

Scientific Creationism: The Rock of Ages vs. The Age of Rocks

[Michigan District Pastor/Teacher Conference, Ypsilanti, Michigan, June 11-13, 1991]
by Kevin P. Peil

Introduction

The theory of evolution, in its long war against God, has claimed many victims. Most precious among these have been our children. Our children are being brainwashed into accepting as fact one of the most anti-christian and unscientific ideas ever invented by man. They are constantly bomb-barded with the lies of evolution not only in public school science classes but in countless magazines, books, and television shows as well. They are told time and again that the evidence in favor of evolution is enormous while believing in creation is as backward and ignorant as believing that the earth is flat. Since most public schools present only one side of the origins argument, it is very difficult for its listeners to form more than one opinion. As pastors, teachers, and parents we must take it upon ourselves, for our children's sake, to present to them not only the biblical evidence for creation but the scientific evidence as well. The scientific evidence for creation forms an ever growing branch of science called "Scientific Creationism".

We firmly believe that God created the earth and the entire universe by a single act of creation in six 24 hour days. He created fish as fish, dogs as dogs, trees as trees, and people as people. We do not believe that any of these basic types—or kinds—have arisen from a common ancestor. There has been variation within each kind; this we do not deny. However, variation has occurred only within strict limits imposed at the time of creation. Creation is finished so we can be assured that no new basic type of life has or ever will arise. If we use the God given gift of scientific inquiry and examine scientific data found on earth and throughout the universe, the data should at all times support and agree with God's creation record of how the universe and life on earth arose. After all, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the skies proclaim the works of his hands." (Psalm 19:1) This is scientific creationism.

The purpose of this paper is to present some of the scientific facts in support of the biblical account of creation. This information is readily available but is almost never taught in the public schools and only rarely in our own Christian Day Schools. The evolution majority has been fairly successful in the past in suppressing this information. By using scientific creationism to support our presentation of the biblical account of creation we can avoid and help eliminate the typical creationist stereotype of bible-thumping fanatics bent on repressing science. By preparing ourselves and our children to handle some of the scientific facts which challenge the theory of evolution and support the biblical account of creation, perhaps we "become all things to all men so by all possible means [we] might save some." (1 Cor 9:22) This might then open the door and allow us to do what Peter encourages: "Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect, keeping a clear conscience, so that those who speak maliciously against your good behavior in Christ may be ashamed of their slander." (1 Peter 3:15,16)

In With a Bang

Most evolutionists believe that the universe began as an explosive Big Bang some 15 billion years ago. The Big Bang theory rests on three observational pillars: 1) the universe is expanding, 2) the observation of the Big Bang's echo known as the cosmic background radiation,

and 3) the fact that hydrogen, the simplest of all elements, comprises over 90% of the universe's mass. We will examine the three observational pillars of the Big Bang and re-interpret their data in light of creation using scientific creationism. The date of 15-20 billion years assigned to the Big Bang arose from the observation that the most distant stars are approximately 15-20 billion light years from the planet earth. A light year is the distance light travels in one year. We'll begin by examining the apparent age of the universe, 15-20 billion years.

It is common place for most people to be aware of stars that scientists claim to be millions of light years away. This has long been a difficult problem for those who believe in creation. Doesn't this distant starlight prove an old universe?

Perhaps the most commonly used explanation by creationists for distant starlight is that God created starlight "on the way" so that stars were visible to Adam immediately. It may indeed be true that many stars are millions of light years away, but Adam did not have to wait millions of years for the starlight to reach the earth. Although such a scenario is certainly possible it is not without its difficulties.

Starlight created "on the way" implies that when we are looking at very distant stars, what we are seeing did not actually happen. So when scientists observe a star exploding that is millions of light years away, are they simply being entertained by a spectacular picture show created by God 6,000 years ago? The light that appears to show an exploding star would have also been created "on the way". While we should avoid placing limitations on the creative powers of God, we should at the same time be aware of some of the questions skeptics are sure to ask about starlight created "on the way". In all other aspects it is a perfectly rational and biblical explanation for distant starlight.

Another explanation put forth by scientists for distant starlight is that the speed of light was considerably faster in the past. Australian scientists Berry Setterfield and Trevor Norman were the first to raise the possibility that the speed of light is decreasing. Setterfield and Norman noticed that since the speed of light was first measured over 300 years ago there has been a persistent tendency for successive measurements to be less than before. The implications of such a finding on the age of the universe are enormous.

Setterfield and Norman have extrapolated the speed of light back 6,000 years and determined that the speed of light would have been 500 billion times faster at the time of creation. If this is true, light from a star 5 billion light years away would have reached the earth in only 3 days. There have been some objections to the speed of light decay theory with one of the most common involving Einstein's famous $E = mc^2$ equation (E is energy, m is mass, and c is the speed of light). If the speed of light was billions of times faster at the time of creation then the amount of radioactive energy would have been billions and billions of times higher. How could Adam and Eve, or any form of life, have survived in an environment of such intense radiation? Such is a popular question asked by many evolutionists.

The speed of light argument is a very complicated issue and there is much debate and ongoing research on the topic. We should wait until all the data is in before we enthusiastically accept the theory. However, if the speed of light theory is true there are some further consequences. Two of the three observational pillars of the Big Bang theory could be easily explained away: an expanding universe and cosmic background radiation (the Big Bang's echo).

The above figure has been reproduced from the early work of Setterfield and Norman. There seemed to be a constant change in the rate of change with a leveling off of the speed of light in the 1960s. Recent work has suggested that the apparent consistency of the speed of light since

the 1960s may be due to all speed of light measurements since then being calibrated by atomic clocks which are themselves changing with the speed of light.

The assumption that the universe is expanding arises from the observed Doppler effect of light rays. We have all experienced the Doppler effect of sound waves by hearing the changing frequency of a car horn as the car approaches and passes us. The speeding car “crushes” the sound waves in front of it and “stretches” the sound waves behind it. A moving star would have a similar effect on light waves. Since astronomers have observed that light waves from distant stars are “stretched”, or “red-shifted” as it is often called, they have assumed that these stars must be moving away from us. Hence, an expanding universe. However, if the speed of light is actually decreasing it would have in it a built-in “red-shift”. Light reaching us from more distant stars would have slowed down more (relative to its initial speed) than light reaching us from closer stars. The light from the more distant stars would have its frequency shifted to the red end of the spectrum and give the star the appearance that it is speeding away from us. If the speed of light is decreasing the universe would only appear to be expanding. It may actually be static or even contracting.

The cosmic background radiation measured in the night-time sky is assumed by scientists to be the echo of the Big Bang fire ball. The Big Bang theory actually predicts this radiation and when it was first discovered it was hailed as proof of the Big Bang. However, the massive built-in red-shifting of the light from the most distant stars would necessarily cause a background level of radiation. It may well be this radiation which scientists interpret as the radiation left from the Big Bang.

The third Big Bang pillar that we must briefly address is the abundance of hydrogen throughout the universe. Since hydrogen is the simplest of elements it would necessarily be the most abundant element. The fact that this is what we find is not all that surprising. Proponents of the Big Bang readily point out the large proportion of hydrogen present in the universe and claim it adds credence to their theory. However, they rarely add that a universe in which hydrogen is not the most abundant element would not be expected.

At this point we will turn our attention to the evolutionist’s explanation of the formation of the first single cell organism. Evolutionists claim that the primitive ocean of the planet earth was full of organic chemicals teeming with a great potential for producing life. From this organic soup of life there supposedly spontaneously arose thousands of single cell organisms built from billions of life’s fundamental building blocks called proteins. We will examine this scenario in light of current scientific evidences.

The Odds

All of life is based on proteins. Proteins are found in all living cells and in all parts of living cells. Chemically and biologically speaking, life as we know it would be impossible without proteins. All animals and plants are built from proteins and as much as 15% by weight of the human body is made up of proteins. Although proteins are very complex they have one simplifying feature. Proteins are formed from a relatively small number of simple chemical compounds called amino acids. Every protein necessary for the existence of life is built from a short list of only 20 amino acids.

Proteins are the largest and most complex chemical compounds known to man. Proteins are long, coiled chains of on the average 300 to 400 amino acid molecules linked together. There is virtually an infinite number of possible proteins. Life in general seems to exploit this since no two species, plant or animal, have the same combination of proteins.

In order for evolutionists to understand how life originated they must first explain how the first proteins were formed. The conventional view of how this happened, as explained by evolutionists, is described by biologist Carl Woese:

In ways that are not understood, the chemicals in the ocean interacted to produce compounds and aggregates of increasing complexity, a process that continued until a level of complexity that could be considered living was reached.

In other words, evolutionists say it just happened. Chemicals present in the primitive ocean interacted with one another until they just happened to form chemical compounds that could be considered alive. Simply put, the first proteins just happened to form by chance. Evolutionists have no idea how they first formed, they just did.

The formation of the first protein has been described by evolutionists as a chance event. Supposedly, an appropriate mixture of amino acids rearranged themselves until a living cell appeared—a natural, random accidental chance process. Events that contain an element of chance lend themselves to study by a branch of mathematics called statistics. Statistics is a very powerful tool in providing us with information on the probability of a chance event occurring.

For example, if you flip a coin it will fall either heads up or tails up. Unless the coin has been altered in any way, heads or tails are equally likely. Statistics would tell us that there is a one out of two ($1/2$) chance of the coin falling heads up. There are only two possible results, with each result equally likely.

If we flipped the coin twice and it came up heads both times, this would represent a chance event with a probability of occurring of one out of four ($1/2 \times 1/2 = 1/4$). The likelihood of flipping a coin three times with heads resulting each time would be $1/2 \times 1/2 \times 1/2$ or $1/8$. The likelihood of heads coming up four times in row would be $1/16$; five times, $1/32$; six times, $1/64$; 100 times, $1/2$ multiplied together 100 times or 1 out of 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000. That's a 1 followed by 30 zeros or one billion trillion. That would be the equivalent of flipping a coin once a second continually for thirty billion trillion years. According to statistics, flipping a coin and having it come up heads 100 times consecutively would be a very, very, unlikely event.

When dealing with very large numbers, scientists avoid cluttering up a page with zeros by using a system called exponential notation. To write our number one billion trillion (a 1 followed by 30 zeros) in exponential notation we would write a number equal to the number of zeros and place it above and to the right of the number ten. In other words, one billion trillion would be written as 10^{30} . To convert 10^{30} back to a regular number we would write down a 1 followed by 30 zeros.

Let's apply the same type of statistical analysis to the formation of the first protein from the 20 commonly used amino acids. Before we do so we need to assume that all 20 amino acids that are biologically necessary for life, are present in large enough amounts so that each has an equal chance of being selected. The average protein molecule comprises 300 to 400 precisely arranged amino acids and if one amino acid were to be out of sequence the resulting protein would not only be useless but potentially deadly.

What's the probability that the correct amino acid would be chosen first? Obviously 1 out of 20. What's the probability that after the first amino acid was correctly chosen the second was correctly chosen also? 1 out of 20 times 1 out 20 or 1 out of 400. What about correctly choosing the first three amino acids? 1 out of 20 times 1 out of 20 times 1 out of 8,000. 4? 1 out of 160,000. 5? 1 out of 3,200,000. The odds of building a protein of 400 precisely placed amino acid units with all the amino acids randomly chosen would be 1 out of 10^{520} . That's a 1 followed

by 520 zeros. To produce the correct protein at least once we would need to choose one trillion amino acids every second—that's right, one trillion amino acids every second—for over one trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion trillion years. However, to give the evolutionists the benefit of the doubt we'll suppose that it did happen.

Let's suppose that a protein molecule of 400 amino acids assembled itself purely by chance in the primitive amino acid soup. Let's suppose that such an unlikely event actually did happen. What would we have? One single molecule of one single protein. This random process would need to repeat itself trillions and trillions of times to generate billions of tons of thousands of different proteins in the over 350 million cubic miles of ocean water present at that time.

Sir Fred Hoyle, a leading and devout evolutionist, originally believed that life spontaneously arose by the chance formation of proteins until he actually sat down and calculated the odds. Hoyle went one step further by calculating the odds of the chance formation of a single, simple bacterium. Hoyle calculated that the odds of assembling the 2,000 special proteins called enzymes necessary for the bacterium to biologically function properly would be 1 out of $10^{40,000}$. That's a 1 followed by 40,000 zeros or 1 trillion written over 3,000 times. To write this number out in its entirety would require over 20 pages. Hoyle estimated the likelihood of such an event occurring was comparable to the chance that "a tornado sweeping through a junkyard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials within". Believe it or not, it actually gets worse.

Most objects found in nature are not identical with their mirror images. Our hands are an example. If you hold your hands palms out in front of you and imagine a mirror between your hands, you can clearly see that each hand is the mirror image of the other. Although our right and left hands appear to be physically identical, because they are mirror images of one another they do not (and cannot) function identically. Humans are generally not ambidextrous and we usually are able to use one hand more effectively than the other. In addition to our hands, there are right- and left-handed screws, golf clubs, and desks. Although the designation is rather arbitrary, irregularly shaped objects such as trees can also be labeled right- or left-handed. Even chemical molecules can be right- or left-handed.

Every amino acid, with the exception of glycine, is readily found in nature in equally proportioned right and left-handed forms. There is no reason to believe that one form would be superior to the other. Both right and left-handed amino acids are equally stable and equally reactive. However, every protein necessary for life is assembled exclusively from left-handed amino acids! How is it that in a prebiotic organic soup containing equal amounts of right- and left-handed amino acids, only left-handed amino acids united to form proteins?

In light of this information, Hubert Yockey at the Army Pulse Radiation Facility undertook the task of determining the largest protein that could have been expected to form in one billion years on the primitive earth. He determined that the largest protein that would be expected to form would consist of only 49 amino acids. Yockey concluded that a belief that life first arose by the random mixing of amino acids to form proteins "is based on faith, contrary to conventional wisdom".

However, evolutionists generally ignore these arguments. George Wald has written: Time is in fact the hero of the plot... What we regard as impossible on the basis of human experience is meaningless here. Given so much time, the "impossible" becomes possible,

the possible probable, and the probably virtually certain. One has only to wait: time itself performs the miracles.

The above statement is not only incredible but a pathetic argument. It is constantly used by evolutionists. Time is definitely on the evolutionists side but assuming time can perform miracles it is ludicrous. The odds of winning the state lottery do not increase with every passing day. The odds of winning are the same today as they were yesterday as they will be tomorrow.

Since we have seen that single cell organisms cannot form naturally, they must have been formed supernaturally. This fits very well with the concept of a special creation. Evolutionists usually don't like to talk about this particular subject and frankly, I don't blame them. The theory of evolution is an absolute disaster when it attempts to explain the appearance and formation of the first cell on the planet earth. Of what value is a theory on the origin of life if that theory cannot offer an explanation as to how the very first cell was formed? Why argue whether apes evolved into men if you cannot make an ape to begin with?

We turn now to another difficult subject for many who believe in creation and a 6,000 year old earth: scientific dating techniques. How often have we seen on television or read in the newspaper of a fossil or a rock that was dated to be millions of years old? Aren't such ancient fossils and rocks proof-positive of evolution?

The Mismeasure of Time

Let's say we walk into a room and see an hourglass sitting on a table. We would like to know how long ago it was turned over. In order for us to know this we must make a number of assumptions. We must first assume the amount of sand in the top of the hourglass when it was first turned over. Was the hourglass turned over with all of the sand in the top or with the sand equally distributed in the top and bottom? Since there was no one in the room who witnessed the hourglass being turned over we must assume the initial distribution of the sand in the hourglass.

We must also assume the rate at which sand leaves the top of the hourglass and trickles to the bottom. Has the rate remained constant? Has it increased or decreased? We can watch the hourglass and the rate at which sand leaves the top and enters the bottom may appear to be constant, but how do we know this was also the case prior to when we entered the room? Finally, is through the neck of the hourglass the only way sand can enter the bottom? If the hourglass is punctured with numerous holes and we are in a desert in the middle of a sand storm the accuracy of the hourglass is greatly diminished. Only when we can safely assume the original distribution of sand between the top and bottom, that sand only enters the bottom from the top, and the rate at which sand leaves the top and enters the bottom remains constant can we say with confidence how long ago the hourglass on the table was turned over.

As we shall see, methods of dating the earth rely on the principles and assumptions of the hourglass method discussed above. Dating methods used by scientists generally fall into two categories: radioactive element methods and carbon-14 methods. Radioactive elements can give ages of billions of years whereas carbon-14 methods are limited to only a few thousand years. We will examine first the radioactive element dating methods then briefly look at the carbon-14 technique.

Scientists primarily rely on uranium-lead and potassium-argon as the radioactive parent-daughter pairs when determining the age of the earth and rocks. The uranium-lead and potassium-argon techniques rely on the observation that over time the uranium contained in rocks decays into lead and the potassium decays into argon. Uranium and potassium are referred to as the parent elements while lead and argon are referred to as the daughter elements. Using the

hourglass analogy uranium and potassium are in the top half of the hourglass and as they trickle to the bottom they decay into lead and argon. It is the uranium-lead technique that scientists have used to give the earth an age of 4.5 billion years. Uranium cannot be used to date anything younger than 10 million years and is never used to date fossils. It is only used to date rocks.

When using radioactive dating, scientists make three assumptions: 1) the sample originally contained only the parent element (all the sand was initially at the top of the hourglass), 2) since the sample originated no parent or daughter element has entered or left the sample (sand enters the bottom of the hourglass only through the neck), and 3) the rate at which the parent element has changed into the daughter has remained constant (the rate at which sand enters the bottom of the hourglass is constant). How valid are each of these assumptions? We'll examine each of the assumptions in part.

The assumption that the sample to be dated originally contained only uranium or potassium and no lead or argon has been found time and again to be seriously lacking. It was recently discovered that rock in Colorado mines may have had at least 95% of its lead when it was first formed. As for potassium-argon dating, since 1% of the earth's atmosphere consists of argon and studies have shown that rocks readily absorb argon, how is one to know the original composition of argon in rocks?

The assumption that no parent or daughter element has entered or left the rock sample has been shown many times to be in serious error. Studies have shown that as much as 90% of the radioactive elements of some rocks can be removed by leaching the rock with a weak acid. As a result, radioactive dating would always give dates that are much too old.

As for the third assumption that the rate of decay of parent to daughter elements has remained constant, Dr. Theodore W. Rybka has written:

To my knowledge no major research effort has been mounted to determine whether nuclear decay parameters vary at all with time. Once values of the decay index for a particular nuclide are obtained and a particular value is agreed upon, this value is generally accepted. Usually no further measurements are taken.

In recent years many scientists have come to the realization that radioactive decay rates are not the universal constants once thought. First, relations have been deduced that show that if the speed of light is slowing down then the decay rate of radioactive elements would also be slowing down. Secondly, factors that are known to have an effect on atoms such as ultraviolet radiation are generally ignored.

Another popular method for determining age is the carbon-14 technique. It can only be used in dating materials that are less than 40,000 years old so it is generally only used by scientists to date fossils. Carbon-14 dating is based on the observation that cosmic rays entering the upper atmosphere convert nitrogen into carbon-14. The carbon-14 then reacts with oxygen to form carbon-14 carbon dioxide. Vegetation uses this carbon-14 carbon dioxide (along with ordinary carbon dioxide) during photosynthesis. Animals feeding on vegetation then add carbon-14 to their bodies. The carbon-14 starts to decay inside the animal's body but it is continually replenished as the animal continues to feed on vegetation. Once the animal dies, the carbon-14 continues to decay but is no longer replenished since the animal no longer feeds. Therefore, when the amount of carbon-14 in the dead animal is compared to the amount of carbon-14 in a living animal, how long the animal has been dead can be determined.

The carbon-14 method assumes that carbon-14 is being produced at the same rate it is breaking down. However, studies have consistently shown that carbon-14 is being produced nearly three times faster than it is breaking down. Therefore, the amount of carbon-14 in the

atmosphere is greater today than it was in the past and animals that have been dead a long time would have contained less carbon-14 in their bodies at their time of death than animals do today. So based on this carbon-14 would always yield ages that are too old. Another objection to the accuracy of carbon-14 dating has to do with the vapor canopy many believe to have blanketed the earth prior to the flood.

The vapor canopy, would have largely shielded the upper atmosphere from cosmic ray bombardment. There would have been much less carbon-14 in the atmosphere prior to the flood than there is today. Therefore, a fossil assigned an age of 40,000 years is not necessarily that old if it had lived prior to the flood or perished as a result of the flood. To attempt to date anything that lived before the flood would consistently yield ages that are too high.

In light of the arguments against the validity of radioactive and carbon-14 dating, it is not surprising that these techniques at times have given very strange results. Rocks from Hawaiian volcanoes that are known to be about 200 years old have been dated to be almost 3 billion years old using the potassium-argon method. Seals found in Antarctica which were known, to be dead no more than a few weeks were determined with carbon-14 to have an apparent age of 615 to 1,300 years. Living snails from southern Nevada springs were assigned an age of 27,000 years based on carbon-14 contents. Single blocks of soil have been assigned ages 15,000 years apart by different labs.

No matter how useful scientists say radioactive and carbon-14 dating are, they are incapable of providing accurate and reliable results. If these techniques cannot be relied upon to give accurate dates, what then? Are there other indications of how old the world might be?

Other Age Indicators

There is wealth of exiting evidence that the earth is no more than a few thousand years old. This information is generally ignored or discarded by the evolution majority because it does not provide the vast amounts of time evolutionists need. The following information clearly and consistently shows that the earth is relatively young and no where near as old as evolutionists claim.

Our universe has been described by many scientists as being very dirty. Tiny particles of cosmic dust are settling everywhere. Scientists in the 1960's working at NASA on the manned missions to the moon were operating under the evolutionist assumption that the earth and moon are 4.5 billion years old. They therefore expected there to be 50 to 180 feet of loosely packed cosmic dust on the surface of the moon. These scientists even fitted the lunar landing module with "duck feet" to prevent it from sinking into the moon. They were later shocked to find only a fraction of an inch of dust which corresponded to a calculated age for the moon of only a few thousand years. The moon provides some further evidence of its relatively recent creation.

Rocks brought back from the moon have shown the moon's surface to be made of a type of rock called basalt. Scientists Harold Slusher, Glenn Morton, and Richard Mandock have demonstrated that impact craters formed in basalt would only be expected to last a few thousand years. This is based on the observed fact that every substance, no matter how hard, flows to some degree. If the moon were made of water the impact craters would have lasted only a few seconds. If the moon were made of thick molasses the craters would have lasted a little longer. If the moon is indeed 4.5 billion years old (as scientists believe) and the surface made of basalt there should be no craters on the surface. These caters should have leveled out long ago. The earth itself provides some exciting evidence for a recent creation.

Measurements of the earth's magnetic field have demonstrated that it decays with a half-life of 1,400 years. In other words, every 1,400 years the magnetic field is cut in half. If we extrapolate back about 20,000 years the heat generated by the increased electric current flowing through the earth resulting from such a high magnetic field would be enough to melt the earth. In order to avoid this problem, evolutionists claim the earth's magnetic field fluctuates every 700,000 years. There has never been a single scientific experiment conducted or shred of evidence collected to support such a crazy notion.

Population statistics yield further support to a young earth. United Nations data has shown that the present world population of 4.5 billion people is not consistent with the theory that man has been around for millions of years. In fact, many have shown that it would only take 4,000-5,000 years to reach this level of population. The accumulation of further evidence continues.

Calculations based on the high pressure underground reservoirs of oil and natural gas reveal that such high pressures could not be maintained for more than 10,000 years. The gradual slow-down of the rotation of the earth reveals that billions of years ago the centrifugal force would have been great enough to flatten the earth into the shape of a pancake. The amount of nickel and silicon dissolved in the oceans alone with the measured influx of nickel and silicon to the oceans via rivers places a maximum age of 9,000 years on the earth. The growth rate of active coral reefs places a maximum age of 10,000 years on the earth. The current rate of formation of river deltas places a maximum age on the earth of only 5,000 years. In total, there are as many as 100 documented examples which yield an age for the earth and the universe between 1,000 and 20,000,000 years. This clearly demonstrates the difficulty scientists have in obtaining an accurate age for the earth.

It is important to remember that ancient dates published by scientists prove absolutely nothing. Many people are troubled by millions and billions of years because they feel this adds support to the evolutionists. But as we've previously seen in our discussion of the formation of the first forms of life, the billions of years hailed by scientists are no where near the trillions and trillions and trillions of years the theory of evolution demands.

We turn our attention now to what evolutionists claim to be the best evidence for evolution; the study of fossils. We are faced with the question of whether the fossil evidence proves evolution or supports Biblical creation. Just what do the fossils prove?

The Fossil Record of Animals

Before we begin our examination of the available fossil evidence it will help to briefly discuss sedimentary rocks and the standard geological column. Sedimentary rocks are formed by the erosion of existing rocks. The sediments are carried by water, wind, or ice and redeposited either on land or under water. Anyone who has ever visited the truly dramatic and inspiring Grand Canyon in Arizona has seen sedimentary rocks. The accumulated layers of sedimentary rocks make up what geologists refer to as the geological column.

The geological column was developed in the 19th century by geologists attempting to arrange the different layers of the earth's crust in some logical order. The earth was viewed as a giant onion with the notion that its crust had an onion skin structure. If a layer of sedimentary rocks was found to contain simpler fossils it was placed at the bottom of the column. The more complex the fossils were in a particular layer, the farther up the geological column the layer was placed. A total of ten layers—or strata systems—compose the standard geological column with the oldest rocks placed at the bottom—and the youngest at the top. The entire geological column is

approximately 75 miles deep. Geologists, then and now, point to the geological column and the fossils contained therein as the major proof of evolution. Creationists have long insisted that the geological column is constructed from and interpreted with circular reasoning.

The different layers of sedimentary rocks are assigned ages based on the fossils they contain. The rocks containing the simplest fossils are placed at the bottom and assumed to be the oldest with the rocks containing the more complex fossils placed at the top and assumed to be the youngest. Yet fossils are arranged on the basis of their assumed evolutionary relationship. The simplest fossils are assumed to be the oldest with the more complex fossils assumed to be the youngest. Thus the main evidence in support of evolution is based on the assumption that evolution is true. This is circular reasoning and a completely invalid argument in support of evolution. There are a number of other problems with the geological column.

The geological column was not constructed from available evidence. It is more of a hypothetical arrangement of the different layers of the earth's crust. It is not surprising then that 77% of the earth's surface has seven or more of the ten strata layers missing. As much as 94% of the earth's surface has three or more layers missing with an estimated 99.6% of the surface missing at least one strata.

There are hundreds of locations throughout the world where the order of the observed sedimentary rock layers does not match the order they should have in the geological column. Sedimentary rock layers are often found inserted where they don't belong, completely inverted with another layer, or often simply repealed. The Matterhorn in the Swiss Alps is one of many mountains peaks composed of rocks younger than the rocks they cover. The entire geological column is not based on any observed data but instead exists only in the minds of evolutionary geologists. Regardless of this, does the fossil evidence contained in the geological column show evidence of a gradual evolution of life from simple to complex?

Evolutionists claim to have found evidence of bacteria contained in the pre-cambrian rock layer, the bottom layer in the geological column. These single cell bacteria are claimed by evolutionists to represent the appearance of the first forms of life on earth. Above the pre-cambrian rock layer is the cambrian rock layer. Contained in the cambrian rock layer are very complex creatures: sea urchins, trilobites, sponges, jellyfish, sea lilies, worms, and a great variety of other highly complex invertebrates. There is an enormous jump between the single cell bacteria found in the pre-cambrian layer and the highly complex invertebrates found in the cambrian layer. Based on the cambrian layer life appears to have suddenly appeared. If, as according to evolutionists, single cell creatures evolved into invertebrates over millions and millions of years there should exist an abundance of fossilized forms intermediate between the pre-cambrian single cell bacteria and the cambrian invertebrates. Yet none have ever been found.

This is an observed fact that is very embarrassing to the evolutionist while at the same time giving great comfort to the creationist. Creation teaches that life suddenly and abruptly appeared and this is indeed what we find when we examine the beginning of the fossil record. What about the rest of the fossil record? Does it paint a clear evolutionary picture of fish becoming amphibians, amphibians changing into reptiles, reptiles turning into birds, birds becoming mammals, and finally mammals changing into man? I'll let evolutionists answer that question.

Dr. J.R. Norman of the Department of Zoology at the British Museum of Natural History has stated that "the geological record has so far provided no evidence as to the origin of fishes". Harold White, a British evolutionist and ichthyologist, has said that every kind of fish he knew anything about had its origins firmly based on nothing. Professor Barbara Stahl from St.

Anselm's college has pointed out that "none of the known fishes is thought to be directly ancestral to the earliest land vertebrates". She continues by saying that since scientists have no evidence of fish evolving into amphibians they "have had to speculate how legs and aerial breathing evolved".

On the evolution of birds from reptiles, Dr. W.E. Swinton of the British Museum of Natural History has made it clear that "there is no fossil evidence of the stages through which the remarkable change from reptile to bird was achieved". Professor Stahl has said that the evolution of feathers from reptilian scales "defies analysis". The fossil evidence of the transition from bird to mammal is so lacking that Roger Lewis in an article in *Science* magazine has written that the "transition to the first mammal, which probably happened in just one or, at most, two lineages, is still an enigma".

In general, no fossilized transition forms have ever been found. Each basic type of animal appears abruptly in the fossil record with no intermediate forms preceding or following it. Charles Darwin was very troubled by the lack of transitional forms and even devoted an entire chapter to it in his book *The Origin of Species*. Darwin wrote:

But, as by this theory innumerable transitional forms must have existed, why do we not find them embedded in countless numbers in the crust of the earth?... Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely-graduated organic change; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory.

To be completely fair, some evolutionists claim to have found clear intermediate forms. Three years ago a nearly complete skeleton of a sparrow-sized bird was found in China and claimed to be a 135 million-year-old transition form between reptiles and birds. Professor Paul Sereno at the University of Chicago has said of this skeleton "if you saw this bird perched in a tree it would probably appear modern, with flying and perching abilities virtually identical to today's birds". He later comments on how exciting it is "to find such a clear intermediary step between dinosaurs and the birds of today". How can this "clear intermediate step" at the same time "appear modern" and "virtually identical to today's birds"?

The most famous link fossil proposed by scientists has been *Archaeopteryx*. A total of five fossils of *Archaeopteryx* have been found and studied by scientists who claim that *Archaeopteryx* is clearly half reptile and half bird. *Archaeopteryx* has an array of features that immediately identify it as a bird: perching feet, feathers, the basic shape of the avian wing, and a wishbone. However, many claim *Archaeopteryx* shares 21 characteristics with reptiles. Space limitations prohibit a detailed discussion of all 21 characteristics (reference material will be given in the last section of this paper) so only a few will be looked at.

The breastbone of *Archaeopteryx* is flat and said to be a reptilian feature. However, the emu has this same type of breastbone. *Archaeopteryx* had claws on its wings but so does an ostrich. No scientists are suggesting that the emu or the ostrich are intermediate forms so why should *Archaeopteryx* be considered one based on it having claws and a flat breastbone. In fact, many of the allegedly reptilian features of *Archaeopteryx* can be seen in one group of birds or another. Other questions have been raised in general about the evolution of birds from reptiles.

The amazing feature of flight was apparently the driving force behind the evolution of reptiles into birds. However, according to evolutionists, flight arose four separate times in insects, reptiles, birds, and mammals. Why did insects acquire the ability to fly only to lose it once evolving into reptiles and consequently gain it back again when evolving into birds?

We move on now to what has proven to be a challenging subject for many who believe in creation; the fossil record of man. Who are these ape-men and did they really exist at one time? Does the fossil record show that man and apes share a common ancestor?

The Fossil Record of Man

Before we begin our examination of the fossil record of man it would be useful to clear-up a common misconception about the theory of evolution. The theory of evolution does not teach that man evolved from apes. The theory of evolution teaches that man and apes evolved from a common ancestor that was half-man and half-ape. Evolution teaches that man and apes are distant cousins. The question is whether the fossil evidence supports such a claim.

The total fossilized evidence in support of the evolution of man from ape-like ancestors is so sparse and fragmentary that the entire collection would barely cover an average size dining room table. Since the collection is so incomplete there is a strong desire on the part of scientists working in this field (paleontologists and anthropologists) to exaggerate the importance of a tiny jaw fragment or a single tooth. Often times any scrap of bone found becomes a human bone.

The classic example of the overzealous nature of paleontologists was the discovery by Harold Cook of a single tooth in western Nebraska in 1922. Evolutionists at that time were very excited by the find because it was clear to them that the tooth was intermediate between apes and man. The tooth was hailed as evidence for human evolution and said to belong to an ape-like creature called Nebraska man. Pictures showing the hairy, ape-like creature using tools and socializing with other ape-like creatures and their wives and children were prepared and published.

In 1925 at the famous Scopes “monkey” trial in Dayton, Tennessee, Professor H. Newman of the University of Chicago claimed on the witness stand that Nebraska man was proof of evolution and laughed at anyone doubting Nebraska man’s authenticity. However, a few years later some more remains of Nebraska man were found and it was discovered that this creature was not an ape-man at all. The tooth discovered in 1922 was not the tooth of an extinct ape-man but instead the tooth of a pig. For years Nebraska man was hailed by overzealous evolutionists to be proof of man’s ape-like origins when it was nothing of the sort.

In 1912, Charles Dawson discovered in a gravel pit at Piltdown, Sussex, England the complete skull of what was then claimed to be the “earliest Englishman”. For 44 years Piltdown man was believed to be over 500,000 years old and a direct ancestor of man. Piltdown man was hailed in science textbooks and museum displays as proof of man’s ape-like origins. Over 500 Ph.D. dissertations resulted from repeated and detailed studies of Piltdown man. This continued until 1956 when Piltdown man was discovered to be a fraud.

The bottom jaw from a 50-year-old orangutan skull had been fused with the top portion of a modern human skull. The teeth had been filed to obscure their identity and the entire skull artificially aged. The person allegedly responsible for the hoax is believed by many to have been Sir Arthur Keith. Keith allegedly perpetrated the hoax out of his frustration of trying to find evidence in support of evolution: He had simply fabricated the evidence he had been hopelessly searching for.

Another example of the exaggerated importance of a few bone fragments is an allegedly five million-year old human-like collar bone. Dr. Tim White, an anthropologist at the University of California-Berkeley, has recently discovered that this five million-year old piece of bone that was thought to be the collar bone of a distant human-like ancestor of man is in fact part of a dolphin rib. The discovery of this error once again sheds a poor light on the track record and

reliability of scientists studying human evolution. If world renowned scientific experts on human evolution cannot tell the difference between a pig's tooth and a human tooth, an orangutan or human jaw, or a dolphin rib and a human collar bone how are we to possibly trust them?

Java man, another of the alleged missing links, was discovered in 1891 by Dr. Eugene Dubois. The fossilized remains of Java man consisted of nothing more than a small piece of the top of a skull, a fragment of a thighbone, and three teeth. It's rarely pointed out that these bone fragments were not found next to one another but instead collected over a range of 70 feet in an old river bed along with the bones of numerous animals. They were also not discovered at the same time but over the course of an entire year. How can anyone, no matter how much of an expert they may claim to be, say with such confidence that these bone fragments belong to an ape-like ancestor of man based on such scanty evidence? Based on this ludicrously small amount of evidence Java man is placed with confidence in science textbooks and hailed as not only a creature that lived but a direct ape-like ancestor of man.

Neanderthal man was discovered in a cave in the Neanderthal Valley in Germany around the turn of the century. Even though his brain was larger than today's modern human he was consistently portrayed in science textbooks as a hairy, bow-legged, knuckle-dragging sub-human. Upon the discovery of other Neanderthal skeletons it was later realized that Neanderthal man was fully human. It turned out that all of his primitive features were due to rather common pathological conditions. Neanderthal man is now thought to have been an ordinary human who suffered from arthritis, rickets, vitamin D deficiency, and other bone diseases. He was fully human.

Richard Leakey, Director of the National Museums of Kenya, has even criticized many of the skulls discovered by his father, the well-known anthropologist Dr. Louis Leakey. In particular he has commented that his father's famous "Lucy" skull was so incomplete that it was nothing but "imagination made of plaster of Paris".

Mary Leakey has described in *National Geographic* her discovery of 3.6 million-year-old footprints allegedly left by some upright walking human ancestor. She describes these tracks as "remarkably similar to those of modern man" and "the form of his foot was exactly the same as ours". Mary Leakey had found human footprints. Nothing more and nothing less.

It should be very clear that the fossil evidence claimed by evolutionists to provide irrefutable proof of human evolution is extremely fragmentary and incomplete. The tract record of scientists in this field is abominable. No matter what evolutionists may claim, they base their theory of human evolution on more fantasy than fact.

Confronting the Challenge

Since public schools teach the theory of evolution to our children as a fact and refuse to even consider presenting any of the available scientific evidence against evolution, we must take it upon ourselves to present to our children not only the biblical evidence for creation but the scientific evidence as well. There are a variety of sources available to aid in our presentation of scientific facts of creation. First among them is the Institute for Creation Research.

The Institute for Creation Research (ICR, P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021; (619) 448-0900) was established in 1970 by Dr. Henry M. Morris. Dr. Morris is regarded by many to be the Charles Darwin of creation since he has authored more than 40 books on the subject of scientific creation. The ICR has as its main purpose the writing and production of books, articles, and audiovisual materials relating to creation. The books and materials meet a wide range of

needs, all the way from books for elementary school children to technical monographs for scientists. The ICR's popular monthly newsletter, Acts and Facts, is available free on request.

A broader selection of creation materials is available from Master Books (P.O. Box 1660, El Cajon, CA 92022). Among some suggested readings are: *The Genesis Flood* by John Whitcomb and Henry Morris, one of the first and what many believe to be the best scientific creation book ever written; *Evolution: A Theory in Crises* by Michael Denton, the best academic argument against evolution from the perspective of molecular biology; *The Origin of Species Revisted* by Wendell Bird, a two volume set which is by far the most thoroughly documented anti-evolutionary book published to date; *Evolution: The Challenge of the Fossil Record* by Duane Gish, the best-documented and most convincing book against evolution using the available fossil evidence; and *Scientific Creationism* by Henry Morris, generally considered as the definitive treatment of scientific creationism.

A number of periodicals, some of a more technical nature, are also available. *Creation Ex Nihilo* (P.O. Box 710039, Santee, CA 92072) published quarterly by the Creation Science Foundation, headquartered in Australia, is an excellent magazine for families, schools, and churches. The *Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal* (P.O. Box 710039, Santee, CA 92072) is published twice yearly and is a more technical presentation of scientific creationism research. The *Creation Research Society Quarterly* (P.O. Box 14016, Terre Haute, IN 47803; (812) 232-3589) is published four times a year and emphasizes original research and interpretation of existing scientific data within the creationist framework.

Conference proceedings from the 1986 and 1990 International Conferences on Creationism are available from The Creation Science Fellowship, Inc. (ICC, P.O. Box 17578, Pittsburgh, PA 15235). Both conferences were five day gatherings of some of the finest creation scientists from around the world who presented the latest in scientific creationism. Many more conferences, seminars, and classes on a regional or more local level are organized on an almost monthly basis. For more information contact the Institute for Creation Research.

While it is God's word that convinces us that the theory of evolution is a lie, it's not just the Bible which belies the theory. Scientific creationism exists as an added comfort against the continuing onslaught of the lies of evolution. The account of origins presented in Genesis is a factual presentation of actual events and provides a reliable framework for scientific research. The scientific aspects of creation are important but are secondary to the biblical account. "By faith we understand that the universe was formed at God's command, so that what is seen was not made out of what was visible." (Hebrews 11:3)

Bibliography

- Ackerman, P., *It's a Small World After All*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI, 1986.
- Baker, S., *Bone of Contention: Is Evolution True?*, Creation Science Foundation, Sunnybank, Queensland, Australia, 1980.
- Bliss, R., *Origins: Creation or Evolution*, Master Books, El Cajon, CA, 1988.
- Brooks, J., *Origins of Life*, Lion Publishing pic, Tring, Herts, England, 1985.
- Colbert, E., "An Outline of Vertebrate Evolution", *Carolina Biology Reader* #131, Carolina Biological Supply Company, Burlington, North Carolina, 1983.
- Darwin, C., *The Origin of Species*, John Murray, London, 1859. (Mentor Edition, New American Library, New York, New York, 1958.)
- Day, M., "The Fossil History of Man", *Carolina Biology Reader* #32, Carolina Biological Supply Company, Burlington, North Carolina, 1984.
- Franzmann, W., ed., *Is Evolutionism the Answer*, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI, 1967.
- Gish, D., *Evolution: The Challenge of the Fossil Record*, Master Books, El Cajon, CA, 1985.
- Goodall, V., ed., *The Quest for Man*, Praeger Publishers, Inc., New York, NY, 1975.
- Gribbin, J., *In Search of the Big Bang*, Bantam Books, New York, NY, 1986.
- Ham, K., Snelling, A., and Wieland, C., *The Answers Book*, Master Books, El Cajon, CA, 1990.
- Heinze, T., *Creation vs. Evolution*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, MI, 1973.
- Huxley, J., *The Wonderful World of Evolution*, Macdonald, London, England, 1958.
- Lewin, R., *Thread of Life: The Smithsonian Looks at Evolution*, Smithsonian Books, Washington, D.C., 1982.
- Moore, R., *Evolution*, Time-Life Books, New York, NY, 1962.
- Morris, H., *Evolution and the Modern Christian*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Phillips burgh, NJ, 1967.
- Morris, H., *The Twilight of Evolution*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids. MI, 1963.
- Pinna, G., *Prehistory*, Burke Publishing Company, London, England, 1984.

Sagan, C., *Cosmos*, Ballantine Books, 1980.

Schroeder, G., *Genesis and the Big Bang*, Bantam Books, New York, N.Y., 1990.

Shapiro, R., *Origins*, William Heinemann Ltd, London, England, 1986.

Siegler, H., *Evolution or Degeneration, Which?*, Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, WI, 1972.

Sippert, A., *From Eternity to Eternity*, Sippert Publishing Company, N. Mankato, MN, 1989.

Snelling, A., *The Revised Quote Book*, Creation Science Foundation, Sunnybank, Queensland, Australia, 1990.

The Proceedings of the First International Conference on Creationism, Volumes I and II, Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 1986.

The Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Creationism, Volumes I and II, Creation Science Fellowship, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 1990.

Whitcomb, J., and Morris, H., *The Genesis Flood*, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids; MI, 1961.

Woese, C., "The Origin of Life", *Carolina Biology Reader* #13, Carolina Biological Supply Company, Burlington, North Carolina, 1984.