

Young Earth Evidences

Introduction. It is becoming increasingly rare in the creation/ evolution controversy to find points on which both creationists and evolutionists agree. Generally speaking, the two are light-years apart from start to finish. But there is one point on which parties on both sides agree: evolution is utterly impossible if the Earth or universe is young -- with an age measured in thousands, not billions, of years.

A simple, straightforward reading of the biblical record indicates that everything was created in six days only a few thousand years ago. Opposed to that view, of course, is the idea of evolutionary theorists that the universe is 8-20 billion years old, and that the Earth is almost 5 billion years old. Even to a casual observer, it is apparent that this is a big problem. There is ample scientific evidence to indicate that such time is not available, and that the Earth is relatively young, not extremely old. Candid writers have admitted this fact. Dr. Stephen Moorbath of the University of Oxford wrote, "No terrestrial rocks closely approaching an age of 4.6 billion years have yet been discovered. The evidence for the age of the Earth is circumstantial, being based upon ... indirect reasoning." Dr. John Eddy of the High Altitude Observatory in Boulder, Colorado declared, "There is no evidence based solely on solar observations that the Sun is 4.5 to 5 billion years old." He went on to say, "I suspect that the Sun is 4.5 billion years old. However, given some new and unexpected results to the contrary, and some time for frantic recalculation and theoretical readjustment, I suspect that we could live with Bishop Ussher's value for the age of the Earth and Sun. I don't think we have much in the way of observational evidence in astronomy to conflict with that" (1978, p. 18).

Without immeasurable stretches of time to fall back on, evolutionists would be sitting ducks for even the questions of high school students. The proven uncertainties about scientific dating are a well-kept secret, but the average person gets the clear impression that dating is an exact science. Since no one can envision ten thousand years -- much less a half-million or a million years -- scientists can hide behind the billions years that they say evolution took, and they think they can hide there in relative safety. But it is hard to overthrow a belief that has been taught as "scientific truth" for so long. Yet when all the evidence is considered, the evolutionists' claims of an ancient Earth are not as strong as they appear.

I. ***Supernova Remnants***

- A. According to astronomical observations, galaxies like our own experience about one supernova (a violently-exploding star) every 25 years. The gas and dust remnants from such explosions (like the Crab

Nebula) expand outward rapidly and should remain visible for over a million years.

- B. Yet the nearby parts of our galaxy in which we could observe such gas and dust shells contain only about 200 supernova remnants. That number is consistent with only about 7,000 years worth of supernovas.

II. ***Dark Matter And Spiral Galaxies***

- A. Dark matter and dark energy are two of the most aggravating problems in science today. Together they dominate the universe, comprising some 96% of all mass and energy. But nobody knows what either is. It's tempting to consider them products of the same unknown phenomenon ... Dark matter was invoked decades ago to explain why galaxies hold together. Given regular matter alone, galaxies might never have formed, and today they would fly apart. So there must be some unknown material that forms invisible clumps to act as gravitational glue.
- B. In other words, the galaxies themselves (if they really were hundreds of millions, or billions of years old) should not possess spiral arms, but should simply consist of large balls of stars, with more stars in the center and fewer on the perimeter. This is because, as galaxies spin, after about 4-5 revolutions, they should lose their "structure" (i.e. their spiral arms), but for some reason they do not.
- C. Astronomers believe this is because there is a lot more mass in the galaxies than can be detected, and so they have invented the theory of "Dark Matter" to account for their belief that the galaxies are billions of years old, when (in fact) they look quite young.
- D. Another way to think of this is to consider our solar system. The planets that are closest to the Sun are rotating around it much more rapidly than those on the outside. This is also (almost certainly) the way it is with spiral galaxies (i.e., the stars near the center are rotating around the center faster than those on the outer edges). Yet in the case spiral galaxies, astronomers and cosmologists believe that the outer stars are rotating around their central cores almost as fast as the ones in the center. In other words, they believe that some invisible force is holding it together so that it turns around like a rigid mass (or like a ferris wheel). For example, they believe that Neptune and Pluto are rotating around the Sun, not in 165 and 248 years (as they do), but almost as fast as the Earth.

III. ***Comets***

- A. Short period comets "boil off" 1-2% of their mass each time they pass the Sun. After several hundred revolutions they disintegrate. Nothing should remain of these comets after about 10,000 years.

- B. There are no known sources for replenishing comets. If comets came into existence at the same time as the solar system, the solar system must be less than 10,000 years old (Thomas D. Nicholson, "Comets, Studied for Many Years, Remain an Enigma to Scientists," *Natural History*, March 1966, 44-47; Harold Armstrong, "Comets and a Young Solar System," *Speak to the Earth*, ed. George F. Howe [New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1975], 327-330; and Steidi, 58-59).

IV. **Radiation From Jupiter And Saturn**

- A. Jupiter and Saturn are each radiating more than twice the energy they receive from the Sun (H. H. Aumann and C. M. Gillespie, Jr., "The Internal Powers and Effective Temperature of Jupiter and Saturn," *The Astrophysical Journal*, Vol. 157, July 1969, 169-172; "Close Encounter with Saturn," *Time*, November 10, 1980, 78).
- B. Calculations show that it is very unlikely that this energy comes from radioactive decay or gravitational contraction. The only other conceivable explanation is that these planets have not existed long enough to cool off (cf. Steidi, 51-52, 55).

V. **Meteorite Deposits**

- A. There have been no authenticated reports of the discovery of meteorites in sedimentary material (Peter A. Steveson, "Meteoritic Evidence or a Young Earth," *Creation Research Quarterly*, Vol. 12, June 1975, 23-25). The amount of meteoritic dust which should have accumulated on the Earth after five billion years is 182 feet. Because this dust is high in nickel, there should be a very large amount of nickel in the crustal rocks of the Earth. No such concentration has been found -- on land or in the oceans. Consequently, the Earth appears to be young (Henry M. Morris, *Scientific Creationism* [San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1974], 151-153; Steveson, 23-25; Hans Peterson, "Cosmic Spherules and Meteoritic Dust," *Scientific American*, Vol. 202, February 1960, 132).
- B. Also, the Sun acts as a giant vacuum cleaner which sweeps up about 100,000 tons of micrometeorites per day. If the solar system were significantly older than 10,000 years, no micrometeorites should remain since there is no significant source of replenishment. A large disk shaped cloud of these particles is orbiting the Sun. The natural conclusion is that the solar system is less than 10,000 years old (Paul M. Steidi, "The Earth, the Stars, and the Bible" [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979], 60-61).

VI. ***The Shrinking Sun***

- A. Since 1836, more than 100 different observers at the Royal Greenwich Observatory and the U.S. Naval Observatory have made direct visual measurements which show that the diameter of the Sun is shrinking at a rate of about .1% each century or about five feet per hour! Furthermore, records of solar eclipses infer that this rapid shrinkage has been going on for at least the past 400 years ("Analyses of Historical Data Suggest Sun Is Shrinking," Physics Today, September 1979, 17-19).
- B. Several indirect techniques also confirm this gravitational collapse, although these inferred collapse rates are only about 1/7th as much (David W. Dunham, et. al., "Observations of a Probable Change in the Solar Radius Between 1715 and 1979," Science, Vol. 210, December 12, 1980, 1243-1245; and Irwin Shapiro, "Is the Sun Shrinking?", Science, Vol. 208, April 4, 1980, 51-53). However, using the most conservative data, one must conclude that had the Sun existed a million years ago, it would have been so large that it would have heated the Earth so much that life could not have survived. Yet, evolutionists say that a million years ago all the present forms of life were essentially as they are now, having completed their evolution that began long ago.

VII. ***The Receding Moon***

- A. The gravitational pull between the Earth and Moon causes the Earth's oceans to have tides. The tidal friction between the Earth's terrestrial surface and the water moving over it causes energy to be added to the Moon. This results in a constant yearly increase in the distance between the Earth and Moon. This tidal friction also causes the Earth's rotation to slow down, but more importantly, the energy added to the Moon causes it to recede from the Earth. The rate of recession was measured at 4 cm/year in 1981; however, according to Physicist Donald B. DeYoung: "One cannot extrapolate the present 4 cm/year separation rate back into history. It has that value today, but was more rapid in the past because of tidal effects."
- B. Because of this, the Moon must be less than 750 million years old -- or 20% of the supposed 4.5 billion-year age of the Earth-Moon system. Even though the maximum age obtained from this method is more than 10,000 years, it is nevertheless much younger than the alleged 4.5 billion year age for the Earth-Moon system proposed by evolutionists. Note also that nobody knows how the Moon got to be in its present orbit. All of the proposed theories as to where it came from have serious problems. It is a complete mystery -- unless of course it was designed that way from the beginning.

VIII. ***The Earth's Magnetic Field***

- A. Direct measurements of the Earth's magnetic field, since Gauss first evaluated it in 1835, show a steady and rapid decline in its strength. This decay pattern is consistent with the theoretical view that there is an electrical current inside the Earth which produces the magnetic field. Electrical resistance in the Earth's core wears down the electrical current which produces the Earth's magnetic field. That causes the field to lose energy rapidly.
- B. Evolutionary theories explaining this rapid decrease, as well as how the Earth could have maintained its magnetic field for billions of years are very complex and inadequate. A much better creationist theory exists. It is straightforward, based on sound physics, and explains many features of the field: its creation, rapid reversals during the Flood, surface intensity decreases and increases until the time of Christ, and a steady decay since then. This theory matches paleomagnetic, historic, and present data, most startlingly with evidence for rapid changes.
- C. Physicists have examined the depletion of the Earth's magnetic field and shown that, given its rate of depletion, the Earth cannot be older than about 10,000 years. If this view is correct, then 25,000 years ago the electrical current would have been so vast that the Earth's structure could not have survived. This would imply that the Earth could not be older than 10,000 years (Thomas G. Barnes, *Origin and Destiny of the Earth's Magnetic Field* [San Diego: Institute for Creation Research, 1973]).

IX. ***Helium And Carbon-14 In The Atmosphere***

- A. The atmosphere has less than 40,000 years worth of helium, based on its production from the decay of uranium and thorium. As uranium decays, the helium produced escapes from the Earth's surface and accumulates in the atmosphere. As time passes, the amount of helium in the atmosphere increases. There is no known means by which large amounts of helium can escape from the atmosphere. If the present rate of accumulation had been constant throughout four billion years of the Earth's history, there should be thirty times as much helium in our present atmosphere as is presently there (Melvin A. Cook, *Prehistory and Earth Models* [London: Max Parrish, 1966], 10-14).
- B. Scientists have estimated the amount of uranium in the Earth's crust. From this they estimate the amount of helium that should be produced, and from these they can calculate how much helium is being added to the atmosphere over a given amount of time.
- C. If we use the same assumptions that radiometric dating experts make (i.e., no initial daughter/byproduct -- in this case helium -- in the

Earth's early atmosphere, a constant decay rate, and that nothing has occurred to add to or take away the helium), then the Earth's atmosphere is at most 1.76 million years old. Other estimates say it is much less (or a maximum of only 175,000 years).

- D. Furthermore, Carbon-14 is produced when radiation from the Sun strikes Nitrogen-14 atoms in the Earth's upper atmosphere. The Earth's atmosphere is not yet saturated with Carbon-14. This means that the amount of Carbon-14 being produced is greater than the amount that is decaying back to Nitrogen-14.
1. It is estimated that a state of equilibrium would be reached in as little as 30,000 years. In fact, the evidence suggests it is less than 10,000 years old.
 2. Some of these estimates place the atmosphere's age between 50,000-100,000 years, but they each pose serious problems for the standard evolution-based scenarios.

X. ***Mineral And Salt Deposits In The Oceans***

- A. The rate at which elements such as copper, gold, tin, lead, silicon, mercury, uranium, and nickel are entering the oceans is very rapid when compared with the small quantities of these elements already in the oceans.
1. Uranium salts, for example, presently appear to be accumulating in the oceans at about 100 times the rate of their loss. It is estimated that 60 billion grams of uranium are added to the oceans annually.
 2. Under uniformitarian rules, the total concentration of uranium salts of the oceans could be accumulated in less than one million years.
- B. When making measurements, the great majority of minerals yield young ages for the Earth's oceans -- many of which are less than 5,000 years old.
1. For example, the Dead Sea receives fresh water from the Sea of Galilee via the Jordan River. The Dead Sea has a very high salt content, and it continues to get saltier since it has no outlet other than by evaporation.
 2. Scientists have measured the amount of salt added each year by the Jordan River; and they have also calculated the amount of salt in the Dead Sea. From these it is possible to estimate the length of this process. Assuming a constant rate of flow, and a zero salt level at the beginning, then the age of the Dead Sea is only 13,000 years old.

XI. ***Radiometric Dating***

- A. There are around 20 different radiometric dating methods for rocks, and they are said to be the most dependable of all methods in use

today. These methods are based upon the decay sequences of certain elements. For example, in the uranium-lead radiometric dating scheme, uranium-238 (called a "parent" element) will, through a series of decomposition processes, produce lead-206 (referred to as a "daughter" element). Since scientists believe they know the present rate of decay, if a sample rock is found to contain both uranium-238 and lead-206, the ratio of the two is used to determine the age of the sample.

- B. However, scientists admit that in order for this technique to be valid, certain assumptions must be granted. If we assume that (1) a rock contained no lead-206 when it was formed; (2) all lead-206 now in the rock was produced by radioactive decay of uranium-238; (3) the rate of decay has been constant; (4) there has been no differential leaching by water of either element; and, (5) no uranium-238 has been transported into the rock from another source, then we might expect our estimate of age to be fairly accurate.
- C. Each assumption is a potential variable, the magnitude of which can seldom be ascertained. Therefore scientists must make a guess with regard to what they believe the original conditions might have been. The shorter the time involved, the more likely it is that a specific process has been constant, and unaltered by external influences.
- D. Recent research has shown that while these decay rates appear constant within narrow limits, under special circumstances they may be altered. Frederic B. Jueneman wrote, "The age of our globe is presently thought to be some 4.5 billion years, based on radio decay rates of uranium and thorium. Such 'confirmation' may be short-lived, as nature is not to be discovered quite so easily. There has been in recent years the horrible realization that radio decay rates are not as constant as previously thought, nor are they immune to environmental influences. And this could mean that the atomic clocks are reset during some global disaster, and events which brought the Mesozoic to a close may not be 65 million years ago but, rather, within the age and memory of man" (1982, p. 21).
- E. Despite what we are often told, radiometric dating is not flawless.
 - 1. Studies on submarine basaltic rocks from Hawaii, known to have formed less than two hundred years ago, when dated by the potassium-argon method, revealed "ages" from 160 million to almost 3 billion years.
 - 2. The shells of living mollusks have been dated at up to 2,300 years old.
 - 3. Freshly killed seals have been dated at 1,300 years, and mummified seals, dead only some thirty years, have yielded dates as high as 4,600 years.

4. According to the evolutionary dating scale, stalactites build at the rate of about one inch per century. In an unused, underground wing of the Milwaukee Public Museum there are stalactites which would suggest that the museum was built 7,200 years ago!

XII. ***Dinosaur Remains***

- A. Before the existence of supposedly "ancient" organic material had been well-publicized, it was predicted that "no DNA would remain intact much beyond 10,000 years." This prediction was based upon the observed breakdown of DNA.
- B. However, not long after this prediction was made, very old DNA started turning up. For example, at the Clarkia Fossil Beds of Idaho, a green magnolia leaf was discovered in strata that is supposed to be 17 million years old. Because it was so fresh-looking and still pliable, scientists decided to see if any DNA was present. To their surprise, they discovered that there was, and that it matched that of modern magnolia trees.
- C. A 1987 article in the Journal of Paleontology states that Hadrosaur bones have been found on the Colville River north of Umiat on the North Slope of Alaska. What is so interesting about these bones is that they lack a significant degree of mineralization. In fact, the people who discovered them did not report it for 20 years because they thought they were bison bones.
 1. Because sandstone and bone are both porous, this means that ground and rain water would be able to seep into the rocks, and thus into the bones as well. The fact that the outer part of one of these bones was mineralized gives strong evidence that water and oxygen had access to the bones.
 2. The fact that the inside of the bones are not mineralized is an indication that they are young. The fact that the partially mineralized bone had (what looked like) red blood cells in it is a strong indication that it is young -- most likely less than 10,000 years old. By evolutionary reasoning, dinosaur bones only occur in the so-called Cretaceous, Jurassic, or Triassic eras. According to the Geological Time Chart, dinosaurs died out between 65 and 220 million years ago.
- D. This means they can be directly dated by the carbon-14 method, the exact same way a mammoth or Neanderthal bone is dated. This has been done at least 30 times by various laboratories, and the dates indicate that dinosaurs were alive from 9,800-50,000 years ago. Many scientists say that any carbon-14 date over 5,000 years is questionable, and its upper limit is around 60,000 years. Therefore, despite what popular publications may report, we can establish that all

mammoths, Neanderthals, or other bones dated over 5,000 years by the carbon-14 method are also questionable. If we accept any, then we must accept them all (including the dinosaur dates), and this is incompatible with evolution-based "ages."

- E. Carbon-14 is found in organic materials of all types, including diamonds, coal seams, carbonized wood, unfossilized wood, and dinosaur bones. In fact, that is the very "problem." Carbon-14 has a half-life of 5,730 years, so in other words, carbon-14 is found where it should not be if the Earth were billions of years old as we have been told.

XIII. *Radiohalos In Fossils*

- A. According to the standard geological time scale, the Jurassic, Triassic, and Eocene epochs represent hundreds of millions of years of evolution. Fossils in Colorado, however, indicate that they are actually not so far apart.
- B. This has been determined by examining radiohalos, which are rings of color that form around microscopic traces of radioactive minerals. The Polonium-210 radiohalos in the Colorado fossils indicate that the Jurassic, Triassic, and Eocene formations were deposited within months of each other! Thus, rather than representing hundreds of millions of years of evolution, the deposits in Colorado are suggestive of a single cataclysmic event (i.e., the Flood).

XIV. *Polystrate Fossils*

- A. The term "polystrate" was coined to describe a fossil which is encased within more than one (poly) layer of rock (strata) thus "polystrate" or "many layers." Fossil-bearing sedimentary rock consists (with few exceptions) of sediments which accumulated in a watery environment and are now hardened into sedimentary rock. Rock units are separated by obvious bedding planes, but frequently even small-scale banding is visible, interpreted as yearly indicators, much like tree rings in a tree. Counting these yearly bands of dividing rock thickness by today's meager accumulation rates, is said to give support to the millions-of-years concept of geological ages. The question is, were past sedimentation rates equivalent to today's rates (or perhaps higher to account for minor catastrophes), or were they accomplished by processes whose rates, scales, and intensities are not occurring, or perhaps not even possible today? Polystrate fossils may help to address this question.
- B. Frequently trees are found protruding out of coal seams into the strata above, and perhaps extending into a second coal seam, several feet above the first. Occasionally hundreds of individual fossils appear

whose body width exceeds the width of the banded layers in which they are encased. Obviously the layers cannot be the result of slow accumulations, for a dead fish, for example, will not remain in an articulated condition for several years while sediment accumulates around it. It must be quickly buried in order to be preserved at all. Some of the big polystrate trees cross multiple strata otherwise thought to have required tens of thousands of years.

1. The great beds of dinosaur bones and other creatures are inexplicable under the uniformitarian assumptions. Enormous heaps of dinosaur bones cover massive areas in many parts of the world, fully fossilized, and piled in heaps upon one another.
2. In Belgium, for example, the fossil boneyard is of gigantic proportions, i.e., a vertical extension through more than one hundred feet of rock. Similar graveyards are found on every continent, all over the world (elephant beds of Siberia, hippopotamus beds of Sicily, Permian beds of Texas, plant fossils in coal mines, etc.).
3. These fossils give every indication of rapid deposition and burial, and therefore support the notion that some catastrophic event created them. No uniformitarian theory can adequately explain them.

XV. *Axel Heiberg And Ellesmere Islands*

- A. Axel Heiberg and Ellesmere Islands are located above the Arctic circle. The winters are so cold that the only vegetation able to grow are tiny shrubs. However, large trees and tree stumps lying on, or buried just beneath the surface were found on these islands.
- B. How and when did these trees get there? It is claimed that the trees are leftover remnants of 40-65 million-year-old forests. The scientific data suggests otherwise.
 1. For instance, they are not petrified, but can be sawed and burned. In addition, pine cones, pine needles, and leaves are also preserved in the sandy/silty soil. Another clue to the puzzle is that the roots of these trees are missing. This strongly suggests that these trees did not grow here but were uprooted by a catastrophic event and later re-deposited here at different "levels."
 2. This is exactly what has happened in Spirit Lake near Mt. St. Helens; however, the upright trees on the bottom of this lake are still under water. At some time in the future, they may be left standing upright -- looking as if they grew there.
- C. Similar trees from Siberia are only 7,000 years old. A so-called "Mammoth Tree," with fruit and leaves still on it, was discovered and reported after a landslide of Siberian tundra. Such cold storage of fruit

7,000 years old can only be explained by a sudden transportation of the fruit from a warm climate in which it grew to the cold storage climate in which it has been refrigerated. This specimen of fruit, with leaves, and many other specimens of leaves reported found in Siberia also confirm the deluge.

XVI. *Sedimentary Deposits*

- A. Robert Garrels and Fred Mackenzie wrote "Evolution of Sedimentary Rocks" in which they listed and quantified sources and rates at which sediment is added to the ocean each year. The total addition of sediment to the world's oceans was found to be 27.5 billion tons per year. Most geologists accepting the general theory of evolution will admit that this total is approximately correct and is to be taken as a constant rate throughout that supposed evolution. However, when we divide the total mass of ocean sediment by that rate, we find the outer limit of the age of the Earth's oceans to be 30 million years (Stuart E. Nevins, "Evolution? The Ocean Says No!," ICR Impact Series, No. 8 [San Diego: Institute for Creation Research]).
- B. The Geological Society of America Bulletin (Jan. 73), estimates the average sediment thickness over the entire ocean at approximately 2,950 feet. When that is multiplied by the area of the world's oceans and the density of the sediment, we are told that the mass of ocean sediments is about 820 trillion tons. How long would it take to deposit that much sediment on the ocean floor if there was none to begin with? What limit does the ocean put on its own age?

XVII. *Niagara Falls*

- A. Up until the time that Niagara Falls was reinforced with concrete, the water was carving a channel upriver toward Lake Erie at the rate of about four to five feet per year.
- B. Since the channel is now about seven miles long (35,000 feet), this means that the age of Niagara Falls is between 7,000 and 8,750 years old (or less). This, of course, assumes that the rate of erosion has been constant. The age of North America is likely the same.

XVIII. *Volcanic Activity*

- A. It has been estimated that 70 volcanoes the size of Mexico's Paricutin producing 0.001 cubic miles of lava per year for 4.5 billion years of Earth's history could account for the volume of the continental crusts today. There are now approximately 600 active volcanoes and about 10,000 dormant ones. Six hundred volcanoes comparable to Paricutin could account for the present oceans in approximately 0.5 billion years.

- B. However, the evidence shows that volcanic activity was much greater in the past than at present, so if that rate could be determined this number would decline substantially (William D. Stansfield, *Science of Evolution* 80-84).

XIX. *Zircons*

- A. Zircons are tiny volcanic crystals. They also are found to contain far more helium and lead than they should -- If the Earth were billions of years old.
- B. In fact, Humphreys, Austin, Baumgardner, and Snelling summarized this by saying, "We contracted with a high-precision laboratory to measure the rate of helium diffusion out of the zircons ... Here we report newer zircon diffusion data that extend to the lower temperatures ... of Gentry's retention data. The measured rates resoundingly confirm a numerical prediction we made based on the reported retentions and a young age. Combining rates and retentions gives a helium diffusion age of $6,000 \pm 2,000$ years. This contradicts the uniformitarian age of 1.5 billion years based on nuclear decay products in the same zircons. These data strongly support our hypothesis of episodes of highly accelerated nuclear decay occurring within thousands of years ago. Such accelerations shrink the radioisotopic billions of years down to the 6,000-year timescale of the Bible."

XX. *The Oldest Living Trees*

- A. The oldest living tree on Earth is either an Irish Oak or a Bristlecone Pine. If we assume a growth rate of one tree ring per year, the oldest trees are between 4,500 and 4,767 years old. Because these trees are still alive and growing, and because we do not yet know how old they will get before they die, this indicates that something happened around 4,500 to 4,767 years ago which caused the immediate ancestors of these trees to die.
- B. Note also that it is possible for trees to produce more than one growth ring per year, which would shorten the above estimated ages of these trees. Also, with regard to fossil tree rings, there are no documented instances of fossil trees having more than about 1,500-1,700. This is significant because we are told that God (literally) made the Earth, and all that is in it, only about 1,500-1,800 years before the worldwide Flood.

XXI. *Gas And Oil Pressure*

- A. When oil wells are drilled, the oil is almost always found to be under great pressure. This presents a problem for those who claim millions of

years for the age of oil because rocks are porous. In other words, as time goes by the oil should seep into tiny pores in the surrounding rock, and, over time, reduce the pressure.

- B. However, for some reason it does not. Perhaps that is because all of our oil deposits were created as a result of Noah's Flood, about 4600 years ago? Some scientists say that after about 10,000 years little pressure should be left.

XXII. **Historical Records**

- A. Depending on which book one consults, historians claim that human history goes back 4,600-5,400 (or more) years; but, according to Froelich Rainey, 1870 B.C. is the "earliest actual recorded date in human history."
- B. Also on this point, Sylvia Baker quotes Professor Libby as follows: "Professor Libby learned this when he tried to verify his Carbon-14 method. He said, 'The first shock Dr. Arnold and I had was when our advisers informed us that history extended back only 5,000 years ... You read statements in books that such and such a society or archeological site is 20,000 years old. We learned rather abruptly (that) these ... ancient ages, are not known accurately; in fact, it is at about the time of the First Dynasty in Egypt that the first historical date of any real certainty has been established.'"
- C. According to evolutionists, Stone Age *Homo sapiens* existed for 190,000 years before beginning to make written records about 4,000 to 5,000 years ago. Prehistoric man built megalithic monuments, made beautiful cave paintings, and kept records of lunar phases. Why would he wait two thousand centuries before using the same skills to record history? The biblical time scale is much more likely.

XXIII. **Population Growth**

- A. Today the Earth's population doubles every 50 years. If we assumed only half of the current growth rate and start with one couple, it would take less than 4,000 years to achieve today's population. Population statistics during recorded history all fall into the fairly consistent range of about 1/4 to 3 percent per year.
 - 1. One growing population is specifically mentioned in the Bible. When Jacob's family moved to Egypt it had 70 members; when the Israelites left Egypt 430 years later (in about 1450 B.C.) they had grown to between one and two million people, which greatly concerned their Egyptian slave masters.
 - 2. If we calculate their growth rate, we find it to have been between 2.25% and 2.41% per year. This is within the range of modern population studies, and is thus completely reasonable.

- B. On the other hand, if we consider any sort of evolutionary growth over a period of a few million years, we arrive at ridiculously low growth rates.
1. For example, if an original pair of "pre-humans" had begun a million years ago, and increased to five billion humans today, the growth rate would have been an average of only 0.00217% per year. At that rate, the time required for the group to double its size would be 32,000 years!
 2. At such low growth rates, these "people" would quickly have become extinct, considering that a life span was probably less than a hundred years or so.
- C. If humanity is really about 2.5 million years old, creationists calculate from conservative population estimates (2.4 children per family, average generation and life span of forty-three years) that the world population would have grown from a single family to 10 to the 2700th power of people over one million years. The present world population is about 6 x 10 to the 9th power, an infinitesimal part of the 10 to the 2700th power.
- D. Population factors, therefore, seem to make the evolutionist's position almost impossible, whereas growth rates according to the creationist's time scale are well within the limits of actual numbers observable throughout recorded history.

Conclusion. There are other equally reliable methods which indicate that the Earth is quite young. Other examples document the fact that the Earth, rather than being billions of years old, has an age measured in only thousands of years, just as the Bible teaches. According to both biblical and scientific evidences, "the beginning" was not very long ago. The claims of evolutionists regarding a multi-billion-year-old Earth do not agree with much of the actual scientific evidence, which speaks eloquently of a young planet.

I am deeply indebted to Dan King and Wayne Jackson for the use of their material.