

NICK GUY & THE AGE OF THE EARTH AFFAIR

NICK GUY, VOLUME 5

RELEASE DATE: Fall 2011

THEME: Is there enough scientific evidence to prove the Theory of Evolution?

NOTES: The debate between evolutionism and creationism has been going on for many years, and most likely will continue. Ironically, the famous 1925 Scopes came about when high school science teacher, John Scopes, was accused of violating Tennessee's Butler Act which made it unlawful to teach evolution in the Public Schools. Today we see that whole situation reversed. Creationists find themselves going to court and being taken to court over the right to teach the Theory of Creation in the classroom, and those, who once petitioned for "equal time" are now bent on denying it to those who disagree with them.

Any Christian child attending a Public School who believes in the inerrancy of God's word is likely to find themselves at odds with what is presented, many times as scientific fact, in the classroom.

In this episode of Nick Guy, Private Eye, we desire to equip such a child with some information that will help them give a defense for what they believe. Unfortunately, this topic is too big and too expansive to be fully covered in such a short amount of time. So, we concentrated on one area. Using comets and meteorites as a starting point, we present the case that there is no empirical evidence for the theory that the universe is billions of years old. Some of the difficulties of this theory force its adherents to make huge assumptions in order to keep it alive.

METEORITES: Our apologetic begins with meteorites. Comets are balls of dust, gases and ice that orbit the sun. Comets are a primary source of meteorites. As they orbit, solar winds blast off parts of the comet. This debris we see as the comet's tail. When the Earth orbits through the cometary residue, we can see the dust fall in what we call meteor showers (sometimes referred to as falling stars). Occasionally one of these meteors from a meteor shower will enter the earth's atmosphere and hit the planet's surface. These are called meteorites.

Meteorites fall into three basic groups. Stony meteorites resemble material found in the earth's crust. Iron meteorites are made of about 90% iron and 10% nickel. These are very similar to the material found in the earth's core. Stony-iron meteorites contain materials found in both of the other groups.

Most meteorites burn up in the atmosphere, but there are a few rare accounts of meteorites hitting the earth. A boy in Germany was hit by a small meteorite. It was about the size of a pea, and left a small scar where it hit. The boy was quoted as saying, "When it hit me it knocked me flying and then was still going fast enough to bury

itself into the road." Astronomers analyzed the small object and concluded it was indeed from outer space.

In Alabama, a woman reported a meteorite crashing through her roof, bouncing off a piece of furniture, and bruising her hip. Another meteorite hit a parked car in New York. It apparently looked like a fireball as it streaked over the eastern United States. In Spain, a moving car was struck by a meteorite weighing three pounds. It crashed through the windshield and bent the steering wheel.

THE MURCHISON METEORITE: One of the most valuable meteorites is the Murchison meteorite, which was found in Australia 1969. A team studying the meteorite had discovered "components of RNA and DNA" in the rock, exciting those who believe life exists beyond earth. A study was made, examining more of the molecular structure of the meteorite. By using mass spectrometry on a sample and extrapolating based on previous studies, 14,000 different compounds were identified. Many include carbon and were therefore deemed "organic," since carbon is central to all known life. A meteorite, said to be billions of years old, which contains molecules that include carbon atoms, is considered proof by some that life on earth could have been seeded from space.

EVOLUTIONARY PROBLEM #1 - UNIFORMITARIANISM: That this meteorite contains carbon only proves that this meteorite contains carbon. It is not proof that life on earth was seeded from space.

Philippe Schmitt-Kopplin, the leader of the team that studied the Murchison Meteorite wrote: "Having this information means you can tell what was happening during the birth of the solar system. Meteorites are like some kind of fossil. When you try to understand them you are looking back in time." But, it must be remembered, that meteorites, like fossils, are subject to interpretation. It is hard to assume that life on earth was seeded from space. Evolutionists have no clear answer as to how lifeless molecules could have self-organized into reproducing life.

Much in the evolutionary theory is built upon uniformitarian presuppositions, or uniformitarianism. Uniformitarianism is a geological doctrine, a philosophical assumption, which states that the geologic processes we observe today have occurred throughout all of history at the same rate and in the same manner, being unchanged today from those of the unobservable past. The Uniformitarian slogan is, "The present is the key to the past."

Unfortunately, for this doctrine to be usable it must be assumed that there have been no cataclysmic events in earth's history that could have disrupted these geological processes.

The doctrine of Uniformitarianism was held by Charles Lyell, who lived in the 19th century, and is considered the father of modern geology. He is responsible for the general acceptance of Uniformitarianism among geologists today.

In order for uniformitarianism to be useful in determining the past, we must reject the

possibility of sudden or catastrophic events that would disrupt this gradualism proposed by uniformitarianism. This is done sometimes in the face of positive evidence for no other reason than that they were not gradual.

EVOLUTIONARY PROBLEM #2 - THE GEOLOGIC COLUMN: Charles Lyell is the man who is credited with developing the geologic column. It was meant as a means of determining, among other things, the age of the earth. Different layers represent different periods in earth's history, with the oldest, obviously, being on the bottom.

In the uniformitarian view, if all layers of sedimentary rock have always been laid down at a similar rate to what we see today, it is a given that the thickness of rock must relate to thousands or millions of years time, based on today's rates.

Uniformitarianism and the geologic column both run into terrible problems with the discovery of geologic features like fossils that appear in more than one layer, or layers that are "misplaced." Such as ancient layers found above modern layers. Also, cataclysmic events such as the eruption of Mt. St. Helens in 1980, proved that catastrophic events are capable of making significant changes in the earth's currently observable features.

Albert Einstein said: "The most incomprehensible thing about the world is that it is comprehensible." All science is based on the premise that there is order and consistency in the universe.

Those who deny the existence of God, and Him as Creator, cannot give reason for universe being consistent and predictable.

Why would he assume that the same laws that apply on earth will apply throughout the galaxy? This is assumed, but these assumptions do not come from what we call naturalism, but from the Bible. The naturalist must borrow the creationist idea that the laws of nature exist and are understandable.

It is through the study of physical things that we begin to comprehend the ultimate truth that God does exist and that we can, to a limited degree at least, grasp His majesty.

EVOLUTIONARY PROBLEM #3 - THE OORT CLOUD: As stated before, meteorites are meteors that have entered the earth's atmosphere, and meteors are debris that fall off of comets. Comets lose about 1% of their mass every time they orbit the Sun, indicating that they cannot last forever. Estimates put a comet's life at 100,000 years. If the universe were billions of years old, as Evolutionists believe, then we would expect there to be no comets left.

This problem is overcome by the existence of the Oort Cloud. The Oort Cloud is a vast reservoir of icy masses which orbits at the edge of the Sun's orb of physical, gravitational, or dynamical influence. Occasionally an icy mass falls into the inner solar system to become a new comet. New comets are always coming into being as old

ones become nonexistent.

The problem with this whole defense is that no confirmed direct observations of the Oort cloud have been made, so there is no real evidence of its existence. Evolutionists reason that the Oort Cloud must exist in order for the old-age earth theory to be correct. It exists in the minds of scientists with no evidence. The Oort Cloud is not proof for evolution, but rather, it's existence is based on the assumption that evolution is true.

EVOLUTIONARY PROBLEM #4 - THE EXISTENCE OF STARS:The evolutionary explanation of how stars came into being is this: Energy was gradually converted into matter with the continually expanding universe following the big bang. As the matter accumulated, the first atoms were formed. As the expansion of the universe slowed and it cooled down, hydrogen, helium and small amounts of lithium were formed from the energy. These gases gathered into what we call nebulae. From this process, planets and stars were formed. This all occurred, they believe, over millions of years.

But this is all speculation, not fact, as it has never been observed. The suggestion is that stars formed as these gases collapsed due to gravity. As the nebulae collapses, the gases heat up and the nebulae spins itself into a sort of flattened disk. One big problem with this scenario is that as the gases are heated, the pressure would increase, causing the nebulae to expand and counteract the gravitational collapse.

To counter this problem, the Evolutionist argues that there would be some sort of shock which overcomes this gas pressure at just the right time. This shock, they assume would come from the explosion of a supernova. But this is what is called a circular argument. In order for the first stars to form there would need to be other stars reaching the supernova stage which would cause the first stars to form. But, with no other stars in existence, the necessary "shock" to form those first stars would not be available.

EVOLUTIONARY PROBLEM #5 - RADIOMETRIC DATING - The Evolutionist theory of an old earth age is defended primarily through the use of radiometric dating. Radiometric dating of rocks is a supposedly useful way of determining the age of the earth. Radioactive isotopes decay to form isotopes of different elements. The starting isotope is referred to as the "parent" and the ending one the "daughter." If certain things are known it is possible to calculate the amount of time that has passed since the "parent" isotope began to decay.

For example it would take 5,730 years for 1 gram of carbon-14 to decay to half a gram. And in 11,460 it would be down to one-fourth of a gram.

But, the accuracy of radiometric dating is questionable as it is based on several assumptions. First, we have to know the rate of radioactive decay and that rate has been constant. Secondly, we must know that there has been neither loss nor gain of the parent or daughter isotopes from the rock. And thirdly, we assume to know the

amounts of parent and daughter isotopes present when the rock was formed.

Rocks of known recent age were tested and the results showed dates of millions, and even billions, of years. Also, samples taken only a few feet apart gave ages that differed from hundreds of millions of years. All calling into serious question the accuracy of radiometric dating.

There are other pieces of information that further undermined the soundness of the old-earth age theory. For example, the moon is spiraling away from the Earth at a current rate of 1.5 inches per year. Using the known rate of recession we can calculate the rate of recession in the distant past. This is necessitated by the fact that the closer the moon is to planet earth the tidal bulges are much larger. With this in mind it can be determined that the moon would have been touching the Earth only 1.5 billion years ago.

Also, if the earth were to be billions of years old the amount of salt in the ocean and the earth's weakening magnetic field would be much greater than they are today. And the fact that there is no recorded human history before 6,000 years ago, further lends support to a young-earth age.

THE SCIENCE VS. RELIGION DEBATE: Evolutionary theories continue to change. One day we are told that the universe is expanding, the next that it is shrinking or oscillating or staying the same. If measurements don't match the theory, they speculate about "dark matter" or "dark energy" which can't be seen but is needed for the theory to work.

The Evolutionist will argue that since new discoveries are constantly being made, they force a change in the theory. With this being the case, how then can they speak with authority? How can they be certain that they now possess all knowledge?

Evolution does not prove that the earth is billions of years old, billions of years are required in order for evolution to be true. Neither have been empirically proven

Creationism should be relegated to religion class: Many in the evolutionary camp hold that creationism is exclusively a religious belief and has no place in science class. True science, they claim, deals with facts, not religious beliefs.

Both Creationists and Evolutionists use the same data. What varies is the interpretation. The Theory of Evolution is not supported by empirical scientific facts but rather on interpretation of scientific data. It is very unscientific to dismiss a theory just because it happens to agree with Scripture.

If that standard is used, we should reject the fact that the earth is round and that it is suspended in space, because Isaiah 40:22 and Job 26:7 & 10 tell us both of these things. It is important to remember that both of these facts were opposed by the science of the day at the time they were recorded in Scripture.

Evolutionists and Creationists base their theories on the testing and analyzing of data. Both test and analyze the same data. Creationism does not merely rest upon the argument of Scripture, but a solid interpretation of data.

Honest Science: The Evolutionist claims to make scientific assumptions based upon what they know, not trusting, as some would say, in an “Ancient holy book.”

As Christians, we can boldly proclaim that we hold to the Bible as the infallible word of God, and have no need to apologies for that. As to its trustworthiness, it has proven to not only be a source of great wisdom but it also contains verifiable historical facts. [See notes on *Nick Guy & the Man from Nazareth Affair*] The accuracy of it's writers is unmatched in all of literature. And, although it is not a science book, if its reliability is established in other areas, we can have great confidence that it is reliable when speaking of the origins of the universe.

True science is based upon verifiable fact. Yet when the Evolutionist cannot explain how comets, with a life span of 100,000 years, can still exist after 4.5 billion years, they invent the Oort Cloud to fit their theory.

An evolutionary atheist once told me that he did not claim to have all the answers. He told me that there is much we do not know about the universe. What I challenged him with was this: With all that you don't know, with all that remains mysterious, why is it the one thing you are quite certain of is that there is no God?

RESOURCES: Perhaps one of the best resources is Answers in Genesis
www.answersingenesis.org

A lot of the information for this episode came from the writings of Dr. Jason Lisle, who is connected with Answers in Genesis.