

The science of truth

[Business](#)



Since the Fall of Man, when sin entered the world, mankind has consistently pushed aside God's helping hand to the point that now; over one in ten people deny that god even exists.

In the mid 1800's, a group of the world's top scientists, of the time, gathered at a convention and ruled that God could not be considered as a scientific explanation. That decision gives the impression that there is not enough hard evidence to make Christianity truthful. However, if people were fully informed on this subject one can see that Christianity is the only logical explanation of life: how it began and how it is now. Throughout life, as people are growing, learning and changing, they are , in many cases, misinformed of several theories about the beginning of life. One of the most well-known of these theories is Charles R. Darwin's theory of Evolution by means of Natural Selection.

Darwin explains that life started out as one single-celled organism. When the organism reproduced, its offspring's DNA was slightly altered, presenting the offspring with a new trait, created by a mutation in the DNA. If the new trait was beneficial to the offspring it would continue into the generations to come. If the trait was useless or harmful to the organism, it would be discarded and would not appear in the next generation of organisms. This process would take place over millions of years until every species of plants and animals was created by slight and numerous modifications of the original single-celled organism. Also according to Darwin, even the first single-celled organism arose from slight and numerous modifications and mutations that came from the creation of the first protein.

However, by definition, Natural Selection cannot create anything; it can only change (Allen Unlocking) Natural Selection alters the DNA in an organism; it does not and cannot create new genes and strands of DNA. However, Natural Selection does exist. It can be observed in the existence of dogs that descend from wolves. Furthermore, Evolution by means of Natural Selection suggests that the creation of the first protein came to be when a group of amino acids randomly put themselves in place and shape to form the first protein. However, that process is not how proteins are made.

The creation of a protein begins in the nucleus when a process called “ Translation” copies a section of DNA and sends the copy into the main part of the cell. From then, the DNA copy (RNA) will enter another machine called a ribosome. As it goes through, specific types of amino acids will go through and will be connected together by the RNA and the ribosome. From there, the line of amino acids will enter a different type of protein where they are shaped into the type of protein they need to be and shipped off to where they are needed (Allen Unlocking). All of these parts of the cell are needed to create the first protein, and the system itself is too complex to have slowly evolved. Another error can be found and was pointed out in Darwin’s own text.

In his book, *The Origin of Species*, he states, “ If it could be demonstrated that an organ could not have existed due to numerous slight modifications my theory would absolutely break down” (Allen Darwin’s Dilemma). In more basic terms, Darwin is saying that if an irreducible complex organ was to be discovered, his theory would be invalid. Years after Darwin’s death, a new organ was found to be a part of the living cell: the flagella cell motor.

<https://assignbuster.com/the-science-of-truth/>

Because of the way the flagella is designed, it cannot be broken down or evolved from Natural Selection. (Allen Darwin's Dilemma) The flagella would not exist today if Evolution by means of Natural Selection were true.

The flagella would have started as a useless part (for it cannot operate without the other parts of the organ) and Natural Selection would have discarded it. The flagella cell motor is the irreducible complex organ Darwin spoke of, proving his theory to be invalid. Moreover, According to Darwin's theory of Evolution by means of Natural Selection, changes in a species are very slight and numerous. It would take millions of years for a new species of life to arise. However, in the early 1900's a British archeologist by the name of Charles Doolittle Walcott made a discovery in the Canadian Rockies that would rock Darwin's world. In the Rockies, Walcott discovered thousands upon thousands of complex pre-Cambrian species.

The rate these thousands of different species appeared was too fast for Evolution by means of Natural Selection to let them slowly change. Lastly, the smallest forms of life are too complex, especially the way they work. "Life is built upon information. In fact, in just one of the trillions of cells that make up the human body, the amount of information in its genes would fill at least 1, 000 books of 500 pages of typewritten information. Scientists now think this is hugely underestimated.

" (Ham 18) This amount of information cannot just slowly come to be. The information in DNA is more like a language. According to The New Answers on page 19: " In the DNA of a cell, the order of its molecules is also meaningless, except that in the biochemistry of a cell, there is a language

system (other molecules) that makes the order meaningful. DNA without the language system is meaningless, and the language system without DNA wouldn't work either. The other complication is that the language system that reads the order of the molecules in the DNA is itself specified by the DNA. This is another one of those “ machines” that must already be in existence and fully formed, or life won't work!” The DNA and the other molecules that make up the language system are completely dependent on each other.

The language system and DNA could not survive if one part had not fully evolved yet. Evolution could not possibly be the origin of life. Evolution is not the only attempt at explaining life's existence without God in the equation. Another theory, created by Materialists, is the Piano Accordion Theory. This theory was created by Albert Einstein before he, so rightfully, turned Christianity. He suggested that the universe never had a beginning.

Through some of his observations with the most powerful telescope of its time, the Hubble Telescope, Einstein recorded the light emission from a specific star. From the light emission, he calculated how far away the star was from Earth. A while later, he observed the same star to find it had actually gotten farther from Earth. Einstein discovered that the universe was expanding. He theorized that the universe undergoes cycles of expanding and contracting.

The brilliant scientist later admitted the error of his ways. In order for the size of the universe to shrink, more mass would need to be created to create a stronger gravitational pull, breaking the Law of Conservation of Mass,

which states that “matter can neither be created nor destroyed.” (Meyer) Some people still believe that the universe was always here. However, Einstein’s observations were still true. The universe is expanding, meaning that there was once a point when the universe did not exist. Another incorrect theory states that a machine continuously created different universes until it created one that could sustain complex life: the known universe today.

However, there is no evidence of how the universe making machine came to be, or the machine that made that universe making machine and so on. To continue, perhaps the most well-known theory, taught in every American school, is that the Earth is billions of years old. Materialists have said to know this from their “reliable” dating systems. The first dating system, Carbon-14 dating, or radiocarbon dating, measures the amount of the unstable element of Carbon-14 in the remains of a living organism. In summary, radiocarbon dating measures the amount of the unstable element Carbon-14. All living organisms gather Carbon-14 inside of them throughout their lives.

A plant takes the Carbon-14 in through Carbon Dioxide and gives it to animals when the plants are eaten. The animal that eats these plants (and takes in the Carbon-14) will continue to gather it until the day it dies. When the creature dies, the amount of Carbon-14 stops increasing and begins to slowly decrease. What radiocarbon dating measures is the amount of Carbon-14 left in the carcasses of the deceased creature, no matter the age. The problem with this is that there are three key factors for radiocarbon dating to work: the starting amount of C-14 (Carbon-14), the current amount

of C-14 and the decaying rate of the C-14. Materialists believe they can find all three.

Dr. Willard Libby, the founder of radiocarbon dating, assumed the decay rate of the C-14 to have always been the same, in which he could calculate the original amount of C-14. However, there are many errors in this critical assumption. “ The magnetic field of the earth is decaying (getting weaker). The stronger the field is around the earth, the fewer the number of cosmic rays that are able to reach the atmosphere.

This would result in a smaller production of C-14 in earth’s past.” (Ham 83). This means that there was a smaller production of Carbon-14 in Earth’s past than there is today. The other dating system is radiometric dating or Radioisotope dating. When evidence against radiocarbon dating was presented, Materialists put their faith in radiometric dating.

This place of faith is yet another critical error. Radiometric dating measures the elements of elements in rocks. Over time some of the “ parent elements” will slowly decay into other “ daughter” elements. Suspiciously, “ sedimentary rocks, which contain most of the world’s fossils, are not commonly used in radioisotope dating [radiometric dating]” (Ham 115). A group of scientists, called RATE (Radioisotopes and the Age of The Earth) obtained the type of rocks favored for radiometric dating from Mount St. Helens.

They knew the sample to have been formed from 1986. Radiometric dating announced that the twenty-six year old sample was between . 5 million and 2. 8 million years old. The RATE group then obtained eleven samples known
<https://assignbuster.com/the-science-of-truth/>

to have been formed from eruptions in 1949, 1954, and 1975 from Mount Ngauruhoe in New Zealand. “ The ‘ ages’ of the rocks ranged from 0.

27 to 3. 5 million years old” (Ham 118). Apparently, according to the radiometric dating, the actual date of these eruptions that made the samples RATE used, is wrong and the eruptions actually took place at least 0. 27 million years ago, millions of years before the scientists could have recorded it. Now, with their dating systems unreliable, one would think that there wouldn’t be anymore evidence against a billion-year-old Earth.

To continue, the amount of salt in the Earth’s oceans increases every year (Men in White). The oceans of Earth would be replaced with large masses of salt if Earth was really billions of years old. In addition, in every rock-like mineral, there is an amount of hydrogen. This amount decreases very slightly every year. The amount of hydrogen would have long disappeared had the Earth really been billions of years old (Men in White).

One would think that both of these pieces of evidence, but there is still more. In Minnesota, 2005, the fossilized skeleton of a T-Rex was discovered in a canyon. The bones were too heavy to lift out of the canyon so the head archeologists did something no one else had dared to do. They split the bones and carried the pieces out. Back in the lab, scientists discovered living blood cells and tissue in the bones. Had the fossils actually been as old as the unreliable radiocarbon dating announces, then the tissue would have rotten away and the cells would have died and completely fossilized.

The cells could only have been a few thousand years old! To continue, Materialists cannot explain thought. They explain that emotions are

<https://assignbuster.com/the-science-of-truth/>

hormones that are released in the human body, which, for the most part, is true. In the book *The New Answers*, it says: “ But if the universe were merely a chance accident, then why should logical reasoning be possible? If my brain is merely the product of mutations (guided only by natural selection), then why should I think that it can be determined what is true? The secular, evolutionary worldview cannot account for the existence of logical reasoning.” If the human brain evolved from mere chance, then the Materialists that created all of these Godless theories, could not be able to tell if it was true since their brains could not be evolved enough to tell right from wrong. In an attempt to counter Creationists, Materialists begin by asking where the Ice Age fits in with Creation. The secular view of the Ice Age is that there were four actual Ice Ages that each occurred for a few millennia.

However, recent evidence shows one rapid Ice Age that could only have been hundreds to a mere few thousand years old. “ When attempting to account for ice ages, the uniformitarian scientists do not consider one key element – the Genesis Flood. What if there truly were a worldwide Flood? How would it have affected the climate? A worldwide Flood would have caused volcanism. It would have also greatly disturbed the climate” (Ham 212). The aerosols (very small particles) from the volcanic dust would have been trapped in Earth’s atmosphere, blocking a proportional amount of sunlight and cooling the surface of Earth substantially (Ham 213). Moreover, the Materialists counter this truth by questioning whether there was even a global Flood.

Most religions believe in some sort of “ great flood” or catastrophic event, but that does not mean it is true. However, Materialists don’t open their eyes to the evidence of Noah’s Global Flood that is staring them in the face. On page 138 of *The New Answers*, it says: “ Some layers of strata extend across continents, revealing the effects of a huge catastrophe. The earth’s crust has massive amounts of layered sedimentary rock, sometimes miles (kilometers) deep! These layers of sand, soil and material – mostly laid down by water – were once soft like mud, but they are now hard stone. Encased in these sedimentary layers are billions of dead things (fossils of plants and animals) buried very quickly.” Even after this, Materialists will not accept defeat.

They claim that since God cannot be seen, tasted, touched, smelt, felt, or seen, then according to the five senses, He cannot exist. However, if they were to use this reasoning, than gravity also does not exist, neither does Earth’s magnetic field. According to these Materialists’ reasoning, life cannot be sustained on Earth because neither Earth’s gravity nor magnetic field can exist. With all of this evidence supporting Creation and Christianity, one would be baffled to see how the Materialists still claim that life came to be by chance. Most people that have no faith in God explain that the Earth is the way it is by mere chance.

They might also expect the chance of an Earth-like planet to be fairly proportional. However, the actual ratio for a planet to be able to sustain complex life is exactly $1/1 \times 10^{68}$ (Created Cosmos). That is one, one times ten to the sixty-eighth; one over a one with sixty-eight zeros behind it. This chance is much like the chance of throwing every Scrabble piece into a hat, turning the hat over and the letters forming a logical sentence as they hit the

<https://assignbuster.com/the-science-of-truth/>

table. There are many key factors to a life-sustaining planet. One factor a planet must have to sustain life is to have the exact type of sun Earth has.

The size and heat of the Earth's sun gives off the perfect amount of heat. Another factor is the distance the Earth is from the sun. It would be like Venus, a greenhouse-effected planet too hot to sustain life if Earth was 5% closer. It would be like Mars, too cold for life to exist if Earth was 20% farther away. Another key factor is the size and distance the moon is from Earth. The moon is one fourth the size of Earth.

Its gravitational pull is just right to control the tides. To be Earth-like, the planet must have a good amount of liquid water. Liquid water absorbs heat from the sun and is able to cool the planet just right. A proportional amount of land with water is also essential to a life-sustaining planet. An Earth-like planet must have an oxygen rich atmosphere for life to be able to even live. An Earth-like planet must have the exact size of magnetic field.

If Earth's was even slightly smaller, the magnetic field could not stop the harmful radioactive waves the sun sends and it would turn into a planet like Venus. The planet must have Earth's exact rotation and nearly circular orbit for the correct seasonal changes. (Allen Privileged) As stated before, the ratio ($1/1 \times 10^{68}$) is too small to have happened by chance. To add on, the qualities that keep the universe stable are so finely tuned that if any are even slightly changed, for example: gravity, anything larger than a tiny organ of a cell would be crushed and life could not be sustained. Moreover, Earth not only is in the perfect place for life, but it is also in the perfect spot for scientific observations and discoveries. Earth is in the right place of the

solar system not only to maintain life, but it is just inside the gas giants, providing a clear night sky.

Earth's solar system is in between two of the Milky Way's "arms" (clusters of billions of stars). If Earth was in those "arms", it would get insufficient light from the sun, and life could not be sustained. Also, the night sky is clear of the dust and therefore open for observations. The Milky Way itself is in the perfect spot, facing out towards millions of other unexplored galaxies. The moon is the perfect size and distance away from Earth and the sun for observations of solar and lunar eclipses to occur. Earth is in the perfect spot not only for life, but for discoveries and that chance, along with the chance that Earth can even sustain life, is so small it could not have happened randomly (Allen Privileged).

Life can only exist or have come to be through God. Parmenides, an ancient scholar, once said, "Anything that has contradiction cannot exist." To this day, there has not been a valid contradiction to Creation that, for the most part, has not been disproven. Therefore, according to Parmenides, Creation must be true. Seeing how Creationism has been the only explanation that cannot be disproven, it is the world's only truth. Works Cited Allen, Lad, dir.

Darwin's Dilemma. Perf. Stephen Meyer and Paul Nelson. 2009. Illustria Media, 2009.

DVD. – – -, dir. Privileged Planet. Perf. Stephen Meyer and Paul Nelson. 2009.

Illustria Media, 2009. DVD. – – -, dir. Unlocking the Secrets of Life. Perf.

Stephen Meyer and Paul Nelson. 2009. Illustria Media, 2009. DVD. Created
Cosmos. Dir.

Jason Lisle, Dr. 2011. Answers in Genesis, 2011. DVD. Foster, David. “
Proving God Exists.

” Saturday Evening Post Nov. 1999: n. pag. Print. Ham, Ken, ed.

The New Answers Book 1. Green Forest: Answers In Genesis, 2006. Print.
Men In White. 2007. Creation Museum, 2007.

DVD. Meyer, Stephen, Dr., and Del Tackett, perf. TrueU. 2010. Focus On the
Family, 2010.

DVD.