

Why Evolution is Impossible
and New Evidence for a young earth and Noah's flood

John Ashton MSc PhD CChem FRACI March 2011

Summary

Evolutionary theories and timescales permeate western education, and the media. These theories which now underpin much of secular culture are a direct contradiction of the Biblical account. With the celebration of the sesquicentenary of the publishing of *Origins* and the bicentenary of Darwin's birth, in 2009, there is an urgent need to educate Christians to defend the position of Biblical creation including the following aspects:

1. The origins debate is not about the best science but about keeping science education moral value free.
2. The origin of evolutionary theories can be traced back to ancient Greek atheism.
3. There is geological evidence for a global flood.
4. The chronologies of four ancient civilisations support the Biblical dating for the tower of Babel and the scattering of the nations.
5. The two basic premises of evolution; abiogenesis and spontaneous generation of meaningful DNA have never been observed with the former being biochemically impossible.
6. Radiometric dating methods cannot be validated for pre-historical dates.
7. The Big Bang theory is no longer supported by observed data.
8. There are many highly qualified scientists who recognise the impossibility of Darwinian type evolution.

Introduction

Science education in Australian high schools provides an introduction to understanding how the world around us functions. Modern science is underpinned by a mechanical view of the world where nature is perceived to obey laws which often can be expressed as mathematical functions or cause and effect. The mechanical model of nature was essentially begun by Isaac Newton when he published his *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* in 1687. Charles Darwin completed the concept of a mechanical paradigm for science when he published *The Origin of Species* in 1859 which proposed a mechanical conception of life on earth which has become known as the **Theory of Evolution**. This theory which required the long ages proposed by Charles Lyell in his *Principles of Geology* published three decades earlier, directly contradicted the Biblical account in Genesis 1 and also the fourth commandment of Exodus 20 which reiterated that God whom mankind is to worship as God, created the heavens and the earth and all that is in them in six literal

24 hour days. It can be calculated from the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11, and the historical dating of the reign of King Solomon, life on earth is only about 6,000 years old which is not enough time for Darwin's or Lyell's theories. Jesus also spoke of male and female being made "in the beginning" and named Abel (son of Adam) with Zechariah as real persons who were murdered.

The theory of Evolution is part of the science teaching curriculum across Australia and registered schools are required to teach it. This can provide a serious conflict of ideologies for students. (1) Consequently it behoves Christian science educators to explain to their science students the serious shortcomings of the Theory of Evolution compared with current scientific findings together with the evidence from history which supports the accuracy of the biblical account. Since one school was recently taken to court for apparently teaching creation in a science class, it is also important to have a properly developed and recognised curriculum available. (2)

What follows is a suggestion for topics which could constitute the framework of such a curriculum providing knowledge of the evidence supporting the scientific position that life was created in a very short time only thousands of years ago.

The aims of this curriculum should be to:

1. Present the scientific evidence for creation, the flood and a creator designer.
2. Outline the evidence which suggests that Darwinian type evolution is impossible.
3. Demonstrate that a creation model is a valid scientific position which forms a basis for falsifiable scientific hypotheses.

Suggestions for a curriculum outline

1. The origins debate is not about the best science but about keeping science education moral value free.

Evolution is a theory supporting the tenets of atheism, humanism and naturalism. There is no moral component to evolutionary processes. The Australian Academy of Science (AAS) statement on creationism and Intelligent Design, points out that "evolution was not guided by some divinity or purpose, but by rules which govern the inheritance of physical characteristics. These rules were not seen as having any moral content, and the theory of evolution **did not therefore acknowledge a moral component** to the pattern of life. (3) The only credible alternative account of origins is creation which implies the existence of God and moral values. Consequently, creation world view is often linked to moral values. For example, a May 2008 article in New Scientist arguing for a science basis for social policies, proclaimed: "You could see the abstinence-only movement as the sexual health equivalent of creationism" (4)

Belief in evolution and the subsequent moral neutrality of much sex education have underpinned the promotion of sexual freedom within the community but the incidence of sexually transmitted disease has risen sharply as a result. For example a Medscape bulletin in 2007, warned that more than 50% of 18-25 year olds in US have caught a sexually transmitted disease. (5)

The AAS goes on to assert that "The creationist account of the origin of life has been and remains an important idea in human culture. However it is not a *scientific* idea. That is, it is not open to

empirical test. It is an article of religious faith. The creationist account of the origin of life is not therefore appropriate to a course in the science of biology, and the claim that it is a viable scientific explanation of the diversity of life does not warrant support.

Therefore students need to be shown how a creation position is a falsifiable scientific position. The creation scientific view would predict for example that measurable amounts of C14 should be found in coal and diamonds and this has found to be the case.(6) The creation view would predict evidence for a global flood, rapid deposition of ice layers etc. Also the creation model proposes “purpose” in nature and many scholars have argued evidence for this (7).

2.The origin of evolutionary theories can be traced back to ancient Greek atheism.

Leucippus and Democritus in the 5th C BC suggested that the universe was composed of atoms which clumped together in a random fashion forming rocks, trees animals. They proposed that chance is the cause of order. These ideas were preserved by the Roman poet Lucretius who wrote about about 60 BC. His poem “On the Nature of the Universe” had been lost until it was rediscovered in 1417 AD. It presented the new thought of origins by mechanical processes.

In the 1600s, Rene Descartes proposed that Nature was a mathematics based machine set up by God. This led to the reductionist approach to science. A short time later, using a reductionist approach, Isaac Newton (1687), discovered the laws of Physics and confirmed view that nature was a machine. Machines subsequently were developed leading to the Industrial Revolution. Steam engine powered factories displaced cottage industries resulting in people being displaced from farms only to move to overcrowded cities. Poverty led to a bitter struggle for survival. Malthus observed and wrote about this struggle. Meanwhile machines were constantly being improved. Superior machines gave owners a competitive advantage and this mechanical evolution was observed by Spencer who wrote that life may have evolved in a similar way.

Charles Darwin 1859, combined the observations of Malthus and Spencer with the Greek idea of chance being the cause of order. He proposed that life evolved by chance, with random mutations which had an advantage surviving better in the struggle for existence. This was a mechanical model of origins that left God out of the picture. God was no longer necessary. The power the church claimed could now be challenged. Charles Lyell’s uniformitarianism and long ages view of geology was now linked to the origin of life.

This mechanical model for life completed the mechanical world view which had been developing in the minds of scholars since Newton’s discoveries. It became the foundation for humanism and modern secular science education.(8)

4. The geological evidence for a global flood

There are massive sedimentary deposits on every continent: coal, sand stone , limestone, conglomerates. These contain indicators of massive water flows and rapid deposition of sediment. Examples include cross bedding, cross strata tree fossils, whale fossils, large rounded boulders in conglomerate mixtures of pebbles and sand.

There are no modern parallels for the formation of these enormous fossil rich deposits, and conglomerates.

The Morrison Formation and its equivalents with their dinosaur fossil graveyards stretch from New Mexico to Canada - 1.5 million square kilometres. Chalk beds up to 100 metres thick and rich in fossils stretch from Ireland to Turkey. Coal beds containing similar plant fossils stretch from Texas, across Europe to the Caspian sea. The Coconino Sandstone which stretches across Arizona, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas has cross beds indicating water 90 metres deep was flowing at around 1 -1.5 m/sec producing sand waves up to 18 metres high which deposited 42,000 cubic kilometres of sand. (9)

The bedding layers in most deposits show very little surface erosion indicating rapid deposition. Creatures that are rapidly decomposed are preserved and there are action fossils. That is fossils of creatures eating, hatching - all indications of very rapid preservation.

On the other hand there are negligible numbers of fossil “intermediates” or mutations. The fossil evidence for intermediate species and mutations which were not successful in the struggle for survival, evolving over time is not there.

4. The chronologies of four ancient civilisations support the Biblical dating for the tower of Babel and the scattering of the nations.

Indirect support for creation come historical evidence for the accuracy of the Bible account. For example, the ancient country of Egypt was named after Noah’s grandson Genesis 10:1, 6; 1Chron 1:4, 8. (Note Egypt is the Greek for Mizraim.) The historian Eusebius (4th Cent AD) wrote that Mestram son of Cham son of Noah, moved to the area of Egypt at the time of the dispersion of the nations from the tower of Babel. (Pref of Manetho). Misr is the local name for Egypt in Egypt today and countries are named after real people. Egypt is also referred to as the land of Ham (Egypt’s father) Psalm 78:51; 105:23, 27; 106:22.

Calculations for the dates for creation and the flood.

Genesis chapter 5 records the age when the patriarchs became fathers. That is: Adam 130 years old, Seth 105, Enos 90, Kenan 70, Mahalel 65, Jared 162, Enoch 65, Methuselah 187, Lamech 182, Noah (Flood) 600 Adding these years up we get a total of **1656 years from creation to flood**. (Note these ages could be up to +1 year out for each of the ten patriarchs depending on whether they became a father just after a birthday or just before a birthday. That is 1656 is the minimum number of years with 1666 years the maximum with the correct value somewhere in between).

Genesis 11:10-25 records the age when post flood patriarchs became fathers. That is Shem 2 (years after flood), Arphaxad 35, Salah 30, Eber 34, Peleg 30, Reu 32, Serug 30, Nahor 29, Terah 130 (died at 205 when Abraham was 75, Genesis 11:32, 12:4). Abraham was 75 when he left Haran and made a covenant with God.(Gen 12:4). Adding up these years we get a total of **427 years from flood to the covenant** with Abraham. Again the years could be out by up to 10 years as before. That is the maximum number of years would be 437.

The dates for the flood and creation can be calculated as follows:-

Solomon's 4th year is now known to be 966 B.C. The Exodus occurred 479 years earlier, i.e. 1445 B.C. (1Kings 6:1). The covenant with Abraham took place 430 years before the Exodus (Exodus 12:40-41, Galatians 3:16-17). Since the covenant with Abraham was 427 years after flood, the time from the flood to the Exodus was 857 years.

Therefore flood was $1445 + 857 = 2302$ B.C. and Creation was $2302 + 1656 = 3958$ B.C. (approx.)

Note: Ussher has Solomon's 4th year as 1012 B.C. i.e. 46 years earlier. Note $4004 - 46 = 3958$ B.C.

Other chronologies

According to the fourth book of *De Caelo* ('About the heavens') by Simplicius, a Latin writer in the 6th century AD, after Alexander the Great had defeated Darius at Gaugmela in 331 BC. , he journeyed to Babylon. Here he received 1903 years of astronomical observations from the Chaldeans, which they claimed dated back to the founding of Babylon. If this was so, then that would place the founding of Babylon in 2234 BC, ie about 68 years after the flood and 33 years before the birth of Peleg.

Four generations after Noah, [Genesis 10:25](#) records the birth of Peleg (meaning *division*) 'for in his days was the earth divided'. The traditional interpretation of this phrase relates this verse to the time of the scattering of the nations after the Tower of Babel event in Genesis 11.

According to the biblical chronology, the Flood occurred in 2302 BC, and Peleg was born in 2201 BC about a hundred years later. The Byzantine chronicler Constantinus Manasses (d. 1187) wrote that the Egyptian state lasted 1663 years. If correct, then counting backward from the time that Cambyses, king of Persia, conquered Egypt in 526 BC, gives us the year of 2188 BC for the founding of Egypt, about 13 years after the scattering of the peoples, or 114 years after the flood. This would align well with the time of Mizraim, the son of Ham, the son of Noah. According to the 4th Century historian Eusebius of Caesarea, Egialeus, king of the Greek city of Sicyon, began his reign in 2089 BC, 1313 years before the first Olympiad in 776 BC. If Eusebius is correct, then this first Greek king started to reign about 112 years after the dividing of the peoples. (10)

Further evidence comes from Chinese history. According to the oldest text of the *Bamboo Annals* (*Chu shu chi nien*), the first royal house in China was established by the ruler and sage Fu Hsi in 1994 BC. (11). That is 207 years after the scattering of the people from Babel and on the basis of distance from Babylon is comparable on a time line basis to the founding of the other civilizations..

In summary the history of the nations could be outlined as follows:-

Flood	2302 BC	
Babylon	2234 BC	Astronomical records
Peleg	2201 BC	Scattering peoples
Egypt	2188 BC	
Greece	2089 BC	
China	1994 BC	
Noah dies	1952 BC	
Abraham	1950 BC	
Shem dies	1902 BC	Last known pre-flood survivor.

Further evidence comes from a study of over 200 flood myths from peoples around the world by Morris (12), who found the following similarities:

The catastrophe was a flood, not another type	95%,
The flood was global	95%,
A favored family was saved	88%,
Specifically eight people were saved	9%,
The rainbow was mentioned	75%,
Animals played a part	73%,
Survival was due to a boat	70%,
Animals were also saved	67%,
The flood was due to wickedness of mankind	66%,
They were forewarned	66%,
Survivors landed on a mountain	57%,
Birds were sent out	35%.

This world wide theme of a global flood provides powerful support for the historical accuracy of the Genesis flood account.

5. The two basic premises of evolution: abiogenesis and spontaneous generation of meaningful DNA have never been observed.

For abiogenesis we need: 1 formation of bio-monomers, 2 formation of biopolymers, 3 formation of connected metabolic pathways and 4 formation of a live cell, where the chemical reactions are

in a steady state of non-equilibrium. To this day it has not been possible to perform step two in the laboratory despite the best efforts of intelligent scientists. On the basis of our current knowledge, steps three and four are impossible. Dr Francis Collins, who lead the human genome project, admits God must have created life. (13)

Dr George Javor Professor of Biochemistry, School of Medicine, Loma Linda University writes:

“Proponents of chemical evolution.... are choosing to stick with a simplistic eighty-year old model against a background of a tidal wave of evidence that abundantly shows the mind-boggling chemical complexity undergirding life.....Our inability to bring back to life intact but dead *E. coli* cells in the laboratory shows the impossibility of spontaneous generation of life. We actually know what needs to be done – changing from equilibrium to non-equilibrium the hundreds of interconnected biochemical pathways. We are just not able to make this happen with our current technologies. The evolutionary recipe for life belongs to the same category as the recipe for perpetual motion.” (14)

In a recent December 2008 article on the chemical origin of life, the author could give no scientific mechanism for how life began but simply asserted that it must have happened. (15)

Similarly for Darwinian evolution to occur, new meaningful genetic information has to arise spontaneously. This has never been observed.

All observed examples of evolution involve the loss of existing genetic information or the transfer of existing genetic information from one organism to another. For example the evolution of food poisoning bacteria could be cited as an example of evolution. However it involves the transfer of toxin genes from one bacteria to a harmless bacteria to form a new toxic species. This is evolution but not an example the Darwinian type evolution which requires the formation of new genetic information.

This lack of experimental evidence is recognised by informed pro –evolutionists. Their attempted explanation is that somehow energy can create information. However it is pointed out by Dr Andy McIntosh DSc Professor of Thermodynamics, University of Leeds that “ New machines are not made by simply adding energy to existing machines. *Intelligence is needed. And this thesis is falsifiable.* If anyone was to take an existing chemical machine and [by adding energy] produce a different chemical machine which was not there before (either as a sub-part or latently coded for in the DNA template), then this argument would have been falsified. No one has ever achieved this.” (16)

6. Radiometric dating methods cannot be validated for pre-historical dates

There are no standard rocks of “known” ages to calibrate the radiometric dating methods for pre-historical dates. Therefore while we can calculate old ages for rocks on the basis of chemical analysis and radiometric dating theory, it is impossible to validate the method. Therefore we cannot assert that these calculated values are the true ages of the rocks. This point is illustrated by the radiometric ages calculated for known young rocks which are dated as very old. For example historic 50 year old lava on the New Zealand Mount Ngauruhoe volcano , dated:- 133 million years (Rb-Sr), 197 million years (Sm – Nd), 3,908 million years (Pb- Pb). (17) Similarly

diamond and coal, by evolutionary theory, are so old that they should not contain any carbon 14. However measurable Carbon 14 has been found in diamonds and coal. (6). Similarly helium found in zircon crystals and the accompanying radiohalos suggest rapid formation and young ages for these rocks which are otherwise dated as very old. (9)

Other scientific evidence suggesting a much younger age for the earth than required by evolution theories include: rate of decay of Earth's magnetic field; rate of accumulation of helium gas in atmosphere, no widely expanded super nova (Exploded star), rate of moon receding – moon not far enough away, oceans not salty enough given rate that salt is being washed into sea. (9). Similarly the rapid erosion rate of Niagra Falls puts the gorge at only thousands of years old. (18)

Conversely the Mt St Helen's and Surtsey Island formations suggest great age even though they were formed in very recent times, that is since 1964. (19)

7. Big Bang theory is no longer supported by observed data.

The Big Bang theory is often taught alongside evolution as an explanation of how the earth, solar system and universe came to exist and provide the environment for life to evolve. However, not only does the theory rely on hypothetical entities such as the inflation field, dark matter and dark energy, but the Big bang theory "can boast of no quantitative predictions that have since been validated". A growing number of leading scientists now acknowledge there are major problems with the theory. (20) These problems are illustrated by a recent observation by the Prof of astronomy Uni of Bonn, Germany, Prof Pavel Kroupa PhD (Cambridge), "We see only about 1% of the predicted number of satellite galaxies. It is the cleanest case in which we can see there is something badly wrong with our standard picture [the big-bang] of the origin of galaxies." (21)

8. There are many highly qualified scientists who recognise the impossibility of Darwinian evolution

It is sometimes said that highly educated scientists do not believe that the earth and life on it was created in six literal days and that life on earth is less than 10,000 years old. Such assertions can be used to imply that people who believe in the Bible account of origins are naive. However there are in fact many scientists who recognise that evolution is impossible and that current scientific observations support a creation young earth explanation of our existence. Such scientists include: Dr Robert Herrman PhD (American Uni), Prof of Mathematics (Retired), US Naval Academy.(22); Prof David Gower, DSc (London), Prof of Biochemistry, University of London; Dr Ker Thomson, DSc (Geophysics – Colorado School of Mines), former director of the US Air Force Terrestrial Sciences Laboratory; Dr Keith Wanser, PhD (Uni of California), Prof of Physics, California State University; Prof Edward Boudreaux, PhD (Tulane), Professor of Theoretical Chemistry (Retired), Uni of New Orleans; Dr Robert Eckel MD (Uni of Cincinnati), Professor of Medicine, University of Colorado; Dr Danny Faulkner, PhD (Indiana Uni), Professor

of Astronomy, University of South Carolina; Prof Joseph Mastropaolo, PhD (Uni of Iowa), Professor of Biomechanics, California State Uni; Dr Geoff Downes, PhD (Plant physiology – Monash University), Principal Research Scientist, CSIRO; Dr Colin Mitchell, PhD (Geography – Cambridge University), Retired UN FAO consultant; Dr Andrew McIntosh, DSc (Mathematics – University of Wales), Professor of Thermodynamics, Uni of Leeds; (23)

Summary

Many secular educationists assert that creation is a religious doctrine and is not based on evidence based scientific observations. This position can be refuted on the basis that:- 1. There is scientific evidence which supports a young earth and rapid creation. 2. There is both historical and scientific evidence for a recent global flood. 3. Evolution can be refuted on the basis of observed data and the Big Bang theory has failed to stand up.

Therefore there is an urgent need to develop a comprehensive syllabus, along the topic lines outlined above for teaching the scientific evidence for creation in Christian schools.

Further reading and resources.

<http://www.icr.org/> , <http://creationontheweb.com/> ; <http://www.creationresearch.org/>
<http://www.discovery.org/csc/>

Westacott, M. and Ashton J. (Eds,) “ The Big Argument: Twenty Four Scholars explore Why science ,archaeology, philosophy haven’t disproved God” . Master Books, Green Forest, USA, 2006. See: <http://books.google.com.au/books?id=-3QWceEWDtAC>

Ashton, J(Ed), “ In six Days: Why fifty scientists choose to believe in creation”. Master Books, Green Forest, USA, 2001. see: <http://creationontheweb.com/content/view/3323/>

Ashton, J. (Ed), “The God Factor: 50 scientists and academics explain why they believe in God”. HarperCollins, Sydney,

Ashton, J. and Down, D. “Unwrapping the Pharaohs: How Egyptian archaeology confirms the Biblical timeline”, Master Books, Green Forest, USA, 2006.

References

1. See for example <http://www.worldnetdaily.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=81459>
2. Patty, A. “School in clear over teaching creation” Sydney Morning Herald, December 9, 2008, p1, and <http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/school-in-clear-over-teaching-creation/2008/12/08/1228584743350.html>
3. See <http://www.science.org.au/policy/creation.htm>
4. Muir, H., “Science Rules OK!”, New Scientist, 24th May 2008, pp40-43. (see also <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg19826571.900-science-rules-ok-running-societies-the-rational-way.html?full=true>)
5. See: <http://www.medscape.com/viewarticle/536107>

6. DeYoung, D.B., "Thousands ... not Billions: Challenging an Icon of Evolution, Questioning the Age of the Earth", Master Books, Green Forest, AK, 2005, pp45-62; also <http://www.icr.org/articles/view/117/262/>
7. Henderson, L. J. 1970, *The Fitness of the Environment*, Peter Smith, Gloucester, Mass. (Original edition published 1913); Birch, C. 1990, *On Purpose*, New South Wales University Press, Kensington N.S.W. Ashton, J and Laura R, 1998, *The Perils of Progress*, New South Wales University Press, Kensington N.S.W.
8. Randall, J.H. 1940, *The Making of the Modern Mind*, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston.
9. Snelling, A.A., "The Geological Evidence for Creation" in M.J. Westacott and J.F. Ashton (eds) *The Big Argument: Twenty Four Scholars explore Why science ,archaeology, philosophy haven't disproved God*. Strand, Sydney, 2005, pp150-183.
10. Eusebius, *Chronici Canones*, Humphredurn Milford, London, Preface pp. 1–14, 1923.
11. Britannica, 1967, Vol 5 p 575.
12. Morris, J., "Why does nearly every culture have a tradition of a global flood?", cited by Bergman, J. in Westacott, M. and Ashton J. (Eds,) "The Big Argument: Twenty Four Scholars explore Why science ,archaeology, philosophy haven't disproved God" . Master Books, Green Forest, USA, 2006. pp 296-7.
13. Van Biema, "God Vs Science", *Time*, November 13, 2006, (Cover story). See also: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1555132-3,00.html>
14. Javor, G. "The Scientific case for creation", in Westacott, M. and Ashton J. (Eds,) "The Big Argument: Twenty Four Scholars explore Why science ,archaeology, philosophy haven't disproved God" , Strand, Sydney, 2005, p132.
15. Livingstone, S., "Thoughts on the chemical origin of life", *Chemistry in Australia*, Vol 75, No11, 2008-2009, pp10-12.
16. <http://www.answersingenesis.org/articles/2007/02/12/just-add-energy>
17. http://www.icr.org/research/index/researchp_as_r01/ and http://www.icr.org/i/pdf/research/ICCMt_Ngauruhoe-AAS.pdf
18. <http://www.iaw.com/~falls/faq.html#erosion>
19. <http://explorenorth.com/library/weekly/aa042601a.htm> , <http://www.answersingenesis.org/creation/v5/i2/surtsey.asp> <http://www.mountsthelens.com/history-3.html>
20. Lerner E., "Bucking the big bang", **New Scientist**, 22 May 2004, p20. See also www.cosmologystatement.org ; chapters by physicists Keith Wanser and John Rankin at <http://www.creationontheweb.com/isd> and also <http://www.serve.com/herrmann/main.html>
21. Chown M., "Mystery of the missing mini-galaxies", **New Scientist**, 22 August 2009, pp 37-39.
22. See: <http://www.serve.com/herrmann/main.html>

23. see: <http://creationontheweb.com/content/view/3323/>

Update

One aspect of science research that continues to challenge me is the widespread acceptance of the Theory of Evolution as an explanation of how life came to be, even though there is still no experimental evidence to support this theory. Biophysicist Dr Lee Spetner who taught information theory at Johns Hopkins University for many years, points out that there is no evidence of purposeful genetic information arising by chance mutations and on the basis of probability theory it is impossible. (1) Also there is still no known mechanism which can explain how a living cell could arise from non living molecules. (2)

A leading advocate of the teaching of evolution, Oxford University professor and atheist Richard Dawkins, in his latest book, gives only one example which he claims is evidence of new purposeful genetic information arising by chance. This example relates to the work of Dr Richard Lenski and his team of researchers at the Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics at Michigan State University. (3)

However Dr Lenski and co-workers are not sure of the mechanism that produced the change in genetic information and both possible mechanisms proposed by the researchers involve pre-existing genetic information (4) In other words, the world's foremost advocate of evolution – Richard Dawkins – has not provided a single example of experimental evidence for the type of evolution that would be needed to produce the first eye , the first jointed legs, the first feathers and all the vast amount of new genetic information associated with all the different types of living things that exist.

Actually, leading educators admit that there is still no known mechanism which can explain how new purposeful genetic information can form and this remains a major research focus in biology. As one well regarded educational website puts it:-

“Biologists are not arguing about these conclusions [that many biologists believe life on earth has evolved]. But they are trying to figure out how evolution happens – and that's not an easy job.” (5)

Over the years I have met many leading scientists who have realised that the scientific evidence we have available to us today strongly supports the Bible's account of how we came to be here. (6) Recently I learned that former Cornell University geneticist Dr John Sanford who invented the gene gun to facilitate the genetic engineering of plants, has converted to a young earth six day creationist on the basis of scientific evidence which shows that human DNA is deteriorating at an alarming rate and thus cannot be millions of years old. (7)

Examples of the huge variation in the radiometric dating ages of rocks are tabulated in a recent major compilation of radiometric dating research studies. **(8)** Since recent rocks can give very old ages, and other rocks give widely varying ages depending on how the age is calculated I believe we can confidently say that at the present time we do not know what these millions of years age numbers really mean and they are certainly not proof that life on earth is very old.

South Australian Government Astronomer George F. Dodwell gathered substantial astronomical evidence that the tilt of the earth's axis was affected by a major event around the date of the flood. **(9)**

1. Spetner L.M., 1997, *Not by Chance*, Judaica Press Inc, N.Y., pp 85-160.
2. Ricardo A. and Szostak J.W., 2009, "Origin of Life on Earth", *Scientific American*, September, vol 301, pp38-45.
3. Dawkins R., 2009, *The Greatest Show on Earth: The Evidence for Evolution*, Bantam Press, London, p 131.
4. Blount Z.D., Borland C.Z. and Lenski R.E. 2008, "Historical contingency and the evolution of a key innovation in an experimental population of *Escherichia coli*", *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol 105, no 23, pp 7899-7906.
5. Evolution 101, 2009, "The Big Issues",
<http://evolution.berkeley.edu/evosite/evo101/VIIIBigissues.shtml>
6. Ashton, J. (Ed), 2007, " In six Days: Why fifty scientists choose to believe in creation" . Master Books, Green Forest, USA,. see: <http://creationontheweb.com/content/view/3323/> or
<http://www.creationontheweb.com/isd>
7. <http://creation.com/john-sanford> See also: Sanford J.C., 2008, *Genetic Entropy & the Mystery of the Genome*, Feed My Sheep Foundation, Inc, Livonia, NY.
8. Vardiman L., Snelling A.A. and Chaffin E.F., 2005, *Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth*, Institute for Creation Research, El Cajon, CA., see for example tables pp 411, 414.
9. http://www.setterfield.org/Dodwell_Manuscript_1.html