

## Creation Science Evangelism Articles

### Dinosaur Extinction and the Global Catastrophe

Every schoolchild knows that the dinosaurs died out because a giant meteorite—possibly even an asteroid—hit the Earth at Chicxulub in Mexico at the end of the Cretaceous period, sending up a great global cloud of dust, which killed off all the dinosaurs. Remarkably, environmentally sensitive creatures like butterflies and frogs were unaffected by this evolutionary global catastrophe, but the great big clod-hopping dinosaurs couldn't stand the change.

#### Theories of extinction

Of course, that method of extinction wasn't always favored by scientists. When I was at school—back in the olden days, as my son is keen to point out—I was taught that the dinosaurs died out because their eggshells were getting gradually thinner, so that they started being eaten up by naughty, furry mammals.

But there seems little actual evidence for this eggshell thinning, so today it is all to do with a Chicxulub impact, which offers the proof we need that dinosaurs died out at the end of the Cretaceous.

Except it provides no such proof! A report in London's Daily Telegraph suggests that a lot of dinosaurs were not killed by the so-called KT-event<sup>1</sup> (K stands for Cretaceous, as C is already used for Cambrian). The article suggests that a hadrosaur fossil has been dated at "only 64.8 million years old—meaning that it was alive about 700,000 years after it was thought to have died."

Now, I don't accept this date, which has been produced "directly" using a new form of Uranium-Lead dating, and our website already contains articles on the problems of radiometric dating. Nevertheless, the importance of the article is in the doubt that it casts on the KT Impact Event.

If a significantly large group of dinosaurs are thought by evolutionists not to have been made extinct by the alleged KT event, then what is the point of hypothesizing such an event? I am not a betting man, but the probability of scientists still believing in the KT event in ten years' time must be pretty small.

#### Global Catastrophe = Global Flood

Meanwhile, the Bible and the geological evidence, correctly understood, both agree: There is considerable evidence for a global catastrophe. But it was not a meteorite impact—it was the global Flood.

## Answering Questions

Richard Dawkins once said, "Some questions simply do not deserve an answer."<sup>1</sup> Of course, his particular ire was directed at Creationists, so that he could claim that Creationists were not worth answering. But does this assertion work in reverse? Are there questions asked by atheists, which do not deserve an answer?

A large part of my work is answering questions. I love answering questions. I love to show that our belief in the truth of Scripture is a reasonable and rational position to take.

However, there are some questions, which may not need to be answered directly. This is because they have not been asked with the intent of receiving the answer to the question. Their purpose is to attempt to mock, or to deflect attention from something else. In those instances, it is better to answer the underlying motives, rather than, necessarily, the question itself. Sometimes, I will provide a brief answer to the question as well, to show that an answer is available, but concentrate more on the underlying motivation.

The Bible has something to say on this strategy. In the book of Proverbs, we find an amazing pair of statements, which, at first sight, appear contradictory.

*Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest you be like him yourself.*

*Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes (Proverbs 26:4-5).*

The main reason why these statements are not actually contradictory is the very fact that they are placed together. Surely no one in his or her right mind could suppose that the inspired writer of this Scripture had not noticed the issue. Therefore, a correct interpretation must take into account the fact that the two proverbs are not contradictory.

The reason why we should not answer a fool according to his folly is "lest you be like him yourself." It follows that we should not abandon our presupposition of Biblical truth in order to answer questions. For example, I am often asked "how can you prove Creation to be true, without using the Bible?" The question has a presupposition. The questioner is saying that he cannot accept the Bible as true, so he wants external evidence.

But my presupposition is that all evidence is interpreted in the light of Biblical truth. If I reject that starting point, then I have already conceded the argument.

This is a tremendously important point, which is often not seen by many Creationists, who spend a great deal of time trying to find the "silver bullet" that will disprove evolution.

But if we play that game, we are actually working in an unBiblical manner. If we try to prove the truth of Creation, or try to prove that God exists, by giving evidence only, it is as if we are putting God on trial.<sup>2</sup> In a courtroom, evidence is presented to the judge and jury. So, the non-Christian questioner is being made judge and jury, and his judgment is over whether God exists or tells the truth. The intentions of such Creationists are good, but when the scenario is analyzed, we find that the intentions are unBiblical.

Indeed, the Bible never attempts to publish an argument about whether or not God exists. If evidential apologetics were correct, then Genesis would open with a treatise on this subject.

Instead, Genesis opens with the words “In the beginning, God...” The existence of God is assumed to be self-evident. That is why Paul explains in Romans 1 that actually everybody knows inside that God exists, so they are without excuse. The only discussion on the possible non-existence of God in the Bible is the repeated verse found in Psalm 14:1 and again in Psalm 53:1—“The fool says in his heart ‘there is no God.’” It may seem offensive to refer to someone as a fool, but that is how God describes an atheist, however intelligent they may be, and Proverbs 26:4-5 explains how we speak to them. We do not abandon our presupposition and use theirs in order to answer them.

But Proverbs 26:5 tells us that we should answer a fool according to his folly! Why? “Lest he be wise in his own eyes.” In other words, having refused to accept his presupposition, we now answer him to show him the absurdity of his presupposition. So instead of attempting to prove Creation by using a non-Biblical presupposition, we are happy to show that the non-Biblical presupposition leads to nonsensical arguments. An example of this is when we show the unbeliever that they have no absolute standards of morality against which to judge that with which they disagree.

For instance, there are a number of website atheists who like to refer to Creationists as “liars for Jesus.” This is because they maintain that we are telling lies about evolution. Of course, we are not doing so—we are telling the truth. But, they need to consider why it matters to them if we were to be telling lies!

What actually is a lie in their worldview? In order actually to call us liars, they have to borrow from the Biblical worldview, so that they can oppose the Biblical worldview! Without a Biblical worldview, there is no reason for lying to be considered immoral.

The absurdity of the atheist position is exemplified by some questioners who ask us questions, which have merely been copied and pasted from other websites. Some of these people have got upset when I haven’t responded to their questions. But if they haven’t thought through the argument themselves, why would I want to spend the time answering them?

One such writer claimed that just because he had copied the question did not invalidate its content. That is true. But my response—simply to direct him to an article on another website that had already answered his question—was considered insufficient for him!

The question might have been pertinent, but his repeated use of copying and pasting, rather than thinking, rendered the requirement for detailed original response unnecessary. Whereas, somebody else might have asked a question on the same point, but from his/her own thought processes, at which point I would have given a personal detailed response.

I hope readers will continue to ask questions. I hope readers will continue to think and, yes, to pray about these issues. I enjoy answering the questions and, although I will get it wrong sometimes, to the best of my ability, as many questioners as possible will receive an answer that I think or hope they deserve.

## Evidence for a Young Universe

### Galaxies

If spiral galaxies were billions of years old, the arms extending from their centers would have completely closed, causing the galaxies to lose their unique spiral shape.

### Red Giants

Evolutionists teach that red giant stars change into white dwarf stars over millions of years; yet Sirius is an example of a red star becoming white within the past 2,000 years.

Ancient astronomers recorded that Sirius glowed red in the sky, yet now it is categorized as white. Obviously, the evolutionists' opinions of the length of time to change a red giant star into a white dwarf star are incorrect.

### Jupiter and Saturn

These two planets radiate more heat than they receive from the sun. If they were billions of years old, both planets would have reached equilibrium and no longer be able to lose more heat than they receive.

### Moon and Tides

The earth and the moon are inextricably linked via their mutual gravitational pull. The moon's primary effect on the earth is that of tides. These twice-daily tides inflict a barely perceptible drag on the earth's rotation, causing the earth's natural day to lengthen and the moon's orbit to recede.

Because both gravitational forces and friction loss can be computed and predicted mathematically, we can determine how close the moon could orbit before resulting in lunar destruction or eradication of life on earth. With this in mind, the earth/moon relationship could not possibly be more than 1.2 billion years old, and geologic evidence indicates that it is much younger.

### Comets

Composed of frozen gasses and small rocks, comets lose material when their orbit takes them close to the sun. The vapor produced gives the appearance of a tail, often the recognizable feature of a comet.

A comet's life is relatively short, falling between an estimated 100 to 200 orbits around the sun. The frequency of comets has consistently decreased through the years, alluding to a much younger universe than textbooks describe.

## How Can We See Stars That Are Billions Of Light Years Away?

There are three things to consider when answering the starlight question:

1. Scientists cannot measure distances beyond 100 light years accurately.
2. No one knows what light is or that it always travels the same speed throughout all time, space and matter.
3. The Creation was finished or mature when God made it. Adam was full-grown, the trees had fruit on them, the starlight was visible, etc.

### Measuring Star Distance

To elaborate on these 3 points: First, no one can measure star distance accurately. The furthest accurate distance man can measure is 20 light years (some textbooks say up to 100), not several billion light years.

Man measures star distances using parallax trigonometry. By choosing two measurable observation points and making an imaginary triangle to a third point, and using simple trigonometry, man calculates the distance to the third point.

The most distant observation points available to an earthbound observer are the positions of the earth in solar orbit six months apart, say June and December. This would create a triangle of 186,000,000 miles, which equals only 16 light minutes. There are 525,948 minutes in a year. Even if the nearest star were only one light year away (and it isn't), the angle at the third point measures .017 degrees.

In simpler terms, a triangle like this would be the same angle two surveyors would see if they were standing sixteen inches apart and focusing on a third point 525,948 inches or 8.24 miles away. If they stayed 16 inches apart and focused on a dot 824 miles away, they would have the same angle as an astronomer measuring a point 100 light years away.

A point 5 million light years away is impossible to figure with trigonometry. The stars may be that far away but modern man has no way of measuring those great distances. No one can state definitively the distance to the stars.

Several other methods such as luminosity and red shift are employed to try to guess at greater distances but all such methods have serious problems and assumptions involved.

### Speed of Light Is Not Constant

Second, the speed of light may not be a constant. It does vary in different media (hence the rainbow effect of light going through a prism) and may also vary in different places in space.

The entire idea behind the black hole theory is that light can be attracted by gravity and be unable to escape the great pull of these imaginary black holes. No one knows what light is let alone that its velocity has been the standard of time. If the speed of light is decaying, the clock would be changing at the same rate and therefore not be noticed as the following demonstrate:

*SCIENTISTS claim they have broken the ultimate speed barrier: the speed of light. In research carried out in the United States, particle physicists have shown that light pulses can be accelerated to up to 300 times their normal velocity of 186,000 miles per second.*

The work was carried out by Dr. Lijun Wang, of the NEC research institute in Princeton, who transmitted a pulse of light towards a chamber filled with specially treated cesium gas.

## Is The Grand Canyon Proof of Noah's Flood?

Two people can often look at the same thing and come to opposite conclusions. The Grand Canyon is a perfect example.

Evolutionists use it as proof that the earth is billions of years old, claiming that the Colorado River carved the canyon over millions of years. Bible-believing Christians interpret the canyon as a spillway from Noah's Flood. One believes it formed slowly, with a little water and a lot of time. The other believes it formed quickly, with a lot of water and a little time. What a stark difference.

If the Bible is true, and the earth is only about six thousand years old, we should find evidence that debunks the evolutionist theory about the Grand Canyon. We do. For example, the top of Grand Canyon is over four thousand feet higher than where the Colorado River enters the canyon, meaning it would have had to flow uphill for millions of years. Additionally, in contrast to all other rivers, we do not find a delta (a place where washed-out mud is deposited). This alone makes the evolutionist interpretation impossible.

### **Evidence of Noah's Flood**

The evidence does, however, point to Noah's Flood. Today, we see two beach lines from what used to be two large lakes near the Grand Canyon. Creationists believe that after Noah's Flood, the lakes got too full and spilled over the top. When water overflows a dam, the weakest point is instantly eroded. Thus, the Grand Canyon would have been formed quickly, supporting the creationist interpretation.

So, which interpretation is right? Knowing that rivers don't flow uphill and no leftover sedimentary deposits are found, evolutionists have a lot of explaining to do when it comes to the Grand Canyon. The Bible, however, says that a flood covered the whole earth (see Genesis 7:18-20). This means we should find places where the water drained. The Grand Canyon is one of those places. It is a washed-out spillway and provides great evidence for Noah's Flood.

## **Jesus Christ – All Things Become New**

In Christianity, the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ serve as the cornerstones of the faith—the lifeblood of the Christian's hope. To the faithful, Christ's work is seen to bring forgiveness and salvation—making one right with God. Theologians call it “atonement.” Great eighteenth-century evangelist John Wesley spoke in no uncertain terms when he said, “Nothing in the Christian system is of greater consequence.” Certainly, no Christian would debate its significance.

### **The Fall from Perfection**

The original creation is indicative of God's perfect will. Adam and Eve enjoyed a flawless creation, relationship with the Father, righteousness, knowledge only of Godly ways, and eternal life. Evil was nowhere to be found. God created a perfect paradise. Indeed, “It was very good!”

Today, creation is wrecked. It certainly does not reflect the “very good” creation described by God on day six (see Genesis 1:31). In a risky move, God gave control over the earth to a new owner—mankind (Genesis 1:28-30). At some point, the first couple gave in to Satan's temptation and rebelled against God. This disobedience wrecked God's original creation, leaving it and humanity in desperate need of redemption (1 Corinthians 15:22).



Suddenly, the soil became difficult to work and getting food became a struggle (Genesis 3:17-19). Death, sickness, and disease began to reign (Romans 5:12). Man was no longer innocent, but became knowledgeable of evil (Genesis 3:7, 22). And the saddest outcome was that the Holy Father could no longer be in direct relationship with His people. Offerings, sacrifices, and laws were instituted to make restitution for one's sins. All creation had fallen and began to yearn for redemption (Romans 8:22-23).

### Atonement

Loosely speaking, "atonement" means bringing unity or reconciliation between God and man. Coined in the sixteenth century, the term is the combination of the words "at-one-ment," meaning to "set at one" or reconcile. The creation needed atoning.

In the words of the Apostle John, "The Son of God was revealed for this purpose, to overthrow the works of the Devil" (1 John 3:8). Everything that Jesus did—His earthly ministry, death, and resurrection—was centered on overthrowing Satan's empire and restoring humanity and creation back to the will of God. Christ provided the perfect atonement the world needed.

### Restoration through Ministry

Peter summarized Jesus' ministry, noting that He "went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the Devil" (Acts 10:28). His healings and exorcisms were a type of combat with Satan.

In God's original creation, mankind had no knowledge of evil. Thus, evil thoughts, speech, and actions had no influence over humanity. With Adam's fall, however, that immediately changed. The Bible says that Adam and Eve's eyes "were opened" (Genesis 3:7). God declared, "Man has become like one of us, knowing good *and* evil" (Genesis 3:22, emphasis added). Christ's teaching ministry was strategically aimed at defeating the knowledge of evil and restoring what was minimized at the Fall—the knowledge of God.

### Restoration through Crucifixion

Jesus Christ was the "suffering servant" foretold in the Hebrew Scriptures who would save mankind. He would be "despised and rejected by others; a man of suffering" (Isaiah 53:3). The chapter concludes, "Yet he bore the sin of man, and made intercession for the transgressors" (Isaiah 53:12). His crucifixion fulfilled the prophecy that, through His suffering, humanity would be rescued and redeemed.

As a sacrifice, Christ paid the penalty of death that mankind deserves because of its sin. The author of Hebrews remarks, "He has appeared once and for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Hebrews 9:26). In propitiation, Christ's death removed the wrath of God that humanity deserved. The Apostle John summarizes: "In this is love, not that we loved God but that He loved us and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1 John 4:10). In reconciliation, Christ's death



overcame humanity's separation from God, bringing it back into fellowship with Him. Paul said, "God through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself" (2 Corinthians 5:18-19).

Finally, in redemption, Christ's death freed sinners from the bondage to sin and to Satan. Through this, Christ paid the ultimate price to ensure humanity's liberation. Jesus said of Himself, "For the Son of man also came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for man" (Mark 10:45). Humanity is purified, made righteous, reconciled to God, progressively cleansed from sin, and able to overcome the Devil. These are all products of Christ's victory over Satan, which provided restoration of God's will for mankind.

### Restoration through Resurrection

Paul, in his letter to the Romans revealed, "[Jesus] was declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness *by resurrection from the dead*" (Romans 1:4, emphasis added). A central significance of the resurrection is that through it, Jesus conquered death. He triumphed over every force that opposed Him. Paul, referring to the resurrection, wrote, "Death has been swallowed up in victory...Thanks be to God, who gives us the victory through the Lord Jesus Christ" (1 Corinthians 15:54-57). When Christ rose from the dead, He conquered death and secured eternal life for humanity. Through Christ's victorious resurrection, He restored God's will of everlasting life.

### All Things Become New

Unlike the first man, Adam, who through *disobedience* brought death and separation, Jesus, the "last Adam," by *obedience* restored God's kingdom (Romans 5:19; 1 Corinthians 5:45). His earthly ministry began with Satan's temptation, but in complete submission to the Father, He overcame. In submission to the Spirit, Jesus exorcised demons and healed the sick. Paul remarked, "[He] became obedient to the point of death—even death on a cross" (Philippians 2:8). Christ's obedience undid Adam's disobedience and restored what Adam lost. Through Christ, everything has been redeemed; even the earth will be made brand new (see Revelation 21:2)!

## Real Days or Thousands of Years?

Both Christians and non-believers often have difficulty with timetables in the Bible. In one frequently overlooked passage, could it be talking about literal days or thousands of years? It seems to refer to days by numbers—the first day, second day, third day, etc. Could these perhaps be long periods of time? We need to read the passage carefully to find out.

## 12 Days or 12,000 Years

The passage that I am referring to is, of course, Numbers 7. You weren't thinking of any other passage, were you? Numbers 7 is one of those boring bits of the Bible that so many people like to skip over. As we will see, the boring bits are just as worthy of study as the bits we might find more exciting—it's all inspired!

In Numbers 7, the leaders of the tribes were bringing their gifts to the LORD, and laying them before Moses. The tribe of Judah came first.

*And the one who offered his offering on the first day was Nahshon the son of Amminadab, from the tribe of Judah. (Numbers 7:12)*

The other tribes came in strict order:

*On the second day Nethanel the son of Zuar, leader of Issachar, presented an offering. (Numbers 7:18)*

*On the third day Eliab the son of Helon, leader of the children of Zebulun, presented an offering. (Numbers 7:24)*

*On the fourth day Elizur the son of Shedeur, leader of the children of Reuben, presented an offering. (Numbers 7:30)*

This list continues, until all twelve tribes had given their gifts. So the important question is this: Did the tribes take twelve literal days to present their gifts, or did they take twelve very long periods of time—perhaps twelve thousand years. Could Moses have been sitting there for twelve thousand years while the people brought their gifts?

I suppose I'm basically a literalist; it seems most logical to suppose from the passage that these days were actually twelve literal, 24-hour days. Most people that I have asked seem to agree with me.

## Scripture Interprets Scripture

I suppose we could ask another question: Do you think there is another passage in the Bible where days are numbered consecutively where there might also be an argument over whether they are literal days or not? Do you think we should interpret that other passage in a similar way to Numbers 7, especially as it was written in the same style by the same person?

A consistent interpretation of Genesis 1 needs to take into account Numbers 7, which has the same structure. Numbers 7 obviously refers to literal 24-hour periods. Therefore, Genesis 1 does as well, as both passages were written by Moses.

The only reasons, therefore, for interpreting Genesis 1 differently would come from accepting an authority outside scripture as being higher than scripture. This tongue-

in-cheek article has a serious point; if we allow scripture to interpret scripture (as we should) then the only satisfactory conclusion is that Genesis 1 refers to six literal 24-hour days of creation.

## Spiders and the Creative Genius of God

There was once a huge garden spider living in the center of an intricate web next to our deck. I spent a few minutes watching it every day for a couple of weeks as this miraculous creature bounced up and down on its web. I can't honestly say that I like spiders, especially the brown recluse-like spider that made a nest in the pants that I almost put on a couple of months ago from off the floor (I'll admit: I smashed it too fast to discern if it was a recluse or not).

### Spiders show the creative genius of God

Likewise, I can't say that I liked the big black one that ran into the pile of papers behind my computer not too long ago, which kept surfacing in different parts of our house for a few days. Nevertheless, they do fascinate me to a great extent, and I do have a great appreciation of the creative genius that our Creator used to design these creatures.

Spiders are able to make seven different types of webs, which they use for different purposes, such as for catching prey, for walking on, for anchor points, for wrapping prey, and for other functions. It is ridiculous to suggest that a creature could randomly develop the irreducibly complex apparatuses to make and eject one type of webbing, but to make seven types is mind-boggling. An irreducibly complex apparatus is something that could not operate if even one of its components were missing. The chances of something of this nature to appear by accident with all of its necessary parts intact are essentially zero.

This amazing web material is five times stronger than steel thread, but it will stretch to over four times its length without breaking. It has been used to make bulletproof vests, it can be used to close bleeding wounds, and scientists have produced nothing with which it can be compared. Furthermore, spiders have an amazing range of talents that for which they utilize their webs. Making a regular spider web is amazing enough. Many spiders make a complex web every day and eat it later as it starts to wear, after which they make a new web. How do they know how to produce such elaborate structures without instruction? It does not stop there. Harun Yahya has provided the following astonishing examples of how spiders use their webs and camouflage for hunting.

### Trapdoor spiders

Trapdoor spiders build a door with their webs and attach a web hinge to them so that they may close them and remain concealed until prey comes along. Did this happen by chance, and how did it get to be a trait of all trapdoor spiders? Bola spiders make a bola out of their webs and even put small weights on them. They are

quite accurate too. They wait until a moth flies by, then they throw this bola like a lasso with great accuracy and reel in their prey. I had to practice a while with my bola from Argentina in order to get reasonably good with it. The bola spider did not have to practice. He would have starved to death if he did have to do so. This could not be accounted for by evolutionary theory. The same question could be asked about Dinopsis spiders. These amazing spiders make nets out of their webs that they throw over their prey. Their mothers are not around to teach them how to do this. How does such a skill evolve?

### **Bell spiders**

Even more amazing are bell spiders. The bell spider makes a diving bell out of its web and actually uses it to hunt under water. How did this entire species figure out how to do this if their creator had not implanted in them the knowledge required?

### **Myrmarachne spiders**

There is a species of spiders called Myrmarachne that look almost like ants, except for having eight legs. They will stand around waving their two extra legs in the air to resemble antennae until an ant comes close so that they can pounce on them. How did such a small creature end up looking like an ant, and with their minute brains how do they know how to utilize this resemblance so ingeniously?

### **Spiders are a sophisticated creation**

There are a number of spider kinds that surf the sky as babies. These kinds of spiders will spin a thin strand of web and leap into the wind where they can sometimes be carried thousands of feet into the air and for hundreds of miles. They are able to hang on to their threads and ride them like air surfboards. Scientists have spotted baby spiders as high as 16,000 feet in the air. This explains why spiders are often one of the first creatures to inhabit volcanic islands. How did they learn this skill on their own?

A very lengthy book could be written on the miraculous nature of spiders, but I'll stop here for now. Spiders are amazingly sophisticated creations, and give us many reasons to stand in awe of God's creativity.

## **The Big Bang Theory**

We would not normally consider it necessary to explain how a theory works that we don't even believe in. However, there are a lot of misunderstandings about the Big Bang theory. This includes misunderstandings amongst fellow creationists, who therefore sometimes end up opposing ideas that the Big Bang theorists don't even believe in.

This article is therefore an attempt to understand a little of what the theory is about, and why, as creationists, we do not accept it. Please note that this is a beginner-level article. Many Big Bang theorists may therefore complain that I have simplified some concepts. However, I have only done so in the same way as a secular High School textbook writer might do.

### How did it start?

The originators—George Lemaitre, a Belgium, struck on the basic idea in 1927; and George Gamow, R.A. Alpher, and R. Herman devised the basic Big Bang model in 1948. At first, the theory was not widely accepted by astrophysicists. It was not the only cosmological theory. Sir Fred Hoyle had a rival theory, called the Steady State theory, in which he claimed that new material must constantly be made in the universe to fill in the gaps, as the existing material expands. It was Hoyle who originally coined the term Big Bang, in a radio broadcast in 1949. He intended the term to be an insult, but it is now widely used by supporters of the theory.

### The Big Bang Theory

According to the Big Bang theory, all matter and all space was originally part of an infinitesimally small point called the Singularity. The theory says nothing about where that singularity came from. It is assumed to have come about by a random quantum event.

This is what Brad Lemley said about quantum events.

*To the average person it might seem obvious that nothing can happen in nothing. But to a quantum physicist, nothing is, in fact, something.*

If this seems a somewhat unusual statement, try this next statement.

*Quantum theory also holds that a vacuum, like atoms, is subject to quantum uncertainties. This means that things can materialise out of the vacuum, although they tend to vanish back into it quickly...this phenomenon has never been observed directly...*

If I might be so bold as to translate this into English, he seems to be saying “things appear from nothing and then disappear back into nothing. And nobody has ever seen any of that happen!”

The astronomer Heather Cowper put it this way, in a children’s book called *The Big Bang*.

*Our Universe probably came into existence not only from nothing, but from nowhere.*

This does not appear like a scientific argument, but more like a doctrine of religious faith. “In the beginning, there was nothing. And that nothing exploded.”

The most common misconception about the Big Bang theory is the idea that it teaches that matter exploded and spread out into empty space. This is not what the theory teaches, and it is important as creationists that we do not misrepresent what secular scientists believe.

The theory actually teaches that space itself was also small. This is difficult to get our heads around, but it is worth trying, for reasons that will become clear. Thus, at the point of singularity, they believe that there was still matter everywhere in the Universe—it is simply that they believe the Universe itself to have been very small.

It is therefore space itself that stretched to its present size. The matter in the universe did not move through space during the stretching. It is what we might euphemistically call the fabric of space that stretched.

It is worth getting our heads around the problem, because the stretching of space is actually Biblical. Isaiah 42:5 and 45:12 both state that God stretched out the heavens like a curtain. Of course, this does not mean that we agree that the Universe started out as a singularity. However, it is completely possible that God created the Universe smaller than it is today, and this concept is the basis for creationist cosmologies based on Gravitational Time Dilation, and discussed in our technical article on “Starlight Issues”.

### Problems with the Big Bang

There are a number of problems with the Big Bang theory. It ought to be pointed out, at this point, that it is not only creationists who have problems with the Big Bang theory. The theory is not universally accepted. For example, the physicist Eric Lerner has described himself as a Big Bang heretic, and has written a book and a website on the subject.

One very large problem with the theory is its inability to determine where the singularity came from. Theoretical astrophysicists (obviously working without any experimentation) have divided cosmological history, by their theory, into a number of epochs, when conditions were different.

The first four epochs are labelled as 10-43s, 10-32s, 10-6s and 3min. Even under their own theory, they cannot work out what happened prior to the first 10-43s. Of course, all their calculations on such issues are theoretical, not experimental, so they do not qualify as observational science. This is notwithstanding the CERN experiments, which I am certain will find some results before the end of 2011. There are two reasons why they will find results. The first is that billions of Euros of cash have been pumped into CERN, and the funding ends in December 2011, so the cynic in me thinks that is good enough reason to get results. The second is that this experiment, unusually, has an actual end in sight. The experimenters already know what conclusion they wish to verify, so whatever results they achieve will be shown to verify the conclusion they require.

For a supposedly random event, the calculations around the Big Bang theory give too good a result. Dr. Robert Matthews, who is actually an unbeliever, said this:

*Why, for instance is our Universe and its laws just right for the existence of life? Some argue that it is because it was specially made for us by a benevolent creator.*

There is not enough antimatter in the universe. This is a big problem for the theorists. The original Big Bang would have produced equal amounts of positive matter (matter) and negative matter (antimatter). But only small amounts of antimatter exist. There should be as much antimatter as matter—if the Big Bang was true.

*Since matter and antimatter are equivalent in all respects but that of electromagnetic charge oppositeness, any force [the Big Bang] that would create one should have to create the other, and the universe should be made of equal quantities of each. This is a dilemma. Theory tells us there should be antimatter out there, and observation refuses to back it up.*

In fact, there isn't enough matter of any sort for their calculations. For this reason, the concept of dark matter has been postulated. Dark matter is matter that cannot be detected, but it must be there, otherwise their calculations do not work! They have a similar problem with not enough energy in the Universe, so they have developed the idea of dark energy.

We used to have answers like this when I was in High School, and we called them "fiddle factors"! What these concepts show is that the Big Bang theory is not a really satisfactory theory, but, at the moment, it is the best they have got. It therefore resembles the car I had in my college days, which was held together by string and duct tape.

Even secular astrophysicists have realized the problems associated with dark matter and energy. The Israeli astrophysicist, Moshe Carmeli, has developed a 5-dimensional cosmology, based on Einstein's principles, and called Cosmological Special Relativity. Carmeli's theory is mentioned in our article on Starlight Issues, because it has been adapted by John Hartnett of CMI to make a creationist cosmology based on time dilation.

The final problem worth mentioning with the Big Bang theory is the so-called Horizon Problem. Many Big Bangers talk about the concept of Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) radiation. They often state that CMB verifies the Big Bang. In fact, it does not. The uniform nature of CMB is actually impossible to explain under current Big Bang estimates for the age of the Universe. There is more detail on this in our technical article on Starlight Issues.



## Conclusion

It is hope that this brief look at the Big Bang theory will help creationists not to misrepresent the theory. For example, creationists should not be asking “how can something explode into nothingness”. The Big Bang theory is not really a theory about an explosion. That name was given to the theory by an early opponent of the theory.

Nevertheless, we have seen that there are many justifiable accusations to level at the Big Bang theory, such as its reliance on “fiddle factors”, like dark matter. We have also seen that the Big Bang theory is not a monolithic theory. There is a substantial minority of atheistic, secular scientists who do not accept it, either.

Most of all, we do not accept the Big Bang theory because it is unBiblical. It suggests that the Earth has no special place, whereas the Bible tells us that it does (Isaiah 45:12). Despite the heavens being vast and beautiful, they were nevertheless created for our benefit (Genesis 1:14) and, most importantly, to give glory to God (Psalm 19:1).

## The Evidence of Things Not Seen

I like evidences. Evidences can build up the faith, if used correctly. They help us to confirm that, given our belief that the Bible is true, we can view the world successfully through Biblical “glasses” and make sense of what we observe.

### Help—I’m losing my faith!

I frequently get emails of the following type: “Someone has given me some evidence about..., which seems to confirm that evolution is true, or Creation is wrong. Help—this is damaging my faith!”

With respect, I need to say to such people that your faith is misplaced if it can be damaged by “evidence.” You see, evidences are not neutral. They are interpreted by our worldviews. You might be interested to know that the Bible actually has something to say about the correct use of evidence. You can find the relevant passage in Hebrews 11:1-3.

*Now **faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. For by it the elders obtained a good report. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear (emphasis mine).***

What is the evidence? It is faith. Faith is not a blind belief system, in the teeth of the evidence. Faith actually IS the evidence. It is therefore by faith that I know that God made the world. Therefore, no evidence will ever shake my faith, regardless of how

“scientific” it appears to be, because the actual evidence is my faith. And remember that the apostle Paul says that even faith is “not of yourselves; *it is* the gift of God” (Ephesians 2:8).

### **Evidence should not shake our faith**

The plea for evidence is therefore often misdirected. We do not require scientific evidence to “prove” the existence of God, or justify our belief that what the Bible says is true. Our faith is the evidence for that.

The Bible does not attempt to prove the existence of God. The Bible does not begin with a High School essay, rehearsing the arguments for, with the arguments against, before reaching a conclusion. The Bible starts with the very clear presupposition that “In the beginning, God ...”

The only discussion in the Bible on the possible non-existence of God is found in [Psalm 14](#) and repeated in Psalm 53: “The fool has said in his heart ‘There is no God’.” In fact, the whole message of [Romans 1](#) is that there is really no such thing as an atheist. They all know that God exists, but suppress this truth in unrighteousness.

### **Evidence is not for the purpose of “proving” God or the Bible**

If supposed evidence should not shake your faith, we can also say that offering evidence is the wrong way to “prove” the Bible to be true. Evidence is presented in court. It is presented to the judge. So if you offer evidence, with the intention of proving to someone else that the Bible is true or that God is real, you are making that skeptic into the judge, and you are putting God and/or the Bible on trial. So that is not what evidence is for.

Evidence is there for the believer, to show that their position is consistent. We can demonstrate that evidence is consistent with what we find in Scripture. But evidence is not there to “prove” the Bible. The Bible is true, because it is the Bible—period!

### **Conclusion**

The approach to evidence that I am outlining here will require a complete paradigm shift for some of you. I had to go through this myself. So much of my Creation ministry involved presenting evidences. But evidential apologetics has two main flaws: 1. It doesn’t work, even though we think it ought to. And 2. It is actually unBiblical, because it attempts to put God on trial. For these reasons, here at the Creation Today ministry, we advocate the presuppositional apologetics approach.

## **The Shifting Sands of Evolution**

Since the birth of evolution theory in the 1800s, evolutionists have been struggling to find a mechanism that can actually cause evolution. Where has this journey taken them?

Take a look for yourself and you will see that from the beginning, evolution has been evolving, and it has still not improved. Here we will look at five major theories that have been popularized under the label of “evolution,” but which simply don’t satisfy the dictates of either science or reason.

### Theories of Evolution

Five major theories have been proposed as the mechanism for evolution; however, they do not stand up to the scrutiny of common sense! Take a minute to examine these for yourself.

1. **Lamarckism** — Lamarckism is the once widely accepted idea that an organism can pass on characteristics that it acquired during its lifetime to its offspring (also known as heritability of acquired characteristics or “soft inheritance”). It is named for the French biologist Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, who incorporated the action of soft inheritance into his evolutionary theories. Lamarckism proposed that the effect of individual efforts during the lifetime of the organisms was the main mechanism driving species to adaptation. As a species would acquire adaptive changes, they would pass them on to offspring causing evolution. Today’s understanding of science has left Lamarckism without a leg to stand on.

2. **Classical Darwinism (Natural Selection)** — The term “Darwinism” (in the classical sense) refers to the concept that natural selection is the sole mechanism of evolution, in contrast to Lamarckism. This theory was popularized by the publication of *The Origin of Species*, by Charles Darwin in the mid-nineteenth century.

Darwin had proposed that species evolved by merely being the fittest—and thus his “survival of the fittest” axiom. Those species most fit for their environment would survive longer and pass along their genes through reproduction. However, in the mid-twentieth century, scientists realized that natural selection alone could not cause evolution. More radical changes needed to be made, and on a much faster timescale.

3. **Neo-Darwinism (Natural Selection + Mutations)** — In modern times, the term “neo-Darwinism” refers to the addition of mutation to the theory of classical Darwinism (natural selection). Following the development in the 1940s of the modern evolutionary synthesis, the term “neo-Darwinian” has been used by some to refer to the modern evolutionary theory that mutations are the driving force of evolution. This idea comes to a halt when science demonstrates that mutations are not frequent or beneficial. That is to say when mutations do happen, they do not produce something new, they just scramble existing information.

4. **Hopeful Monster** — This term is used in evolutionary biology to describe evolution as taking place in a single bound. It says that maybe one day a reptile laid an egg, and a bird hatched out. The problem now is: Who would the new bird mate with? This kind of event would surely be rare, and the chances of that happening twice, at the same time, in the same place, with animals that are the same species, that are of the opposite sex, that are able to reproduce, are .... Well, let's just say, "It ain't happening!"

The phrase was coined by the German-born geneticist, Richard Goldschmidt, who believed that small, gradual changes could not bridge the gap between microevolution and macroevolution, and that rapid evolution events were necessary to explain the lack of transitional fossils. This argument is an attempt to explain away the lack of transitional fossils in the fossil record.

5. **Punctuated Equilibrium** — In 1972, paleontologists Niles Eldredge and Stephen Jay Gould developed this idea in a paper that built upon Ernst Mayr's theory of geographic speciation. Eldredge and Gould noticed that evidence of slow gradual changes by means of natural selection championed by Charles Darwin was virtually nonexistent in the fossil record, and that, rather than gradual evolution through minor changes, punctuated equilibrium better explained the fossil record. Punctuated equilibrium stated that major changes did take place, but over relatively short periods of geologic time (10 to 20 thousand years as opposed to millions). This theory is just as ridiculous as the others, as it attempts to argue from the lack of evidence. "Since we don't have the evidence in the fossil record, this proves evolution happened quickly."

### **Back to the Beginning**

Scientific evidence has far surpassed the theories of those who believe evolution has taken place and has instead reinforced what the Bible tells us in Genesis 1:25: The animals bring forth after their kind!

As long as man takes God out of the creation equation, then there will be many more theories that try to explain evolutionary phenomena. But as we all know, you cannot build a strong structure on shifting sand. Acknowledging God as Creator is a construct based on solid ground.

## **Things That Negate Evolution: Snake Legs**

It's not a topic that comes up very often now, but it still persists in certain circles. The presence of small bones that appear to the very imaginative as tiny remnants of legs in boa constrictors has been used to prove evolution. After I caught a garter snake when I was eleven years old, I read several books on snakes, and most of them

stated that these bones were evidence that snakes once had legs. I do remember thinking at the time about the serpent in the Garden of Eden being told that from henceforth it would have to crawl on its belly on the earth.

### Vestigial legs?

If I were a member of the evolutionist cult, I would avoid this example, even if those small bones had proven to be remnants of legs; however, we know that the bones in boas are **not** remnants of legs. These alleged legs are tiny claw-like structures near the base of the tail. Although they are not entirely understood, they appear to be related to the boa's sexual functions. The male actually uses them to sexually stimulate the female. Positing that these tiny structures were vestigial legs is foolishness.

Furthermore, the bones that have been interpreted as remnant legs apply only to hind legs. Are they suggesting that boa constrictors walked upright with two legs and had no arms? This would make for an amusing image. Perhaps the mindless designer of the evolutionist cult failed to provide them with front legs and made the rear legs go away for symmetry's sake. That, of course, is *devolution*, not evolution.

Of course, if this devolution took place, a mindless designer would have to explain why there was a problem with the original design in the first place.

### Designed by a designer

This would be like deducing that a man that was sound asleep designed and built a watch, and later, while still asleep, altered its design by removing parts that were not necessary. How could a mindless designer be concerned with symmetry, and how could it design anything that worked?

These creatures, like the whole universe, were designed by a designer that was an artist and an engineer, not by a chaotic, undefined force, and even the evolution cultists imply that in their writings at the exact same time that they are denying it. One might call that an oxymoron, but there are no oxymorons, only morons who posit contradictions.

Modern evolutionists seem to be devoting their lives to proving that a mindless designer can design something that works by their own attempts to design theories that are mindless, but even that does not prove that it can be done. They still have designed words in patterns that form structures that can be understood by others. However stupid these theories may be, it still required minds to structure them.

## Wrong Assumptions in C-14 Dating Methods

### **Atmospheric C-14 is in equilibrium**

This assumption is wrong. It has been estimated that the C-14 in the earth's atmosphere would reach equilibrium (the formation rate would be equal to the decay rate) in about 30,000 years. The amount of C-14 in the atmosphere is still increasing. This research indicates a young earth (probably less than 10,000 years). The same research also modifies all dates obtained by C-14 decay. As the earth's magnetic field decays, more cosmic radiation penetrates our atmosphere.

On a Geiger counter, 16 clicks per minute per gram (16DPM/Gc) is typical in living objects today. Plants and animals that lived on the earth four thousand years ago would have had much less C-14 in their body to start with. The low amount of C-14 would make them appear to be thousands of years older than they really are. Several factors can affect the rate of C-14 formation. The 11-year solar sunspot cycle is one such factor.

Living penguins have been carbon dated as being 8,000 years old!

### **Decay rate remains constant**

Many times this assumption has been shown to be uncertain. Because the rate of decay may not be constant, dates obtained by C-14 may be accepted, but only with caution.

### **Initial amounts of C-14 can be known**

Many times this assumption has been demonstrated to be wrong. Different parts of the same sample often yield different ratios. Various living samples give very different ratios. Some items will not be tested with carbon dating even though they contain carbon (see number 5 below).

Would a mollusk have the same amount of C-14 per gram of carbon as a tree? Probably not. Living penguins have been carbon dated at 8,000 years old! The oldest sample of independently known age is Hemaka, the Egyptian mummy from 2700–3100 BC. (Secular writers of antiquity tend to exaggerate ages, so even these dates are suspect.)

### **The sample being tested has not been contaminated for thousands of years.**

This assumption is very difficult (if not impossible) to prove. Parent or daughter products may have leached in or out of the sample. Many lab tests have confirmed that this can happen.

### **The geologic column can be used as a base to calibrate the C-14 dates**

This assumption is not wise. The ages applied to the geologic column (invented in the 1800s to discredit the Bible) do not exist anywhere in the world except in textbooks. Polystrata fossils, missing layers, layers out of order, misplaced fossils, and layers in reverse order all invalidate the geologic column.

[© 2005 Creation Science Evangelism.](#)

