



# **ARTICLES RELATING TO THE AGE OF THE EARTH**



**Taken  
From the  
Internet**



## **Articles Relating to the Age of the Earth**

### **The Age of the Earth: Why Does It Matter?**

“Age of the Earth” is a query typed into many Internet search engines these days. Why? Because the issue is very crucial, and the entire world is divided by it. Your response to this four-word query will reflect your entire worldview.

#### **Age of the Earth: Two Worldviews**

A look at the “Age of the Earth” query reveals that there are really only two possible solutions as to how everything came into existence — Creation or Evolution. Creation is the concept that Someone apart from the universe created the universe. Evolution is essentially the atheistic explanation of origins. Both solutions should be treated as “religious” beliefs, since they are both held by faith, separate and distinct from testable, repeatable data.

It is agreed that Evolution is not possible without excessive amounts of time (it is argued that even given excessive lengths of time, Evolution is not possible for various reasons). If the Earth is young, we are left with only one option — Special Creation. If the Earth is excessively old, Evolution is theoretically possible. Obviously, it is in the best interests of Evolutionists to prove an Old Earth. And so we have the Question: “What is the Age of the Earth?”

#### **Age of the Earth: Education or Indoctrination?**

Public schools in the U.S. view the “Age of the Earth” query as a separation of Church and State issue. They feel compelled to push Old Earth as a means to remove God from public education. This is a contradiction, as an atheistic worldview is no less “religious” than a Creationist worldview. The immediate result from such an effort is censorship of Young Earth evidence. The long-term result is that our students are indoctrinated, not educated. A child in the U.S. public school system is not learning both theories of origins. As such, Evolution is being taught as scientific fact. Here are some examples of evidence not reaching today’s youth:

- There are approximately 5 times the *Natural Chronometers* indicating a Young Earth than those indicating an Old Earth. Today's student is not aware of ANY Natural Chronometers indicating a Young Earth, and is therefore ignorant of 80% of the total data.
- All data is interpreted through presuppositions.
- What are the presuppositions and how were they reached? (An example would be the assumptions fundamental to *Radiometric Dating*).
- *Uniformitarianism* is taught as scientific fact, but is merely an Evolutionist presupposition to explain *sedimentary layers*. Uniformitarianism has been dramatically weakened by geologic features such as poly-strata fossils and the lack of erosion between strata.
- There is an alternative to Uniformitarianism — Catastrophism — which is validated by ancient manuscripts, poly-strata fossils, fossil clams (in the closed position) found on Mt. Everest's peak, sedimentary rock, the fact that 95% of all recorded fossils are marine invertebrates, etc.
- There are actually six stages of Evolution necessary for what we see in today's world (cosmic, chemical, stellar/planetary, organic, macro, and micro). Only one stage, Micro-evolution, has been observed, and the rest are merely assumed. Many of the assumptions have actually been shown to be unreasonable (for instance, the lack of transitional fossils has severely affected the *theory of macro-evolution*, and the observation of retrograde motion, "voids" and "clumps" have proven to be a great setback to the theory of cosmic-evolution, starting with *the Big Bang*).
- There are actually *Limiting Factors* that limit the possible age of the Earth (like moon-drift, magnetic-field decay, Earth's slowing rotation, ocean-floor sediment build-up, chemical influx into the oceans, etc.).

### **Age of the Earth: Be Wary of Unreasonable Conclusions**

Age of the Earth: Perhaps a better question is not "What is the

Age of the Earth?” but rather, “Are we being educated or indoctrinated?” Our children are not being taught what the evidence is and how to think about it, they are being taught to memorize a small portion of inconsequential data and to believe an unreasonable conclusion. We urge you to seek out ALL the evidence before you make ANY conclusion.

## **How Old is the Earth?**

### **How Old is the Earth? Traditional Thought**

How old is the Earth? Good question. The Earth was thought to be fairly young (thousands of years old) until the 19th and 20th centuries, when uniformitarianism (which assumes an Old Earth) and evolutionary thought (which demands an Old Earth) became popular in mainstream society.

### **How Old is the Earth? Recent Consideration**

So, how old is the Earth? In the 19th century, it was proposed that the Earth may be as much as 70 million years old. Then, certain evidence was brought to light indicating that evolution was not possible in so short a time. So, the age of the Earth was pushed back. During the 20th century, it was thought that the age of the Earth was as much as 1 billion years old. Now, with the development of radiometric dating and the application of that technique on the meteorite “Allende,” it is thought that the world is up to 4.6 billion years old. However, this is not conclusive. The assumptions that are fundamental to radiometric dating are extremely controversial, and are not held to be reasonable by many leading scholars. Furthermore, uniformitarianism has been disputed by such geologic features as poly-strata fossils and the lack of erosion between strata. Moreover, evolution is a theory in crisis with the *discovery of DNA* and its complex language convention, plus the absence of *transitional fossils*.

### **How Old is the Earth? Modern Evidences**

By the 21st century, “How Old is the Earth?” has become an increasingly difficult question for Old Earth advocates. Every

year, more and more Natural Chronometers indicating a Young Earth are being identified. While the majority of scientists still presuppose an Old Earth, 80% of the observable data indicates a *Young Earth*. With the weight of evidence indicating a Young Earth, the ranks of Young Earth advocate groups has swelled.

## **How Old is the Earth? Natural Chronometers**

“How old is the Earth?” This question is once again sparking a heated debate. With discoveries such as the following Natural Chronometers, we are at the forefront of a Young Earth revolution:

- Our oceans contain concentrations of Aluminium, Antimony, Barium, Bicarbonate, Bismuth, Calcium, Carbonates, Chlorine, Chromium, Cobalt, Copper, Gold, Iron, Lead, Lithium, Manganese, Magnesium, Mercury, Molybdenum, Nickel, Potassium, Rubidium, Silicon, Silver, Sodium, Strontium, Sulphate, Thorium, Tin, Titanium, Tungsten, Uranium, and Zinc. The river systems add to these concentrations at fixed apparent rates. Comparing the amounts already in the oceans with the rates at which more are being dumped, indicates the earth, as well as its river systems and oceans, are fairly young.
- Sediments are being eroded into our oceans at a fixed rate. There are only a few thousand years worth of sediments on the ocean floor.
- The Earth’s magnetic field has been accurately measured since 1829. Since 1829, it has decayed 7%. It is decaying exponentially at a fixed rate. By graphing the curve, we see that approximately 22,000 years ago the Earth’s field would have been as strong as the Sun’s. Life would have been impossible.
- Comets are constantly losing matter. They are losing and losing and never gaining. “Short Period Comets” (like Haley’s comet), which have predictable orbits, should deteriorate to nothing within 10,000 years. Why are there still Short Period Comets?

- Jupiter is losing heat twice as fast as it gains it from the Sun (it is five times further from the Sun than Earth). Yet Jupiter is still hot. If it is billions of years old, shouldn't it have cooled off by now?
- Jupiter's moon, Ganymede, which is roughly the size of Mercury, has a strong magnetic field, a possible indication that it is still hot. Why hasn't it cooled down?
- Saturn's rings are not stable. They are drifting away from Saturn. If Saturn is billions of years old, why does it still have rings?
- The Moon is slowly drifting away from the Earth. If it is getting further, at one time it was much closer. The Inverse Square Law dictates that if the Moon were half the distance from the Earth, its gravitational pull on our tides would be quadrupled. 1/3 the distance, 9 times the pull. Everything would drown twice a day. Approximately 1.2 billion years ago, the Moon would have been touching the Earth. Drowning would be the least of our concerns!
- Earth's rotation is slowing down. We experience a leap second every year and a half. If the Earth is slowing down, at one time it was going much faster. Besides the problem of extremely short days and nights, the increased "Coriolis Effect" would cause impossible living conditions.
- In 1999, the human population passed six billion. In 1985, it passed five billion. In 1962, it passed three billion. In 1800, it passed one billion. In 1 AD, the world's population, according to the censuses taken by the governments of that time, was only 250 million. At the current human population growth rate, considering wars and famines and all such variables, it would take approximately 5,000 years to get the current population from two original people.

## **Carbon Dating**

### **Carbon Dating — What Is It And How Does It Work?**

This is how carbon dating works: Carbon is a naturally

abundant element found in the atmosphere, in the earth, in the oceans, and in every living creature. C-12 is by far the most common isotope, while only about one in a trillion carbon atoms is C-14. C-14 is produced in the upper atmosphere when nitrogen-14 (N-14) is altered through the effects of cosmic radiation bombardment (a proton is displaced by a neutron effectively changing the nitrogen atom into a carbon isotope). The new isotope is called “radiocarbon” because it is radioactive, though it is not dangerous. It is naturally unstable and so it will spontaneously decay back into N-14 after a period of time. It takes about 5,730 years for half of a sample of radiocarbon to decay back into nitrogen. It takes another 5,730 for half of the remainder to decay, and then another 5,730 for half of what’s left then to decay and so on. The period of time that it takes for half of a sample to decay is called a “half-life.”

Radiocarbon oxidizes (that is, it combines with oxygen) and enters the biosphere through natural processes like breathing and eating. Plants and animals naturally incorporate both the abundant C-12 isotope and the much rarer radiocarbon isotope into their tissues in about the same proportions as the two occur in the atmosphere during their lifetimes. When a creature dies, it ceases to consume more radiocarbon while the C-14 already in its body continues to decay back into nitrogen. So, if we find the remains of a dead creature whose C-12 to C-14 ratio is half of what it’s supposed to be (that is, one C-14 atom for every two trillion C-12 atoms instead of one in every trillion) we can assume the creature has been dead for about 5,730 years (since half of the radiocarbon is missing, it takes about 5,730 years for half of it to decay back into nitrogen). If the ratio is a quarter of what it should be (one in every four trillion) we can assume the creature has been dead for 11,460 year (two half-lives). After about 10 half-lives, the amount of radiocarbon left becomes too miniscule to measure and so this technique isn’t useful for dating specimens which died more than 60,000 years ago. Another limitation is that this technique can only be applied to organic material such as bone, flesh, or wood. It can’t be used to date rocks directly.

## **Carbon Dating — The Premise**

Carbon dating is a dating technique predicated upon three things:

- The rate at which the unstable radioactive C-14 isotope decays into the stable non-radioactive N-14 isotope,
- The ratio of C-12 to C-14 found in a given specimen,
- And the ratio C-12 to C-14 found in the atmosphere at the time of the specimen's death.

## **Carbon Dating — The Controversy**

Carbon dating is controversial for a couple of reasons. First of all, it's predicated upon a set of questionable assumptions. We have to assume, for example, that the rate of decay (that is, a 5,730 year half-life) has remained constant throughout the unobservable past. However, there is strong evidence which suggests that radioactive decay may have been greatly accelerated in the unobservable past.<sup>1</sup> We must also assume that the ratio of C-12 to C-14 in the atmosphere has remained constant throughout the unobservable past (so we can know what the ratio was at the time of the specimen's death). And yet we know that "radiocarbon is forming 28-37% faster than it is decaying,"<sup>2</sup> which means it hasn't yet reached equilibrium, which means the ratio is higher today than it was in the unobservable past. We also know that the ratio decreased during the industrial revolution due to the dramatic increase of CO<sub>2</sub> produced by factories. This man-made fluctuation wasn't a natural occurrence, but it demonstrates the fact that fluctuation is possible and that a period of natural upheaval upon the earth could greatly affect the ratio. Volcanoes spew out CO<sub>2</sub> which could just as effectively decrease the ratio. Specimens which lived and died during a period of intense volcanism would appear older than they really are if they were dated using this technique. The ratio can further be affected by C-14 production rates in the atmosphere, which in turn is affected by the amount of cosmic rays penetrating the earth's atmosphere. The amount of cosmic rays penetrating the earth's atmosphere is



itself affected by things like the earth's magnetic field which deflects cosmic rays. Precise measurements taken over the last 140 years have shown a steady decay in the strength of the earth's magnetic field. This means there's been a steady increase in radiocarbon production (which would increase the ratio).

And finally, this dating scheme is controversial because the dates derived are often wildly inconsistent. For example, "One part of Dima [a famous baby mammoth discovered in 1977] was 40,000 RCY [Radiocarbon Years], another was 26,000 RCY, and 'wood found immediately around the carcass' was 9,000-10,000 RCY." (Walt Brown, *In the Beginning*, 2001, p. 176)

1. D. R. Humphreys, J. R. Baumgardner, S. A. Austin, and A. A., Snelling, "Helium diffusion rates support accelerated nuclear decay," in Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Creationism, R. Ivey, Ed., Creation Science Fellowship, Pittsburgh, PA, 2003. See also: Walt Brown, *In the Beginning*, 2001, p. 75, under "Constant Decay?"
2. Brown, *ibid*, p. 246.

## **The DNA Molecule — the Impossibility of Information**

The DNA molecule is one of the greatest scientific discoveries of all time. First described by James Watson and Francis Crick in 1953<sup>1</sup>, DNA is the famous storehouse of genetics that establishes each organism's physical characteristics. It wasn't until mid-2001, that the "*Human Genome Project*" and Celera Genomics jointly presented the true nature and complexity of the digital code inherent in DNA. We now understand that the DNA molecule is comprised of chemical bases arranged in approximately 3 billion precise sequences. Even the DNA molecule for the single-celled bacterium, *E. coli*, contains enough information to fill an entire set of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) is a double-stranded molecule that is twisted into a helix like a spiral staircase. Each strand is comprised of a sugar-phosphate backbone and numerous base chemicals attached in pairs. The four bases that make up the

stairs in the spiralling staircase are adenine (A), thymine (T), cytosine (C) and guanine (G). These stairs act as the “letters” in the genetic alphabet, combining into complex sequences to form the words, sentences and paragraphs that act as instructions to guide the formation and functioning of the host cell. Maybe even more appropriately, the A, T, C, and G in the genetic code of the DNA molecule can be compared to the “0” and “1” in the binary code of computer software. Like software to a computer, the DNA code is a genetic language that communicates information to the organic cell.

The DNA code, like a floppy disk of binary code, is quite simple in its basic paired structure. However, it’s the sequencing and functioning of that code that’s enormously complex. Through recent technologies like x-ray crystallography, we now know that the cell is not a “blob of protoplasm,” but rather, a microscopic marvel that is more complex than the space shuttle. The cell is very complicated, using vast numbers of phenomenally precise DNA instructions to control its every function.

Although DNA code is remarkably complex, it’s the information translation system connected to that code that really baffles science. Like any language, letters and words mean nothing outside the language convention used to give those letters and words meaning. This is modern information theory at its core. A simple binary example of information theory is the “Midnight Ride of Paul Revere.” In that famous story, Mr. Revere asks a friend to put one light in the window of the North Church if the British came by land, and two lights if they came by sea. Without a shared language convention between Paul Revere and his friend, that simple communication effort would mean nothing. Well, take that simple example and multiply by a factor containing hundreds of zeros.

We now know that the DNA molecule is an intricate message system. To claim that DNA arose randomly is to say that information can develop randomly. Many scientists argue that the chemical building blocks of the DNA molecule can be explained by natural material processes over millions of years. However,

explaining the material base of a message is completely independent of the information transmitted using those materials. Thus, the chemical building blocks have nothing to do with the origin of the complex message itself.

As a simple illustration, the information content of the clause “nature and design” has nothing to do with the writing material used, whether ink, paint, chalk or crayon. In fact, the clause can be written in binary code, Morse code or smoke signals, but the message remains the same, independent of the medium. There is obviously no relationship between the information and the material base used to transmit it. Some current theories argue that self-organizing properties within the base chemicals themselves created the information in the first DNA molecule. Others argue that external self-organizing forces created the first DNA molecule. However, all of these theories must hold to the illogical conclusion that the material used to transmit the information also produced the information itself. Although I’m not a scientist, logic tells me that the information contained within the genetic code must be entirely independent of the chemical makeup of the DNA molecule.

Does this science stuff make sense? Am I correctly interpreting the awesome complexity of the DNA molecule that we only recently started to understand? It seems to me that anyone who goes out and truly investigates the miracle of the DNA molecule — this incredible micro, digital, error-correcting, redundant, self duplicating, information storage and retrieval system, with its own inherent language convention, that has the potential to develop any organism from raw biological material — has to be equally awe struck!

*It is astonishing to think that this remarkable piece of machinery, which possesses the ultimate capacity to construct every living thing that ever existed on Earth, from giant redwood to the human brain, can construct all its own components in a matter of minutes and weigh less than  $10^{-16}$  grams. It is of the order of several thousand million million*

*times smaller than the smallest piece of functional machinery ever constructed by man.*<sup>2</sup>

1. J.D. Watson and F.H.C. Crick, “Structure of Deoxyribose Nucleic Acid,” *Nature*, 171:737 (1953).
2. Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Adler and Adler, 338

With the discovery, mapping and sequencing of the DNA molecule over the last few decades, we now understand that organic life is based on vastly complex information code, and, like today’s most complex software codes, such information cannot be created or interpreted without some kind of “intelligence.” For me, truly understanding the scientific reality of the DNA molecule single-handedly defeated my life-long presupposition that life arose from non-life through random materialistic forces. Even with trillions of years, the development of DNA is statistically impossible.

But, hey, let’s dig in further... If DNA is the information storehouse that acts as the blueprint for cellular development, what do these functional cells look like? Are they really all that complex?

## **Cell Structure — The Complexity of the “Simple” Cell**

Each person begins as a single cell — a cell structure formed by the joining of the mother’s egg and the father’s sperm. That single cell contains the digital code to make thousands of other kinds of cells, from fat cells to bone cells — from brain cells to lung cells. There are muscle cells, skin cells, vein cells, capillary cells and blood cells... Ultimately, from that one original cell, the human body will have something like 30 trillion cells conducting an orchestra of different functions.

In the first half of this century, scientists still assumed that the cell was a fairly simple blob of protoplasm. Without electron microscopes and other technology, the cell was treated as a “black box” that mysteriously performed its various functions — an unobservable collection of “gelatin” molecules whose inner

workings were unknown.

Through the marvels of 21st century technology, scientists now understand the following:

*Although the tiniest bacterial cells are incredibly small, weighing less than  $10^{-12}$  grams, each is in effect a veritable micro-miniaturized factory containing thousands of exquisitely designed pieces of intricate molecular machinery, made up altogether of one hundred thousand million atoms, far more complicated than any machinery built by man and absolutely without parallel in the non-living world.<sup>1</sup>*

Each microscopic cell is as functionally complex as a small city. When magnified 50,000 times through electron micrographs, we see that a cell is made up of multiple complex structures, each with a different role in the cell's operation. Using the city comparison, here's a simple chart that reveals the awesome intricacy and design of a typical cell:

City =>	Cell
Workers	=> Proteins
Power Plant	=> Mitochondria
Roads	=> Actin fibers, Microtubules
Trucks	=> Kinesin, Dynein
Factories	=> Ribosomes
Library	=> Genome (DNA, RNA)
Recycling Centre	=> Lysosome
Police	=> Chaperones
Post Office	=> Golgi Apparatus

As we delve further into the cellular world, technology is revealing black boxes within previous black boxes. As science advances, more of these black boxes are being opened, exposing an “unanticipated Lilliputian world” of enormous complexity that has pushed the theory of evolution to a breaking point.<sup>2</sup>

Wow! That's at the cellular level. If the cell is that complex, what about the simplest organisms made up of these cellular structures? Is there really such a thing as “simple,” now that we

can view organisms using the latest in microbiological and biochemical technology?

1. Denton, 250.
2. Michael J. Behe, *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution*, Simon & Schuster, 1996, 18.

## **The Human Eye**

The human eye is enormously complicated — a perfect and interrelated system of about 40 individual subsystems, including the retina, pupil, iris, cornea, lens and optic nerve. For instance, the retina has approximately 137 million special cells that respond to light and send messages to the brain. About 130 million of these cells look like rods and handle the black and white vision. The other seven million are cone shaped and allow us to see in colour. The retina cells receive light impressions, which are translated to electric pulses and sent to the brain via the optic nerve. A special section of the brain called the visual cortex interprets the pulses to colour, contrast, depth, etc., which allows us to see “pictures” of our world. Incredibly, the eye, optic nerve and visual cortex are totally separate and distinct subsystems. Yet, together, they capture, deliver and interpret up to 1.5 million pulse messages a milli-second! It would take dozens of Cray supercomputers programmed perfectly and operating together flawlessly to even get close to performing this task.<sup>1</sup>

That's so powerful to me! Obviously, if all the separate subsystems aren't present and performing perfectly at the same instant, the eye won't work and has no purpose. Logically, it would be impossible for random processes, operating through gradual mechanisms of natural selection and genetic mutation, to create 40 separate subsystems when they provide no advantage to the whole until the very last state of development and interrelation.

***How did the lens, retina, optic nerve, and all the other parts in vertebrates that play a role in seeing suddenly come about? Because natural selection cannot choose separately between***

***the visual nerve and the retina. The emergence of the lens has no meaning in the absence of a retina. The simultaneous development of all the structures for sight is unavoidable. Since parts that develop separately cannot be used, they will both be meaningless, and also perhaps disappear with time. At the same time, their development all together requires the coming together of unimaginably small probabilities.***<sup>2</sup>

The foregoing represents the core of “irreducible complexity.” Complex organs made up of separate but necessary subsystems cannot be the result of random chance. Or, using the above language, such development could only result from “unimaginably small probabilities.” For me, this means “statistical impossibility.”

Come to think of it, I remember Darwin specifically discussing the incredible complexity of the eye in *Origin of Species*:

***To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree possible.***<sup>3</sup>

So, how did Darwin deal with the staggering realities of the eye in the 1850's? As “absurdly” improbable as it was, he followed through with his theory and pointed to the simpler eye structures found in simpler creatures. He reasoned that more complex eyes gradually evolved from the simpler ones.

However, this hypothesis no longer passes muster. Short of the micro-biological and genetic information issues, palaeontology now shows that “simple creatures” emerged in the world with complex structures already intact. Even the simple trilobite has an eye (complete with its double lens system) that's considered an optical miracle by today's standards.

1. Lawrence O. Richards, *It Couldn't Just Happen*, Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1989, 139-140.

2. Dr. Ali Demirsoy, *Inheritance and Evolution*, Meteksan Publications, Ankara, 475.
3. Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 155.

### **The Fossil Record — Are there “Transitional” Forms?**

Let’s start by looking at a few of Darwin’s very honest statements:

*Firstly, why, if species have descended from other species by insensibly fine gradations, do we not everywhere see innumerable transitional forms? Why is not all nature in confusion instead of the species being, as we see them, well defined?*<sup>1</sup>

*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?*<sup>2</sup>

*Lastly, looking not to any one time, but to all time, if my theory be true, numberless intermediate varieties, linking closely together all the species of the same group, must assuredly have existed.*<sup>3</sup>

*Why then is not every geological formation and every stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps is the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against my theory.*<sup>4</sup>

Since Darwin put forth his original theory, scientists have sought fossil evidence indicating past organic transitions. Nearly 150 years later, there has been no evidence of evolutionary transition found thus far in the fossil record. In Darwin’s own words, if his theory of “macro-evolution” were true, we would see a vast number of fossils at intermediate stages of biological development. In fact, based on standard mathematical models, we would see far more transitional forms in the fossil record than complete specimens. However, we see none — not one true transitional specimen has ever been found.



Our museums now contain hundreds of millions of fossil specimens (40 million alone are contained in the Smithsonian Natural History Museum). If Darwin's theory were true, we should see at least tens of millions of unquestionable transitional forms. We see none. Even the late Stephen Jay Gould, Professor of Geology and Palaeontology at Harvard University and the leading spokesman for evolutionary theory prior to his recent death, confessed "the extreme rarity of transitional forms in the fossil record persists as the trade secret of palaeontology."<sup>5</sup>

He continues:

***The history of most fossil species includes two features inconsistent with gradualism:***

***1. Stasis. Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking much the same as when they disappear...***

***2. Sudden Appearance. In any local area, a species does not arise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and 'fully formed'.<sup>6</sup> The evolutionary trees that adorn our textbooks have data only at the tips and nodes of their branches; the rest is inference, however reasonable, not the evidence of fossils.<sup>7</sup>***

Wait. I need to tighten this down! Are there some transitional fossils, or none? If Gould uses phrases like "extreme rarity" and "most species exhibit no directional change" when referring to the fossil record, that must mean that there are at least some transitional specimens. Right?

1. Darwin, *Origin of Species*, 143.
2. Ibid., 144.
3. Ibid., 149.
4. Ibid., 230.
5. *Natural History* 86(5), 1977, 14.
6. Ibid., 13.
7. Gould, "Evolution's Erratic Pace," *Natural History*, Vol. 5, 1977

## **Problems with the Fossil Record — What are the Scientists Saying?**

Author Luther Sunderland saw the problems with the fossil record, so he determined to get the definitive answer from the top museums themselves. Sunderland interviewed five respected museum officials, recognized authorities in their individual fields of study, including representatives from the American Museum, the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, and the British Museum of Natural History. None of the five officials were able to offer a single example of a transitional series of fossilized organisms that document the transformation of one Kind of plant or animal into another. <sup>1</sup>

The British Museum of Natural History boasts the largest collection of fossils in the world. Among the five respected museum officials, Sunderland interviewed Dr. Colin Patterson, Senior Palaeontologist at the British Museum and editor of a prestigious scientific journal. Patterson is a well known expert having an intimate knowledge of the fossil record. He was unable to give a single example of Macro-Evolutionary transition. In fact, Patterson wrote a book for the British Museum of Natural History entitled, “Evolution.” When asked why he had not included a single photograph of a transitional fossil in his book, Patterson responded:

*...I fully agree with your comments on the lack of direct illustration of evolutionary transitions in my book. If I knew of any, fossil or living, I would certainly have included them. You suggest that an artist should be used to visualize such transformations, but where would he get the information from? I could not, honestly, provide it, and if I were to leave it to artistic license, would that not mislead the reader? I wrote the text of my book four years ago. If I were to write it now, I think the book would be rather different. Gradualism is a concept I believe in, not just because of Darwin’s authority, but because my understanding of genetics seems to demand it. Yet Gould and the American Museum people are hard to*

*contradict when they say there are no transitional fossils. As a palaeontologist myself, I am much occupied with the philosophical problems of identifying ancestral forms in the fossil record. You say that I should at least “show a photo of the fossil from which each type of organism was derived.” I will lay it on the line — there is not one such fossil for which one could make a watertight argument.* <sup>2</sup>

OK, I just wanted to complete that loop. In my research, I haven't found even one transitional fossil. Therefore, based on Darwin's own words, his original theory of macro-evolutionary progression didn't happen. Palaeontology was a brand new scientific discipline in the mid-1800's, and now, roughly 150 years later, we know that the fossil record doesn't provide the support Darwin himself required.

David B. Kitts. PhD (Zoology) is Head Curator of the Department of Geology at the Stoval Museum. In an evolutionary trade journal, he wrote:

*Despite the bright promise that palaeontology provides a means of “seeing” evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists, the most notorious of which is the presence of “gaps” in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species and palaeontology does not provide them...* <sup>3</sup>

N. Heribert Nilsson, a famous botanist, evolutionist and professor at Lund University in Sweden, continues:

*My attempts to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for more than 40 years have completely failed... The fossil material is now so complete that it has been possible to construct new classes, and the lack of transitional series cannot be explained as being due to scarcity of material. The deficiencies are real, they will never be filled.* <sup>4</sup>

Even the popular press is catching on. This is from an article in Newsweek magazine:

*The missing link between man and apes, whose absence has*

*comforted religious fundamentalists since the days of Darwin, is merely the most glamorous of a whole hierarchy of phantom creatures ... The more scientists have searched for the transitional forms that lie between species, the more they have been frustrated.*<sup>5</sup>

1. Colin Patterson, personal communication. Luther Sunderland, *Darwin's Enigma: Fossils and Other Problems*, 4th edition, 1988, 88-90.
2. Ibid.
3. *Evolution*, vol. 28, 467.
4. Nilsson quoted in *The Earth Before Man*, p. 51.
5. "Is Man a Subtle Accident," *Newsweek*, November 3, 1980.

## **Catastrophism**

### **Catastrophism — Past Cataclysmic Activity**

Catastrophism is the idea that many of Earth's crustal features (strata layers, erosion, polystrate fossils, etc) formed as a result of past cataclysmic activity. In other words, the Earth's surface has been scarred by catastrophic natural disasters.

### **Catastrophism — Uniformitarianism**

Catastrophism is contrary to Uniformitarianism, the accepted geological doctrine for over 150 years. Uniformitarianism states that current geologic processes, occurring at the same rates observed today, in the same manner, account for all of earth's geological features. As present processes are thought to explain all past events, the Uniformitarianism slogan is "the present is the key to the past." Uniformitarianism ignores the possibility of past cataclysmic activity upon the surface of the earth. James Hutton first purposed the doctrine of uniformity in his publication, *Theory of the Earth* (1785). Sir Charles Lyell endorsed Uniformitarianism in his work, *Principles of Geology* (1830). Uniformitarianism is fundamental to Lyell's *geologic column*. Uniformitarianism and the geologic column, both of which assume uniformity, have been disputed in recent years by

geologic features such as poly-strata fossils, misplaced fossils, missing layers and misplaced layers (including layers in reverse order or “ancient” layers found above “modern” layers). Furthermore, observed cataclysmic events such as the eruption of Mt. St. Helens in 1980 have leant credibility to Catastrophism. Prior to the introduction of Uniformitarianism, Catastrophism was the accepted geological doctrine. Once again, Catastrophism is becoming accepted as an accurate interpretation of earth’s geologic history.

### **Catastrophism — Empirical Evidence**

Catastrophism is supported by actual, recorded history. Nearly 300 ancient flood legends have survived the ravishment of time. Legends of a worldwide deluge, commonly known as the “Noachian Flood,” are found in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, North American and South America. Furthermore, earth’s sedimentary layers with the fossil record seem to suggest a past marine cataclysm. Sedimentary rock (sandstone, siltstone, shale, limestone, etc) is primarily the result of moving water, laid down layer upon layer by hydrologic sorting. Animals whose fossil remains are found within those layers must have been caught in this running water appear to have been buried and preserved. The remains, as well as the rocks, would be sorted according to density or specific gravity. Otherwise, the carcasses would rot or be scavenged. Approximately 95% of all earth’s fossil remains discovered thus far are marine invertebrates. Of the remainder, approximately 4.74% are plant fossils, 0.25% are land invertebrates (including insects), and 0.0125% are vertebrates (the majority of which are fish). Roughly 95% of all land vertebrates discovered and recorded to date consists of less than one bone. The overwhelming majority of the plant fossils found appear to demonstrate an instantaneous burial. The leaves are pressed in fine sediment as if placed between the pages of a book and show no signs of decay or rot.

### **Catastrophism — The Noachian Flood**

**Catastrophism is supported by the evidential data. Catastrophism supports the Noachian Flood. Dramatic evidence is everywhere except in the popular press. For instance, who is aware that fossil remains of clams (found in the closed position, indicating they were buried alive) have been found atop Mt. Everest? What about whale fossils and petrified trees that stand upright through multiple sedimentary layers supposedly separated by millions of years? It is a remarkable time to reinvestigate the facts and determine your own position.**

## **The Global Flood**

### **Is there any evidence for a global flood?**

There is much evidence for a global flood including evidence from geology, archaeology, ancient legends, catastrophism trademarks, biblical consistency, evidence of Noah's ark, and from Jesus Christ Himself. The worldwide flood, the biblical story and the evidence fit together perfectly.

In general, the credibility of the worldwide flood story in the Bible is supported by unrelated facts that support the truth of the Bible. In recent years, much *archaeological evidence* has been found that supports the truth of many facts documented in the Bible. Also, Jesus, God in the flesh, completely supported the truth of the Old Testament and quoted it often.

The climate in the pre-flood era was different than after the flood. Before the flood, it may have never rained and instead, a mist watered the surface of the earth. The climate was warm and moderate, which was favourable to plant and animal life from pole to pole. Evidence of high concentrations of bones found all over the globe is consistent with what would be expected from a tropical, lush, pre-flood environment and a catastrophic worldwide flood. Some of these areas include Agate Nebraska, a cave of San Ciro in Sicily, ossiferous fissures in England and Western Europe, including the Rock of Gibraltar and Santenay in central France.

The only possible explanation for most fossils is rapid deposition from a catastrophic event. The worldwide flood is the only satisfactory explanation for the evidence. The uniformitarianism philosophy that was made popular by evolutionists 150 years ago cannot explain the fossil evidence. Additional evidence that completely supports catastrophism and recent deposition are discoveries in the polar-regions where animals are left standing with undigested food in their stomachs.

Oceanographers took core samples of sediments in the Gulf of Mexico that included fossils shells from one-celled plankton called foraminifera and made an interesting discovery. They discovered that at locations in the core samples that represent thousands of years ago, the salinity in the water was suddenly reduced based upon the shells locked-in permanent record of the conditions. This reduction in salinity could only be caused by a huge fresh water deluge.

There is much archaeological evidence confirming the Flood of Noah. There is a tablet in Babylon on which one of the Babylonian kings mentions his enjoyment in reading the writings of those who lived before the Flood. Another Babylonian tablet gives an interesting confirmation. Noah was the tenth generation from Adam according to the Bible, and this Babylonian tablet names the ten kings of Babylon who lived before the Flood. Another tablet names all the kings of Babylon, and after the first ten there are the words: "The Deluge came up. . ."

Stories of the Noachian Flood have been found in almost every civilization in the world. Dr. Aaron Smith of the University of Greensboro collected a complete history of the literature on Noah's Ark. He found 80,000 works in 72 languages about the flood. About 70,000 of them mention the wreckage of the Ark.

## **Does the History of Dragons Actually Link Back to Dinosaurs?**

In order to answer that question, one must first look at the history of dragons and dinosaurs. Plus, we need to answer within ourselves whether we believe in God's creation of the world or do

we believe in evolution?

We have a history of dragons because ancient peoples from all over the world spoke about unusual, reptile-like creatures (large and small) that once roamed the earth. These people from Europe called them “dragons.” The descriptions sounded similar to dinosaurs. Scientists agree that legends are almost always based on facts, not just imagination. Dragon pictures are found in Africa, India, Europe, the Middle East, the Orient and every other part of the world. Dinosaur-like animals have been drawn and written about since the beginning of recorded history. Some of the stories became wild, but yet, many seem rather believable.

Many evolutionists believe that dinosaurs became extinct millions of years before man walked the planet, but think about the world’s legends regarding dragons. Dragons are drawn on cave walls; written about in ancient literature, and described in the Bible. They are included in every culture of the world causing many to believe that what these people saw were actually dinosaurs. There are dinosaur fossils, which have been discovered along with human footprints and remains that add proof to the ancient people’s history of dragons. Furthermore, there are contemporary, unusual dragon or sea monster sightings. Some have been captured in modern times.

Dinosaurs were created along with man and all other animals. They were not called dinosaurs, but rather, dragons. Thus, the history of dragons begin. The big ones died out. People forgot that dragons were ever real and quickly faded into mythology. When dragon bones were dug up later, they were given the new classification of dinosaur.

The Bible records that a worldwide flood occurred causing massive destruction of all living things on earth except for Noah’s family and God’s selection of animals. All the other people, plants, animals and vegetation that were destroyed in the flood were fossilized in the sediment, the source of fossil fuels. The earth’s climate changed after Noah’s flood, for it was the first time rain had occurred on the earth. Before the flood, the earth was covered with a canopy of mist creating a giant green house.



The ice age came during the history of dragons (dinosaurs) when the earth no longer had that green house climate, which enabled reptiles to live so long. Reptiles are cold-blooded creatures needing warm temperatures. In addition to the climate change reducing the population of dinosaurs, people hunted those that remained, because of the menacing behaviour of the large creatures.

People forgot about the history of dragons, and centuries later in 1822 the first dinosaur bone was discovered. It was thought to have come from a giant iguana. Interestingly enough, if you place an iguana in a warm, moist climate with plenty of food allowing it to grow to a few tons, you have a dinosaur.

These articles were taken off the Internet.



## CONTENTS



<b>The Age of the Earth: Why does it Matter?.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>How Old is the Earth?.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Carbon Dating .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>The DNA Molecule – The Impossibility of Information .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Cell Structure – The Complexity of the “Simple” Cell .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>The Human Eye .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>The Fossil Record – Are There “Transitional” Forms?.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Problems with the Fossil Record – What are the Scientists Saying?.</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Catastrophism .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>The Global Flood .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Does the History of Dragons Actually Link Back to Dinosaurs?.....</b>	<b>22</b>

