring, but bear with me because it gets exciting after the introduction. So the purpose of this lecture is to review the different views of the origins of organisms and other things in nature. We will look at scientific evidence to see if theories of origins are supported by these evidences. So how do we prove theories and can any Theories of Origins be proven scientifically?

First let's define a few terms. **Science** is knowledge which covers general truths or the operation of general laws especially as obtained and tested through scientific methods. The **Scientific Method** is the systematic pursuit of knowledge and the collection of data through observation and experiments and the formulation and testing of hypotheses. The word **Origins** means the point at which things *begin* their course or existence and a **Theory** is just a belief or an idea; an *unproved* assumption.

For theories or ideas to become known as fact they must be proven by the Scientific Method. This means they can be observed to occur or repeatable results can be seen through experimentation. Therefore true scientific facts require observation and/or reliable experimentation. But since no one was alive to observe or record the origins process, any experimentation today to try to prove what happened in the past would require assumptions of what the past was like. Assumptions and guesswork do not belong in true science. Therefore no theory or idea about our origins can be *proven* scientifically. So to believe in any idea of our origins, we have to believe by faith. The less evidence there is to support a theory or idea, the more faith you must have to believe it.

If we cannot prove theories of origins scientifically, how can we determine if any theory is correct? To see which theory is the most logical, we have to study the evidences. Scientists search, find and evaluate evidences, then they see if the evidence supports any theory and which theory best fits the evidence. Before coming to any conclusion on any subject we must examine all, not just part of, the available evidence and facts.

We should always be able to give reasons for why we believe what we believe. Therefore we must study different views to prove to ourselves that we are correct to believe what we believe. If we have not seen the evidence for an idea which opposes our understanding, we cannot wisely say that the idea is wrong. We can only say that we believe in what we understand. If the facts and evidences do not support our belief then we must look for what they do support. We must not just assume there is something wrong with the evidence and therefore ignore it if it does not fit our belief. A good scientist will always review all the available evidence before making a conclusion.

For generations our schools and our society have been teaching us that certain ideas and theories are now basically accepted as fact even though they have not been proven. Even though modern scientific discoveries have shown how most of the accepted ideas of origins are incorrect, we are still being taught that they are correct. "How is this possible?" you might ask. Well, to believe these ideas we have to ignore the facts that these new discoveries have revealed and make many unprovable assumptions about the past. There are other ideas which are strongly supported by modern scientific evidence but our society has either not been shown much of this evidence or they have chosen to ignore most of it for various reasons. A few powerful people in our society want to control what you believe by controlling what you learn. They do not want you to see the evidence which supports ideas which oppose their ideas. If you see how the evidence actually supports the opposing ideas and how it discredits their ideas, they are afraid you will not believe what they want you to believe. Then again, many teachers teach these incorrect

outdated ideas only because that is what they were taught and told to believe. I believe that even Hitler said something like: "if you teach a lie long enough, people will begin to believe it as true." Although many teachers would be very willing to teach the modern scientific evidences and different views of our origins, most of them have probably never been shown the overwhelming evidence that supports these different views.

There are three basic Theories of Origins:

First is the **Theory of Evolution** which is the belief that the earth and universe gradually came into an orderly existence by random chance natural processes.

Next is the **Theory of Creation** which is the belief that the earth and universe were brought into an orderly existence by an intelligent designer or creator.

Finally is the **Theory of Progressive Creationism** or **Theistic Evolution** which is the belief that an intelligent designer created all the basic elements for a primitive earth and universe and used evolution to mature it. This theory is a compromised view for those who cannot accept the pure ideas of evolution or creation alone.

Until the early 1900's our public schools taught nearly exclusively the ideas of creation. It was the accepted explanation for our origins. Slowly the ideas of evolution were introduced into schools and taught so strongly until the ideas of creation became ignored by many people. Although it could not be proven, many people thought that the evidences of that day supported evolutionary ideas. However, now, due to many modern scientific discoveries in all areas of science, the old ideas of evolution are strongly being challenged and many ideas of the creation theory are strongly being supported.

So what are some of the evidences and ideas of our origins? Which theory or ideas do the evidences support the most? I ask that you be open minded and thoroughly examine, without prejudice, the evidences which I am about to present. Let's now look at some evidences and different ideas about our origins.

1st we will look at the **Origin of Life**

Evolutionists say that life began when tiny non-living materials came together in water to form different kinds of amino acids which somehow arranged themselves in the exact proportions and positions to form complex proteins. Eventually many of these proteins arranged themselves in just the correct manner to form very complex DNA and RNA. Also other very complex and well organized structures as mitochondria, ribosomes, supporting fibers, and a nucleus somehow all developed on their own, all came together by chance with the DNA and RNA and somehow developed a wall around the materials to form - a single living cell. This all supposedly happened by *Spontaneous Generation* which is the process of non-living matter coming to life. It was also believed about 150 years ago that if meat was left out too long it would turn into flies and cheese would turn into mice. But *Spontaneous Generation* was scientifically disproved over 100 years ago by Luis Pasteur & others. According to the *Law of Biogenesis*, it is an established scientific fact that life cannot originate from non-living matter. The science of "information theory" also tells us that code systems always arise from an intelligence and all life is built on a code. Information only arises from previously existing information, and genes contain massive amounts of information. Codes and programs (like DNA and the genetic code) are produced only by intelligence. No natural process has ever been observed to produce a program. Also the chemical evolution of life is impossible. No scientist has ever advanced a testable procedure by which this could occur. The Miller-Urey experiment, which is still shown in many current textbooks, has been proven to be irrelevant.

Think about this question. If a cell breaks open and its organelles spill out, the cell and its organelles will die, so if cell organelles cannot live outside the cell in the present, how could they have lived outside the cell in the past to create the first living cell? How did cell organelles live before the first cell wall was formed. Scientists still do not know how the cell wall was formed. Also if protein and DNA cannot survive without each other, how were the first cells formed? DNA and protein are dependent on each other in a cell. Protein is made by DNA and DNA is made up of proteins. So which came first - DNA or protein? It is obvious that they both had to be present at the same time from the very beginning.

In Darwin's time, about 150 years ago, it was believed that a cell was just a blob of protoplasm. Now we know that cells are highly complex and very organized. In the booklet called "Answers to the 4

Big Questions,” we are given an idea of how complex a single living cell is. It states that “modern knowledge of biochemistry shows that even so-called ‘simple’ bacteria are phenomenally complex—far more complex than the most sophisticated machine mankind has ever made.... Such bacterial ‘machines’ contain the equivalent of about 2 large books of coded information on their DNA. The source of this information is an insurmountable problem for the origin of life without a creator.... A human being has about 1,000 books worth of information on the DNA in *each* cell.” The chimpanzee DNA is about 98% similar to humans. Although this appears to be close to humans, it still means there is about 2% difference and that would correlate to a difference of about 20 large books of DNA information. That is a big difference. DNA is the molecule of heredity, part of a staggeringly complex system, more information-dense than that in the most efficient supercomputer.

Also think about this: if it took intelligent minds to put $4\frac{1}{2}$ million parts together to build an airplane, how could billions of parts come together by chance to form a complex, organized, living cell without intelligence? It has been estimated that the odds of a single cell possibly coming together by chance is about 1 chance out of 10 to the 40,000th power of attempts, but anything over 1 chance in 10 to the 50th power attempts is practically impossible. So the chance of life having occurred by chance, for all intents and purposes, is zero. No one can explain this either: if it took ages for all the non-living parts to come together, how long would have it taken for it to accidentally duplicate itself before it died? The replication of a cell is a very complex procedure too.

The 1st option for the origin of life is that it happened by chance, but the second option for the origin of life is that it occurred as a *Supernatural Creative Act*. In the pamphlet “Evolution - Fact or Fiction?” by James L. Melton, he mentioned that “Darwin’s theory is commonly accepted as a scientific fact, not because it can be proven, but rather because it is the only alternative to believing the account of creation. Therefore most evolutionists believe in the scientifically impossible *Spontaneous Generation*, because to them *Special Creation* is unthinkable. They’d rather believe in the impossible, than believe in a creator and the creator’s act of creation.

Now let’s look at the **Origin of the Different Species** of Plants and Animals.

Evolutionists say that the 1st cells spontaneously generated from a primordial soup of non-living matter then evolved slowly, over millions of years into Plants & Animals. Many single-celled forms of life exist, but there are no known forms of animal life with 2, 3, 4, or 5 cells, and the forms of life with 6 to 20 cells are parasites. If there were no organisms larger than the parasites when the parasites first evolved, what did the parasites live off of? If evolution occurred, one should find many forms of life with 2 to 20 cells as transitional forms between one-celled and many-celled organisms, where are they? Evolutionists believe that so-called “simple” organisms eventually evolved into highly complex ones over millions of years. They believe that single-celled organisms eventually evolved into multi-celled ones then into invertebrates, as worms, which evolved into vertebrates, as fish, and fish into amphibians and amphibians into reptiles. They also believe that reptiles evolved into birds and small mammals although there are many significant differences between reptiles and birds and between reptiles and mammals. Birds are warm-blooded and have hollow bones and their feathers are in no way similar to scales on cold-blooded reptiles. So for a reptile to turn into a bird it would have had to undergo many major reconstructions of systems as their respiratory system, blood system, skeletal system, digestive system, and nervous system. They would also had to construct bills and beaks, master the art of nest building, learn how to fly, and develop sound producing organs. The same is true for a reptile evolving into a mammal. Mammals, also warm-blooded, nurture their live-birth offspring and have lungs which is far different from the infant-care, reproductive and respiratory systems of reptiles. Also they would have had to develop milk producing glands, elaborate new teeth designs and a diaphragm for the lungs to be able to breathe, and reform musculature systems, digestive systems, nervous systems, and skeletal systems. All these accidental changes would have had to happen in a male and female simultaneously for them to be able to pass on these new changes to successive offspring. Many evolutionists also believe that, eventually ape-like creatures supposedly evolved into man.

Evolutionists believe too that organisms evolve in order to make themselves more fit and better equipped to survive. Each change that occurs in the evolutionary process is supposed to produce a “gain”

in genetic information to help that organism's offspring better survive. Therefore strong, "more evolved" organisms should out last and replace their weaker "less evolved" relatives. Now think about this- if "Survival of the Fittest" weeds out weak, mutated, defective creatures, how would evolving, mutated creatures, out run their predators and /or prey and outlive their non-defective relatives? If legs evolved into wings, at one point for many years, the evolving creature would have front legs that were half legs and half wings. It is absurd to think that any such transitional organism could be considered superior to the animal that preceded it. How did any such transitional, mutated organism even survive?

All living species are fully developed, and their organs are fully developed. There are no living lizards with scale-feathers, leg-wings, or 3-chambered hearts. If evolutionary processes were the norm, these intermediate forms of development should be observable throughout nature. Instead, they are non-existent. Natural Selection (or "survival of the fittest") actually prevents evolutionary change, it does not encourage it. Since mutations almost always contribute to a decrease in viability (or survivability), the mutated animal quickly becomes part of the food chain.

There is a study in science called "Homology" which is the study of similar design of body parts found in different kinds of organisms such as many animals having similar designed arms and legs. To the evolutionist this indicates to them that this is evidence for a "common ancestor," but to the creationist the presence of similar body parts in different creatures is evidence of a "common designer." The Creator of these animals found such designs to be very functional, so He used them over and over in many different creatures. Also acquired characteristics cannot be inherited either. For example, the long necks of giraffes did not result from their ancestors stretching their necks to reach high leaves, nor does a man in a weight-lifting program pass his well-developed muscles on to his child. No mechanism exists whereby the altered behavior of an organism, in an attempt to adapt to its environment, will produce a genetic change in its offspring. Genetic mutations have never made a creature more viable than its ancestors. Mutations are almost always harmful, and many are lethal. More than 90 years of fruit fly experiments, involving 3,000 successive generations, give absolutely no basis for believing that any natural or artificial process can cause an increase in complexity and viability.

Up to a few decades ago it was commonly taught that humans had many "Vestigial Organs." but what are vestigial organs? Vestigial organs are organs found in the body which seem to have no useful function, but are they really useless? The Theory of Evolution predicts that these organs are useless, leftover, relic organs from organisms we evolved from. But the Theory of Creation predicts that these are organs which we have not yet discovered what their true purposes are. Scientific evidence has shown that more than 100 allegedly useless vestigial organs in humans are now known to be essential to human life. For example: up to a few decades ago, it was common for doctors to remove healthy appendices and tonsils in patients believing that they had no function. Now we know that the appendix and tonsils are part of our immune system, and protect us from infections until they become overwhelmed. It is also thought that our tail bone was a vestigial leftover of a real tail. Now we know that our tail bone has nothing to do with supporting a tail. Instead, several muscles, responsible for proper waste elimination, are attached to this very important support bone.

Here is another question for you. If it took several million years for organisms to evolve from one organism into another, there had to have been millions or billions of organisms in-between two different kinds of organisms and we should be able to find thousands to millions of such fossils. So if millions of creatures have evolved from one creature to another for millions of years, why haven't scientists found many fossils of real "in-between" transitional creatures? There has only been a hand full of such fossils, and they are very questionable and definitely not proven transitionals.

Also why don't we see any such transitional organisms living today? Why don't we see all kinds of animals at some stage between two different kinds of animals living today? For that matter why do we even have distinct groups of organisms instead of all organisms blending together? All living creatures are divided into distinct types. There should be a myriad of transitional, un-classifiable creatures if evolution was the norm. There is no direct evidence that any major group of animals or plants arose from any other major group. Created kind are only observed going into extinction, never coming into existence. The fossil record has been studied so thoroughly that it is safe to conclude that the alleged "gaps" or "missing links" will never be found because they never existed. Nature shows that organisms always give rise to

organisms like themselves, and no evidence has ever been found to indicate any one organism giving rise to a new kind of organism. Although nobody knows for sure what the original created “kinds” were, we know that only “like kinds” can breed with each other to produce offspring. This is fixed in their genetic codes. Mendel's Laws of Genetics limit the variations in a species. Different combinations of genes are formed, but not different genes. Breeding experiments and common observations have also confirmed that genetic boundaries exist. The science of genetics overwhelmingly supports the biblical account of created kinds.

There is even a branch of science called “**baraminology**” which is the study of organisms to determine what the original created kinds were. No one really knows what the original created kinds would have been, but it is believed that the original kinds may have been similar to what we now call “Families” or “Genuses.” An intelligent creator created every “kind” of creature and plant with the ability to reproduce only its same “kind” (not mutate or evolve into other “kinds”). This creator created each specific “kind” with great potential for variations within its kind (what we might think of as “species”). Modern science has shown that many species of each genus, or variations of each kind, have occurred mostly through reshuffling of the already existing gene pool, and to a much less degree by genetic mutations and gene pool isolation. Some people refer to this speciation as micro-evolution and this definitely does occur, but macro-evolution, which is the evolving of one kind into another kind, has not and does not occur. Often many schools will teach that micro-evolution is science then try to make you believe that all the other forms of evolution are scientific too. We not only do not see the evolving of “one kind into another kind” in nature today, but we also have very few, if any, true evidences of transitional “in-between” kinds in the fossil records. Again, what we observe in nature through science overwhelmingly supports the theory of creation.

Over the years, scientists have found fossils of several different sized horses. Instead of realizing that they are different species of the “horse kind”, they try to make us believe that the smaller horses gradually evolved into larger and larger horses. That is like finding fossils of different dogs and assuming that smaller dogs as Chihuahuas slowly evolved into Poodles then into Terriers then into Collies which eventually evolved into Great Danes. Also Archaeopteryx is often used in text books as an assumed example of a transitional organism between a dinosaur and a bird. Archaeopteryx is now believed to be just an extinct bird, but this new evidence is rarely, if ever, demonstrated in textbooks. Rarely is evidence for creation used in textbooks if it causes doubt in the theory of Darwinian evolution.

If evolution is true and all animals evolved from other similar animals, what did the Duck-billed Platypus evolve from? This Australian mammal has several traits seen in many different animals but is obviously not related to any of them. It has a bill like a duck, lays eggs like a turtle, has fur like a bear, has a tail like a beaver, and uses sound and echo-location to find food like a bat. The platypus looks like a mistake and European scientists thought Chinese taxidermists had artfully pieced it together for a joke when it was first sent to them from Australia. Also so many plants and creatures are so unique in their design and unlike any other organism that evolutionists have no idea how or why they evolved or from what organism they evolved (as the Duck-billed Platypus).

In his book *The Origin of Species*, Charles Darwin admitted that “if it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous, successive, slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down.” Today we know that many organisms have very complex systems or structures that could not have functioned if only partially formed so they had to be complete from the very beginning . The term “irreducible complexity” explains that complex systems will work only if all the components operate at once. It is not possible to get an intricate, interrelated system by numerous, successive and slight modifications. If such systems or structures were not complete and could not work, they would be a hindrance and a disadvantage to the organism, making the organism less likely to survive. Such organisms would have likely died out instead of evolving into stronger organisms. Mutations cannot produce complex organs such as the eye, the ear, or the brain, much less the intricacy of design found in microbiological organisms. These organs are not even imaginable, much less viable in a partially developed state. The principle of "irreducible complexity" demonstrates that a wide range of component parts and technologies must be simultaneously existent for these organs to function. In a partially developed state, they would become a liability to an organism, not an advantage. Moreover, most

complex organs have interdependent relationships with other complex organs which enable proper functioning. These relationships must also be simultaneously existent. Some other examples of very complex systems or structures are the bacterial flagellum, the blood clotting system, and the DNA - coded protein synthesis system.

The most complex phenomena known to science are found in living systems. Detailed studies of various animals have also revealed physical equipment and capabilities that cannot even be copied by the world's best designers using the most sophisticated technologies. Examples include the miniature and reliable sonar systems of dolphins, porpoises and whales; the frequency-modulated radar and discrimination system of bats; the aerodynamic capabilities and efficiency of the hummingbird; the control systems, internal ballistics and combustion chamber of the bombardier beetle; the precise and redundant navigational system of the arctic tern; and the self-repair capabilities of practically all forms of life. All evidence points to "intelligent design," not random processes.

The butterfly is a beautiful example of how evolution cannot work. If a caterpillar evolved into a butterfly, the butterfly would produce butterfly offspring instead of caterpillars. So such a transformation is not an evolutionary process. But still the first caterpillars would have had to learn, through genetic trial and error, how to turn into butterflies and lay eggs to make more caterpillars. For an organism, like a caterpillar, to evolve into another form, like a butterfly, it would take thousands of genetic mutations. Caterpillars undergo their transformation into butterflies in chrysalises, as moths do in cocoons. It takes many years for each mutation to occur and it would have taken multiple mutations for a caterpillar to figure out, by chance, how to make a chrysalis and many more to turn into a butterfly. The caterpillar must stay in the chrysalis until its transformation is complete or it would emerge grossly deformed and unable to survive. If mutations take years to occur and the caterpillar changes in the chrysalis, the first caterpillars which formed a chrysalis should have died long before they had a chance to transform enough to emerge. Also as mutations occur they supposedly are passed onto organisms' offspring. How could a partially transformed, grossly deformed, half-caterpillar/half-butterfly, trapped in a chrysalis, have laid eggs to pass on its new genetic information. It is obvious to me that caterpillars were created from their beginning to have all the genetic information they needed to completely transform and reproduce. The same is true for tadpole transformation into frogs.

Many different forms of life are completely dependent upon each other (this is called symbiotic relationships). Even members of the honeybee family, consisting of the queen, workers, and drones, are interdependent. If one member of each interdependent group evolved first, it could not have survived. Since all members of these groups have survived, they must have come into existence simultaneously. The only possible answer for their existence is "intelligent design". Also it is impossible to conceive of an evolutionary process that results in sexual reproduction. Complementary male and female systems must have completely and independently evolved at each stage at the exact same time and place. The millions of mechanical and chemical processes, as well as behavioral patterns and physical characteristics, would all need to be compatible. Even leading evolutionists admit they cannot explain this.

Darwin never cited proof of any evolutionary process; he just speculated that someday evidence would be found to prove his theories. After more than 100 years and billions of dollars of research, to date, none have ever been proven.

Also according to the Laws of Probability, the chance of anything evolving by chance, random selections is theoretically impossible. In an article by Ross S. Olson M.D. entitled "Intelligent Design and the Public Schools: Pro," he states "If you want to do a calculation you can try to construct a 100 unit protein molecule from a primordial soup of the 20 different amino acids used in life. Even if you allow them to all be left handed isomers instead of the mixture that would occur naturally, there is only one chance in $10^{\text{to the } 130\text{th} \text{ power}}$ occurrences of getting it right (that means one chance to get it right out of 1 with 130 zeros behind it). And there are only about 10^{80} atoms in the universe and 10^{18} seconds in 30 billion years. And the simplest cell needs at least 230 proteins with their controlling DNA, all put together in the proper configuration to function. It is an incredible assumption to say that it could all happen by natural mechanisms. And deceptively, evolutionists try to pretend that natural selection somehow reduces the odds when the truth is that natural selection only selects, it does not create and the creating in evolution must be done by random mechanisms."

In the booklet "Answers to the 4 Big Questions" the two theories of the origins of the species is demonstrated. The "evolutionary tree" depicts the trunk of the tree as the first living single-celled organism and the branches as the organisms which evolved from the first cells. But in this so-called "evolutionary tree" it has a very short trunk, since in the earliest part of the fossil record (generally the Cambrian sedimentary layer), life appears suddenly, complex, diversified and fully developed. There are also "gaps" or "missing links" in the branches of this tree between every major kind to another because evidence shows that there were no links between kinds. Also insects have no known evolutionary ancestors. But, in the "creation orchard" many trees are used to demonstrate the many different kinds of created organisms and the branches of each tree illustrates the variations, or species, within each created kind. Although the "evolutionary tree" has little to no evidence to support it, the "creation orchard" fits what we see in nature.

Also the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics poses many problems for evolutionists. This law states that if systems in nature are left alone, over time, they become less organized, less complex, and lose genetic information by deterioration and mutation. But why does evolution require the opposite? Evolutionists believe that simple, disorganized organisms gain genetic information and become more complex and organized with the passage of time, but history and science show that everything tends to wear out or run down, lose genetic information and become less organized over time.

The next origin we will look at is the

Origin of Man How did mankind start?

Over the past several decades evolutionists have had many claims of evidences for ape-men creatures, but to date, all part-ape/part-man claims have turned out to be either mistakes or hoaxes. People tend to easily accept these ape-man claims because they want the claims to be true. People are so anxious to find "proof" to support evolutionary beliefs, that they will believe many ideas even if there is little or no evidence to support the ideas. Many books have detailed information on this subject but here are some very short explanations to a few specific examples. One example is Pittdown man which convinced many people that this was proof of a true ape-man. Pittdown man was later found to be a hoax where someone had skillfully combined a human skull cap with the jaw of an orangutan. Another is Nebraska man - the hairy, ape-man, drawn by an artist, for a man who found a single tooth which he thought to be part-ape and part-man. This so-called "proof" for evolution was instrumental in getting evolution taught in public schools in 1925 at the Scope "monkey" Trials in Tennessee. But about 20 years later it was discovered that the tooth was that of an extinct pig which was later found still living in Europe. No bones or fossils of any supposed ape-men creatures have been found to be hairy. The hairy appearance comes from the artists' belief that first men would have looked ape-like, so they draw them hairy. Also forty years after Eugene Dubois discovered "Java man," he conceded that it was just a large gibbon. The skulls of "Peking man" are now considered by many to be the remains of apes; and the classification *Homo erectus* is considered by most experts to be a category that should never have been created. Also Neanderthal men, who were once thought to be early ape-men, have been discovered to be true men with a severe crippling arthritic disorder called rickets which caused a stooped ape-like posture. Rickets are due to a vitamin D deficiency from a lack of sun exposure to the skin. Post-flood skies were probably darkened for many years from thick clouds and volcanic ash. This would have drastically limiting sun exposure especially to clothed skin in cold climates and especially if their skin was darkly pigmented. Neanderthals were fully human with brain cavities 13% larger than present man. It makes you wonder how intelligent these so-called "primitive" men really were. Therefore Ape-Men never existed; all supposed Ape-Men were either Ape or Men, not a transitional creature between the two.

The present human population is far too few for man to have existed more than a few thousand years. The present human population growth rate is nearly 2%, but at 1/4 of the present growth rate, to account for wars, plagues, etc., our present population could have been obtained within 4000-5000 years. Consider this, if the present human population could have been reached in only 4,000 to 5,000 years, at a growth rate of 0.5% per year, then what would the population be in one million years, which is the evolutionary estimate of the existence of man? One estimate states that the present population would be infinitely greater than one person for every cubic foot of the entire universe. Another estimate states that

the present population would be greater than the number of atoms in the entire universe.

Many evolutionists also say that each “race” evolved from a different origin. If each race of people has been evolving separately for hundreds of thousands of years, as many evolutionists suggest, we would expect wide variations in their genes, so why aren’t there? Although we get half of our gene DNA from our mother and the other half from our father, some DNA is mitochondrial DNA and only comes from the mother. So such DNA can be traced down the genealogy of only the females. The recent Human Genome Project and studies of mitochondrial DNA, support the creation teaching that there is only one biological race of humans and all people trace back to a single mother living only a few thousand years ago. The first created humans, if created perfectly, would have had all the genetic information in their genes to produce all the physical (as racial) characteristics that we see in all people groups today. They were both probably mid-brown in color too (an average-blended coloration) allowing for their offspring to be anywhere from very dark brown to very light brown (or Caucasian). If they were created perfect, with no defects, their children (as well as the next several generations) could have safely married each other and had children with no fear of them having genetic defects which now cause birth defects.

What about a world-wide flood, is it true history or just a legend? Archaeologists have found flood stories in the form of inscriptions made on monuments and tablets. Virtually every tribe and nation on earth has a similar flood story? Today nearly all cultures of different people groups around the world have similar historical stories of a flood with only a few people saved on a vessel and the later dispersion of families. Such common historical accounts indicate a single common society before its dispersion.

Another controversy deals with the development of human speech. Did it evolve? Human speech and languages did not evolve - in fact the best evidence is that languages "devolve". Speech is uniquely human. Furthermore, studies of 36 documented cases of children raised without human contact show that speech appears to be learned only from other humans. Apparently, humans do not automatically speak. If so, the first humans must have been endowed with a speaking ability (intelligent input). There is no evidence that speech has evolved.

Now let’s look at the

Origin of the Universe

For over 50 years evolutionists have accepted the “Big Bang Theory” as the cause of all heavenly bodies in our universe (such as planets, stars and comets). According to the “Big Bang Theory” several billion years ago “Nothing” existed, then that “Nothing” exploded & created “Everything”. The question is “where did the original matter come from?” Although many evolutionists don’t accept the “Big Bang Theory” now, many still use it to explain their belief in evolution because they have no alternative theory. Evolutionists say the earth and universe are billions of years old, but much evidence indicates the earth and universe are very young.

First let’s look at what we can learn from comets? According to the theory of evolution, comets are supposed to be the same age as the solar system, supposedly about 5 billion years old. But comets melt and lose much of their material each time they orbit the sun. At the rate that comets disintegrate, they could not last more than 100,000 years. Many comets have an expected life of only 10,000 years. So why do we still have comets?

Another example is that earth’s moon is slowly moving away from earth. At its present rate Earth’s moon is far too close to earth to be more than a few thousand years old. About 4.5 billion years ago the moon would have nearly been touching the earth. Also according to the “Inverse Square Law”, if you reduce the distance between two objects by half, you quadruple the attraction between them. Therefore two billion years ago the moon’s attraction on the earth would have created such tremendous tides that all land on earth would have been drowned two times each day.

Currently oil pressure in the ground is about 20,000 pounds per square inch. Over time pressure tends to dissipate as it escapes through tiny cracks in the rocks. Therefore it is estimated that oil pressure should be “zero” after 10,000 years in the ground. So why do we still have so much oil pressure underground when we drill for oil if oil was produced millions of years ago?

At the present rate of earth’s erosion, the continents would have eroded to sea level within

200,000 years and could have done so over 20,000 times in 4.5 billion years which is the supposed amount of time evolutionists say the earth has existed. Why does land still exist today? Also at the present rate that sediment builds up on the ocean floor, why is there not nearly enough mud on the ocean floor for the earth to be at the most 12 million years old. Far less than the expected age of oceans of 3 billion years. A world-wide flood a few thousand years ago could have easily caused the majority of the sediment we see today on the ocean floor.

Some of the following information on the Sun, the Moon, Helium, and Earth's Magnetic Field are found in a section entitled "How Old Is The Universe?" in a pamphlet called "Evolution - Fact or Fiction?" By James L. Melton. "The sun is continuously burning out at a rate of 5 feet per hour. This means that the sun would have been twice the size that it is now only 100,000 years ago. Only 20 million years ago, the sun would have been so large that it would have been touching the earth! Yet evolutionists insist that the universe, including the sun, is billions of years old.

Radioactive helium is generated by decaying uranium atoms. Dr. Melvin Cook, a former Nobel-prize nominee, says that this helium is constantly being released into our atmosphere, and that there are currently about a million-billion grams of this helium in our atmosphere. (Today there is only 1/2000 of the expected amount of helium in our atmosphere for the earth to be 4.5 billion years old.) According to Cook's measurements, the earth can't be over 10,000 to 15,000 years old.

"The half life of the earth's magnetic field is believed to be less than 1400 years. That is, 1400 years ago, the earth's magnetic field would have been twice as strong as it is today. (Creation scientists believe that the earth's magnetic field is decaying too fast to be greater than 10,000 years old.) Only 10,000 years ago, the earth would have had a magnetic field as strong as the sun! Who knows what it would have been like 4.5 billion years ago!"

The second law of thermodynamics is a constant law of nature which states that over time things tend to run down, wear out and lose their available energy. Given enough time all things should lose all their available energy. This is called "Heat Death". It is believed that the magnetic fields of heavenly bodies are produced by their molten liquid center cores. As these cores cool down and solidify, they begin to lose their magnetic field. As stated earlier it has been said that earth's magnetic field is decaying too fast, at present rate, to be over 10,000 years old. Some people believe that the universe has always existed, that it had no beginning. If this were so or even if the universe were several billion years old, then why hasn't the universe already experienced "Heat Death"?

Have you ever wondered why oceans are salty? Where does the salt come from? Salt is made up of sodium and chlorine. Through rain and its erosion, sodium is leached out of the earth every year. The rivers drain into the oceans with sodium and many other minerals and debris. Although about 73% of the sodium remains in the sea each year, some of the sodium leaves the sea each year through evaporation. This evaporation creates the clouds which cause the rains and starts this whole water cycle over again. Assuming there was no world-wide flood, the present sodium content in the ocean could have been reached within the past 62 million years, assuming the oceans were salt free to begin with. If the oceans were salty to begin with, then how salty were they at first and how much less time would it have taken to reach present levels of salt? Obviously it would have taken less than the estimated 62 million years. Nonetheless, this 62 million years is much less time than is allowed by the evolutionary views of the oceans being three billion years old. The rate of erosion before a world-wide flood was probably very minimal since there was possibly no rain yet and the entire earth was probably heavily vegetated. But the flood would have caused massive erosion and heavy erosion for a few more years. It is very possible that the oceans were created with fresh water and remained pretty fresh until the flood, but with the help of a world-wide flood they could have rapidly become salty. Created sea creatures may have been created to live in fresh water with the ability to adapt to increasing sodium levels as we see today. So if the earth is billions of years old, then why is there not nearly enough mud or sediment on the ocean floor, or sodium in the sea, or helium in the atmosphere, or oil pressure underground to support such long ages?

The last origin I'll discuss is the

Origin of Rock Layers and Fossils

Another problem for evolutionists is the presence of Level Rock layers & Out of Place Fossils.

Many evolutionists believe in uniformitarianism which is the idea that the conditions of the present explain the past. Therefore since layers of soil are laid down very slowly in today's age they must have been in the past also. If we see that one thin layer of soil is laid down about every year, then we can assume that it would have taken thousands of years to lay down thousands of layers in the past. Therefore the further down you dig into rock layers, the less complex and older organisms you should find. It is assumed that the more "primitive" fossils are found in the deeper rock layers. This brings up the problem with how rock and fossils are dated. Rock is often dated by the fossil types which are found in it. Fossils are dated by what kind of rock it is found in. This is called "circular reasoning" and is totally inaccurate. Therefore, how do evolutionists explain the frequent findings of fossils of complex creatures, supposedly out of place, in deep layers of rock where only fossils of simple, much more "primitive" creatures should be found (in areas where there is no evidence of erosion or over thrusting)? Also to get the extremely detailed fossils we see today, organisms would have had to have been buried very quickly after dying, and deep enough to eliminate decay from oxygen and microorganisms, and allow for the conditions of fossilization. A massive flood would have been sufficient to cause enough sediment to quickly bury all kinds of organisms which existed at that time. Uniformitarianism thinking, ignores the possibilities of any massive catastrophic geological events as a world-wide flood with numerous volcanoes and massive underwater landslides. The fossil records and rock layers we see today are consistent with the effects of a world-wide flood. We find billions of dead things (fossilized with amazing detail), buried in multiple, striated, sedimentary, rock layers, which were quickly laid down by water, all over the earth. This brings up the question as to whether fossils are evidence of the order in which organisms emerged in the supposed evolutionary time scale, or are fossils just a preserved order of their burial during the flood. Also, if rock layers seen in canyons and mountains took thousands to millions of years to form, why are layers level and uniform in thickness, instead of irregular from expected plant and animal activity and long-term erosion? Also the presence of bent or folded rock layers which are not cracked, indicate that these layers were bent while still soft, probably during the last part of the flood or shortly afterwards verse thousands to millions of years after the rock layers were formed.

Now what about radiometric dating? Doesn't radiometric dating prove that things on earth have existed for millions of years? Think about this question. If radiometric dating methods are supposed to be accurate, why do the results of several testings of the same sample often vary by millions of years? Why do testings of samples known to be only a few years old often show millions of years old with these methods? Radiometric dating techniques are dependent on a fairly stable environment. It is assumed by many scientists that there was no world-wide flood and that the conditions of the past are similar to those of today. First of all the ancient past cannot be "proven" scientifically since the conditions of the past cannot be directly observed. Neither can reliable experiments be performed on items from the ancient past since many assumptions of the past conditions must be made. Therefore since no one was around in the ancient past to record radiometric conditions, scientists have to make many assumptions of the past conditions to come up with an age for items being tested. Radioactive dating methods are based on a number of untestable assumptions that produce "old age" results. The following conditions of the past are just a few which are simply unknown, they are: the climate or atmospheric conditions, solar activity, geologic activity such as volcanoes and earthquakes, state of the earth's magnetic field, and the beginning composition of and the decay rates of radioactive elements in the past. Many people believe that the world is billions of years old but this idea is only a theory based on man's imagination and evidence which is interpreted with many assumptions that now contradict modern scientific evidences. Only man's theories and experiments based on these many unprovable assumptions, suggest an age of billions of years. These theories are quickly being disproved by advanced modern scientific evidences. Most modern scientific evidence indicates the earth to be only a few to several thousand years old. Therefore most dating techniques actually indicate that the earth is "young", not "old". Ages determined by radiometric dating may be considered fairly reliable only up to a world-wide flood which would have catastrophically changed the entire world. Therefore, the environment would have been drastically different before the flood than it was after it. Also why does radioactive decay of microscopic bits of minerals in rock crystals indicate that Jurassic, Triassic, and Eocene formations were deposited within months of one another instead of hundreds of thousands of years apart as evolutionists assume? Why? Could it be because the

thousands of layers of sediment were laid down in only a few months during a world-wide flood?

This brings us to some more very interesting points. Consider this question - Could the many thousands of layers of sedimentary rock, as seen in the Grand Canyon, and the fossilized trees of the Petrified Forests, have been formed quickly as demonstrated by the relatively small 1980 Mt. St. Helens' eruptions? In less than one year, 600 feet of layered sedimentary rock was laid down - most of it within days. Several thousand layers would have been produced in this way which would have indicated to evolutionists that it took several thousand years to produce. The rock, ash and debris also dammed a river causing a large lake behind it. Eventually water began flowing over the dam, causing heavy erosion which weakened the dam. The dam broke and created, in one day, a 100 ft high by 100 ft wide canyon. It is believed by many people today that the Grand Canyon and a few other canyons around the world were formed in a similar way. During a world-wide flood there could have been many volcanoes erupting and spewing massive amounts of rock, ash, and other debris quickly depositing thousands of feet of sediment. Also once the hills and mountains became saturated with water there would have been massive underwater landslides all over the world creating thousands more feet of sediment. We often see large mud slides and landslides today when hills are saturated by rains alone. Imagine what would happen if these hills were completely under water. Also in recent years we have seen the power of rushing water from swollen rivers and tsunamis. It is believed by many scientists today that a huge lake, perhaps the size of all the five Great Lakes put together, was trapped behind a landslide, plateau-dam after the flood receded. As the lake water kept rising, it would have eventually crested and flowed over the top of the dam. This flowing water over the dam would have caused erosion of the dam, slowly at first, but as the erosion increased, the volume of water and the speed of the water would have drastically increased causing massive erosion. Running water has tremendous power to move and erode rock especially in large volumes and high speeds. Eventually, as this massive lake drained, the water broke through the huge dam and quickly cut a canyon creating the majority of the Grand Canyon. Over the past few thousand years it has continued to grow, although at a much slower rate, as weather erodes rock into the Colorado River.

Another problem for evolutionists is their belief in slow sedimentation. How can they explain the presence of vertically positioned fossilized trees? For an organism to become fossilized it must be completely buried quickly and deep enough to avoid decay. How do evolutionists explain the presence of many undecomposed, vertically-positioned, fossilized trees, incased in many rock layers and coal beds, if it took several thousand years for the sedimentary rock to be laid down around the trees? Why didn't the trees rot away before they had a chance to be covered completely, much less become fossilized? Again the 1980 Mt. St. Helens eruption has provided much evidence to explain the vertically fossilized trees. The explosion blasted millions of trees to the ground. Several of these trees ended up in Spirit Lake. As the trees waterlogged they sank at different rates to the bottom of the lake with their heavy end going down first while their lighter end, still trying to float, pointed upward. These trees stuck vertically into the lake floor allowing loose bark, ash and other debris to quickly settle around them until the trees were completely covered and eventually deeply incased. Mass burials of vertical trees like these and many mass animal burials, including vertically positioned fossilized whales, are found all around the world. Remember for an organism to become fossilized it must be completely buried quickly and deep enough to avoid decay. So if fossils of organisms are found positioned vertically above and below each other, sharing the same layers of sediment, or rock, it is obvious that they had to have all been buried at about the same time - quickly, within minutes to days or weeks instead of millions of years.

Conclusion

Now that we have reviewed this brief list of evidences, which theory would you say best fits our modern scientific evidence - the **Theory of Evolution** or the **Theory of Creation**? Did first life come from non-living matter or from an intelligent creator? Were all organisms created by an intelligent designer or did they evolve by chance from simpler forms? True scientists should always try to view all the available evidence then try to come up with unbiased conclusions, but most people, even many scientists, are very biased toward their beliefs. Even though creation scientists and evolutionary scientists are looking at the same evidence, they will interpret the evidence according to their biased opinions. We

must stay open-minded and concentrate on the evidence and be willing to adjust our beliefs.

When the physical evidence is shown to support special creation and catastrophism, such as the effects of a world-wide flood, this teaching is called *Creation Science*. When the physical evidence is shown to support the incredible complexity, organization and therefore apparent intelligent design of everything in nature, this teaching is called the *Science of Intelligent Design*. These views of science are highly researched and published views. They support the idea that elements and organisms and systems in nature had to have been designed, due to the high complexity and organization of their structures. Although we cannot prove any theory of origins by the scientific method, we can now see that the available modern evidence strongly supports these views. Look at the many modern scientific discoveries in all areas of science, and see for yourself if most of the old ideas of evolution still make sense to you. If you are convinced that there is no creator then you are basically forced to accept the only remaining belief - the theory of evolution - even if you now see that most of its ideas contradict modern evidence. For those who believe in the Theory of Evolution, as I did for many years, I highly recommend that you research these modern evidences and reevaluate why you believe what you believe. The ideas of evolution were based on many assumptions of the ancient past and the lack of knowledge which we possess today, but now due to many discoveries these ideas no longer have much evidence to support them.

The theory of evolution is man's idea of how natural things could have originated without a creator. Both evolution and creation ideas are faith based since they cannot be proven. The ideas of evolution are used as the explanation of origins in many different religions around the world and the ideas of creation in another religion. Just because ideas are printed in a religious book does not mean that they are solely religious and not scientific. The ideas of a creator may have religious implications but the ideas of creation are not based on religion, they are based on the scientific evidence. Things in nature are far too complex, detailed and organized to have occurred by chance without an intelligent designer. Many scientific discoveries have strongly indicated this.

Since I was not taught evidences for creation in school, the ideas I learned about evolution throughout my schooling all sounded possible. I believed them for many years until I saw how modern evidences did not really support evolution, but did support the ideas of creation. How can we possibly continue to believe as true and teach as fact outdated ideas which we know are either not true or are very questionable at the least? And how can we wisely continue not to teach ideas which explain the scientific evidences much better? In the January/February 2006 edition of *The Good News* magazine, it was stated that U.S. President George W. Bush said "I think that part of education is to expose people to different schools of thought." He also commented that intelligent design should be taught in public schools alongside evolution "so people can understand what the debate is about." By only teaching the theories of evolution over the past several decades, our school systems have indoctrinated millions of people around the world in the faith of evolutionary ideas. The article also stated that Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, said that teaching both intelligent design and evolution in schools "doesn't force any particular theory on anyone" and that "in a pluralistic society that is the fairest way to go about education and training people for the future." It is my understanding that surveys have revealed that the majority of our population wants both the theories of evolution and the theories of creation taught in public schools. Dr. Ross S. Olson said that there is a strong intellectual case for Intelligent Design and to withhold the evidence from students is a betrayal of education. He also indicated that we need to let the evidence for both sides be available to students so they can learn to think critically. Give kids all the available evidence and let them decide for themselves which theory they would rather believe in. Teaching only one view is bad science: it is unscientific and very misleading as to what is fact and what is only an idea. Teachers legally have the freedom to present different ideas, theories and evidences as long as they do not try to teach any religion which either theory is part of. Evolution and creation ideas and their supporting evidences can easily be presented in schools without teaching religion or theological beliefs. No one should just believe in either theory by faith alone; they should believe what modern scientific evidence truly supports.

For more information visit www.icr.org, www.creationism.org, www.answersingenesis.org, www.drdino.com, www.evolution-facts.org, & <http://biblicalreliability.blogspot.com>