

Young Earth Creation: The Scientific Evidence

Ross S. Olson MD

Origins is like forensic science. There are no controlled experiments on the origin of life as it actually happened. Stanley Miller was able to produce simple organic molecules using the presumed “primitive atmosphere” of the earth, electric sparks and a trap. But he was no closer to life than finding a block shaped rock is to finding a spontaneously formed Taj Mahal.

The secular scientist avoids considering creation by defining science as the search for natural explanations, -- which is reasonable -- but then subtly implying that only the natural exists. This is a philosophical assumption, not science and not logic.

When no plausible natural cause can be found, is it not logical to consider something outside of natural causes? For example, we recognize an arrowhead as a product of intelligent manipulation, even though it is theoretically possible that erosion might form one. A living cell is as complex as a city and the human brain is as complex as the internet and no natural process produces things like the Encyclopedia Britannica. In fact time and chance degrade information. Why is it so hard to postulate an intelligent source? Romans 1 gives us a clue. There is active suppression of the truth going on to avoid an uncomfortable conclusion that we are responsible to our Creator.

But what of the Christian who says, “Couldn’t God have used evolution to create?” The answer, of course, is, “Yes, but did He?” I will summarize some of the scientific points.

Firstly, there is design in life that cannot be accounted for by chance or any other natural process. Darwin had no idea of the intricate design of living matter and since he was much more honest and frank than his latter day disciples, I think that today he would admit that his hypothesis has been falsified. The mathematical odds of forming a single protein molecule from its component parts can be shown to be so unlikely that it could not have happened anywhere in the known universe in 30 billion years, much less be combined with the hundreds of other components to form a living cell.¹ Even staunch evolutionists now say that they “have no theory” for the origin of life, but refuse to admit that if there is no natural explanation, then their working hypothesis needs to be a supernatural one.

Theistic evolutionists will respond that God manipulated nature over billions of years, or intervened at intervals to produce the beginning and progression of life. This means that they accept the “other evidences” of evolution. Let me briefly summarize the problems with those. Similarity of form does not prove common ancestry but can also mean common design. (Let me add that young earth creationists believe that the original Genesis kinds were capable of great diversification, similar to what we have seen with the breeds of dogs.) The fossil record is actually evidence against gradualistic evolution with millions of missing links, and the “punctuated equilibrium” theory is really a grasping at straws, only superficially plausible. And fundamentally, fossils require rapid burial. Closed clams, seen all over the world, were covered before they could open in death.

And when interacting with an unbeliever, theistic evolution, long age creation, and intelligent design that does not refer to Biblical data, are all open to the criticism that the designer seems incompetent and clumsy. Atheists point to poorly designed features or broken processes and ask why a creator had to keep tinkering. (Now, some of so-called

“design flaws” have actually been shown to be superior engineering, such as the inverted retina in mammals with the blood supply in front, critical for cooling and in no way interfering with vision because of the wavelengths of light passing through it.) But only the Biblical creationist can speak of a perfect creation forever changed by the Fall and the Curse. The problems are not part of God’s original design, but even so He can use them to draw people to Himself as they come to the end of their own resources.

As to the age of the earth, this seems to be the most formidable barrier to accepting Biblical creation and requires more technical knowledge. Let me cite a few examples that point out the weakness of the arguments for old age and the increasing scientific respectability of a young earth view.

Firstly, the geologic column, such as exposed in the Grand Canyon, is said to be the result of slow deposition of material over tens to hundreds of millions of years. Yet there are sharp distinctions between the layers as if something suddenly changed. Further, there is great difficulty in accounting for the sinking and rising of the continents, regardless of how many eons of time are postulated. And in the case of the Grand Canyon, there is a 200 million year gap in the sequence, between the Cambrian and the Mississippian. The Ordovician and Silurian periods are missing and there is blending and interbedding at the junction. The lower layer would have had to remain soft for 200 million years, not below the water level (or there would be deposits) and not above (or there would be erosion) waiting for the next geologic epoch. It is much easier to see it as the result of a truly worldwide flood, with massive erosive forces caused by tidal waves sweeping over the entire globe, depositing their loads in twice daily low tides.²

Formations such as the very pure St Peter Sandstone, require rapid current to sort and move it, usually attributed to river deltas. Yet it covers an area from Minnesota to Missouri, Illinois to Nebraska, to a depth of 100 to 300 feet. The flood model also can explain the presence of huge deposits of pure uncontaminated salt and gypsum as chemical deposition of mixed brines, not as the remnants of evaporated seas.³ The source of the water and the mechanism of a worldwide flood are worked out in competing models with scientific and Biblical credibility by such creation scientists as Walter Brown⁴ and John Baumgardner⁵ among others. But the fact remains that the uniformitarian origin of the layers is not credible, as shown by polystrate fossils, such as 30 – 50 foot tree trunks standing upright. Obviously they could not wait for thousands much less millions of years to be covered and fossilized or they would have rotted.⁶ And the ocean would be like the Dead Sea if it had been taking in salt for billions of years.⁷

The Grand Canyon also contains pollen in the Pre-Cambrian layers when only single celled organisms were supposed to be alive. This was supposedly discredited by a scientist who used a different method of extraction. But Creation Research Society duplicated the original data and found pollen of extinct species of modern types of trees, so that modern contamination could not be a possible explanation.⁸

Radiometric dating has been used to support long ages, but dating of lava samples from volcano eruptions of known ages has given erroneous ages in the millions. Recently the project called RATE has shown that rocks contain too much helium to be millions of years old⁹ and also there is measurable carbon 14 in all fossils, oil, coal and even diamonds when it ought to be totally gone, implying a young and similar age for all those materials.¹⁰

Evidence of coexistence of humans and dinosaurs is vigorously opposed by the evolutionary establishment but is actually quite convincing. Human and dinosaur tracks have been found in the same strata and have been uncovered on film to prove that they were not manufactured.¹¹ In Ica, Peru¹² and Acambara, Mexico,¹³ artifacts over 2000 years old have been found that depict humans and dinosaurs together, some showing apparent domestication.

What about the astronomical data that implies we are seeing light from stars that has been travelling for billions of years before it reaches us and events such as supernova that seem to have occurred more than 6000 years ago? First of all, the challenges of astronomy do not negate any of the powerful evidences for a young earth that I have given. Secondly, there are many assumptions in determining the distance of astronomical objects. And thirdly, having been convinced of the accuracy of the Bible, I am not going to discard it when one particular answer is not yet clear. And there are clues. One is Russell Humphreys' time distortion with a universe aging rapidly during a short time on earth.¹⁴ Also there is a credible argument that the speed of light might be decaying because, after all, light does change speeds in media of different density and space may have changed from a perfect vacuum to its present near-vacuum state.¹⁵ Further, the Scripture repeatedly states that God "stretched out the heavens," which may well have something to do with what we are seeing.

Recently a T Rex bone was found that contained blood vessels, cells and collagen fibers in the marrow cavity. Rather than admit that this specimen could not be 65 million years old, the response was to claim that we need to rethink how soft tissue is preserved for long ages. In a demonstration of the incredible power of professional peer pressure, the discoverer, self proclaimed evangelical Christian, Mary Schweitzer, claimed that young earth creationists were "hijacking" her data.¹⁶

But bucking peer pressure, plant geneticist J.C.Sanford, at the peak of his illustrious career decided to ask the question, "Can natural selection improve the human genome." The result is in his book, *Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Genome*.¹⁷ The Conclusion? Natural selection can not improve the human genome. It cannot even prevent steady deterioration. There are at least 100 new deleterious mutations in each individual with each generation. The overall fitness of the human race is decreasing by about 1 - 2% per generation. He concludes that we are headed for extinction as a race and that the human genome cannot yet be a thousand generations old or we would already be extinct. This, of course, is contrary to evolution but fits completely with the Biblical account of a perfect creation, spoiled by sin and a world that will some day -- perhaps very soon, -- come to an end.

Much more can be found on www.tccsa.tc and in the over 140 links to other websites.

¹ www.tccsa.tc/articles/is_evolution_reasonable.html

² www.tccsa.tc/articles/grand_canyon_missing_strata.pdf (Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 23, March 1987, pp 160 – 167.)

³ www.tccsa.tc/articles/Saltville.pdf
(Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 40 No. 2 pp 72-84 September 2003)

⁴ www.creationscience.com/

-
- ⁵ www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/faq/tectonics.asp
- ⁶ www.creationresearch.org/crsq/articles/43/43_4/polystrate_fossils.htm (Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 43 No. 3 pp 232-240 March 2007)
- ⁷ tccsa.tc/articles/ocean_sodium.html From "Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Creationism," Pittsburgh, 1990, vol.2, pp. 17 - 33.
- ⁸ www.tccsa.tc/articles/grand_canyon_3.pdf (Creation Research Society Quarterly, Vol. 24, March 1988, pp 173 – 182.)
- ⁹ www.icr.org/article/114/
- ¹⁰ www.icr.org/article/117/
- ¹¹ ***Texas Track and Artifacts*** by Bob Helfinstine and Jerry Roth, available from the author. See www.tccsa.tc/index.html#texas_tracks
- ¹² www.mondovista.com/dinostone.ica2.html and www.mtblanco.com/ForSale/2006/ICASTones.html
- ¹³ **Mystery in Acambaro** by Charles Hapgood, Adventures Unlimited Press, Kempton IL, 1973 www.wexclub.com/aup
- ¹⁴ www.icr.org/article/446/
- ¹⁵ creationontheweb.com/content/view/2551/
- ¹⁶ www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/dinosaur.html and <http://www.icr.org/article/4130/>
- ¹⁷ ***Genetic Entropy and the Mystery of the Genome***, FMS Publications, Waterloo New York, 2005.