

Creation – part 6

We saw last time that the curse or the second law of Thermodynamics totally defeats evolution's argument of chance producing order and symmetry.

--Things are not going uphill but downhill, and the only things that are going uphill have been created by intelligence.

It is counter to logic and science to say that things came about by evolution: **There's a fine line between faith and stupidity.**

The odds of life originating by chance have been calculated to be one chance in $10^{40,000}$
Let me give you an idea of the magnitude of these odds:

1. Cover the entire face of the earth with silver dollars including the surface of the oceans to a depth of 100 feet.

2. Color one of those dollars red.

3. Allow a blind person to wander over these dollars and pick up just one (he can take as long as he likes)

--What is the chance that he will pick up the red one?

--This still isn't a good picture since to cover the earth to the depth of 100 feet with silver dollars only gives 1% of that preposterous number of $1 \times 10^{40,000}$

Famous evolutionist, **Thomas Huxley** said, "No one would bet on anything so improbable happening...And yet it happened."

--He's a believer, isn't he?

Dr. George Wald, Nobel Prize winner of Harvard University, "One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are..."

--Also, a sold-out believer.

God created everything and everything is held together by Him.

Atoms are little wonders of the created order, because they defy the rules: the center (nucleus) is made of positively charged particles called protons and neutral particles called neutrons.

--Take a Uranium atom as an example (heaviest naturally occurring metal—9 times heavier than gold) it exists naturally as U-238 or in the isotope U_3O_8 —it has 92 protons, 146 neutrons and 92 electrons orbiting.

--What is holding that together? the nucleus is made of many positive charged particles--Like charges repel each other! —the Repel like the positive ends of two magnets.

How does an atom keep from flying apart?

They call it the binding force or the "nuclear force"

--Nobody knows what it really is, but they do know it's very powerful.

--It is very difficult to split an atom and only certain atoms will ever split we call them fissile or radioactive elements.

When an atom's nucleus is broken, the energy that is released is incredible:

--It's the essence of this that produces an atomic bomb or nuclear energy.

--Atoms in a book the size of the Bible, for instance, if we could shatter the atoms and the energy was released, would produce the same amount of energy produced by the Hoover Dam in 1 year!!

--The energy within the nuclei of one pound of any substance is equal to the energy of 1.5 million tons of coal!

--The reason why they call it “nuclear” power is because it comes from the nucleus.

What holds this together? Because shouldn't hold together: [Colossians 1:17](#)—In Christ all things hold together” -- [Hebrews 1:3](#)

--What would happen if God withdrew His power? [II Peter 3:10-11](#)

1. How old is the earth? Let's talk about Carbon 14 dating.

We hear all kinds of numbers of very ancient ages that have supposedly been proven by scientific methods.

--But we don't have science unless we approach it scientifically,

--We can't believe anything and it be science, and we cannot assume anything and it be science because only that which is observable and repeatable is science.

Carbon 14 dating a great example of that which for the most part isn't science.

--Carbon 14 is a radioactive isotope of regular carbon like we find in CO₂

--What happens is that regular carbon interacts with nitrogen as it is hit with cosmic radiation dumps two neutrons into the carbon atom, and this creates a heavy C-14 atom in the carbon dioxide molecule.

--Plants breath in this carbon dioxide with the heavy carbon and then animals eat the plants and other animals eat those animals—this is how carbon 14 gets into the environment.

--Carbon 14 fluctuates in plants and animals but is fixed at the time of death and decays at a given rate after that is called a half-life which can be measured.

--Carbon 14 has a half-life of 5,730 years; so, if we had 1 pound of Carbon 14--5,730 years later we would only have a half of a pound.

--The premise is we measure the amount of carbon 14 in an organism that has decayed to determine how long ago the animal or plant died.

Problems with this method are numerous:

In order for Radiometric dating to be accurate, we will have to assume or believe several things to be true.

1. For this dating to be accurate and reliable, we have to assume (believe) that the rate of decay has remained the same over the years.

--This has been proven to be an unreliable assumption.

--Extensive experiments have been performed on other radioactive isotopes like U-238 and F-57 which have shown that rates of decay can and do vary widely.

--But we are certain of the results of Carbon 14?

2. For the dating to be accurate, we have to assume (believe) that the rate of carbon 14 production has remained the same over the years.

--We know for a fact that the industrial revolution increased the amount of regular carbon over carbon 14 in recent centuries.

--We know that atomic testing in the 50's increased the amount of carbon 14 over normal levels.

--We know that volcanic activity changes the amount of C 14 as well.

--We believe and have prolific proof that the world was flooded and destroyed and all that rotting vegetation would have greatly decreased the amount of regular carbon in the air, thus, greatly affecting the percentage of C 14 in the atmosphere.

3. Another assumption (belief) is that all plants and animals utilize carbon 14 equally across the board. This has been proven false – Mollusks from Hawaii had their shells dated with the

carbon 14 method and the tests showed that the mollusks had died 2000 years before—quite a shock to the mollusks since they were still alive in a salt water aquarium!

4. Another problem with Radiometric dating is human bias – Dates that do not fit a desired theory are thrown out.

--Remember the premise of Evolutionist has not been to let the data say whatever it says but try to prove their agenda which is not “how old is the earth?” but “How is the earth Old?”

--Just because they are scientists does not make them unbiased.

--Claiming cross contamination, an evolutionist can present a sample for testing in a lab and tell them that he believes the results to be between 50,000 and 100,000 years old.

--All other results are ruled as cross contamination. ?

--They get 9 tests that show 2000 to 4000 years old and one that says that it was 65000-year-old and they will throw out the nine other tests results saying that they were inaccurate.

This is very bad science but it is practiced all the time in order to make things fit into the evolutionary model that is firmly believed.

--Why would someone do this? [John 3:19-21](#)

The best description of the problem in using Carbon-14 dating method is summed up in the words of Dr. Robert Lee, assistant editor of Anthropological Journal of Canada, in which he wrote an article in 1981 stating:

“The troubles of the radiocarbon dating method are undeniably deep and serious. Despite 35 years of technological refinement and better understanding, the underlying assumptions have been strongly challenged, and warnings are out that radiocarbon may soon find itself in a crisis situation. Continuing use of the method depends on a fix-it-as-we-go approach, allowing for contamination here, fractionation there, and calibration whenever possible. It should be no surprise then, that fully half of the dates are rejected. The wonder is, surely, that the remaining half has come to be accepted.... No matter how useful it is, though, the radiocarbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. There are gross discrepancies, the chronology is uneven and relative, and the accepted dates are actually the selected dates.”

Examples of bad dates: (there are multitudes of these)

1. Mt. Etna erupted about 2100 years ago, well documented. Nevertheless, rocks from the eruption were dated to 25 million years ago by carbon dating?

2. Lava flows from a volcano in New Zealand that erupted in 1949 and again in 1954 were tested and dated to 275,000 years ago.

3. Mount St. Helens erupted in 1980 but some of its rocks were dated as old as 2.8 million years old. The answer to these discrepancies is sad:

“If we know the dates of these rocks then we can reject their radio carbon dating, but if we don’t know that date when they were formed then we can trust the radio carbon dating”?

During the days of Mark Twain, Evolution was a new teaching, but many were latching onto it and making all kinds of predictions and assumptions that they couldn’t prove.

One of those assumptions was that the Mississippi delta was far longer in the past and that its erosion would prove that the earth is millions or billions of years old.

In his book/memoir called Life on the Mississippi, Mark Twain wrote: “In the space of 167 years the Lower Mississippi has shortened itself 240 miles. That is an average of a trifle over one mile and third per year.

Therefore, any calm person, who is not blind or idiotic, can see that in the Old Oolitic Silurian Period, (just a million years ago next November), that the Lower Mississippi River was upward of 1,300,000 miles long, and stuck out over The Gulf of Mexico like a fishing rod. And, by the same token, any person can see that 742 years from now the Lower Mississippi will be only a mile and $\frac{3}{4}$ long, and Cairo and New Orleans will have joined their streets together, and be plodding comfortably along under a single mayor and mutual board of aldermen.

There is something fascinating about science: One gets such wholesale returns of conjecture out of such a trifling investment of fact.”