

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session

(previous 2003 version of this seminar, the slides used for this seminar are not included - only the first part of the seminar is made available here as transcript)

DVD introduction by Eric Hovind:

Questions, everybody seems to have a question that needs answering in life. Hi, my name's Eric, in this next seminar Mr. Hovind takes a large variety of questions that he's been asked on a regular basis, combines them and gives his best explanation for what's happening. He covers a variety of topics such as the Red Sea crossing, primitive man, what about radiocarbon dating? Hey, are there really contradictions in the Bible? Find out for yourself in this seminar entitled 'Questions and Answers'.

SEMINAR PART 7: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS SESSION

Welcome to our very informal question and answer session where we deal with questions that are not covered in our seminar on creation and evolution. Now for those just getting this material, my name is Kent Hovind, I taught High School science for 15 years, and now do seminars on creation and evolution. Since early 1989 I've been doing this. The Bible tells us in the book of Ecclesiastes chapter 7: He said, "I applied my heart to know and to seek Him", searching to seek out wisdom and the reason of things. 1 Peter Chapter 3 tells us that we should be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh us the reason for the hope that's in us. I think it's good for Christians to study the truth so that they can give an answer to those who are not Christians and it's good for those of you who are not Christians to study the truth so that you can become Christians. When you get to the top of the mountain of truth, you'll find Christians were sitting there all along - God's word is truth.

In 2 Timothy Chapter 2 the Bible tells us we should study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman need not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

So, in this session we're going to deal with quite a few miscellaneous questions. If you have questions that are not covered here, or elsewhere in the seminar, feel free to send them in. We'll try to deal with them as time permits on our website at drdino.com or on our radio programme or possibly in a future edition of our question-answer tapes.

Do all scientists believe in evolution?

One question I often get when I say I believe in creation, they're going to say wait a minute, all scientists believe in evolution. Wa ha, That's simply not true, ok? The vast majority of scientists they believe... well some do... A majority of scientists they believe in evolution. But that depends on what you mean by evolution. But all scientists do not believe in evolution, and even if they did, that's not how you determine truth. It is possible for the majority to be wrong. History shows us there are many times when the majority is wrong. The majority of scientists used to teach that all the planets go around the Earth. That is wrong as far as we know, but there are still some folks who believe in the Geocentric theory. I don't fight them, I disagree with them, but there are really a surprising number of folks who believe in the Geocentric theory. For years many people thought, the majority of people thought, that the heavy objects fall faster than lighter objects. That was

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

taught for 2000 years and it's wrong. It's not true. For many years it was taught if you're sick you have bad blood, take out your blood and you'll get better. That is simply wrong, it's not true. They were places all over the country to get your blood taken out, they had little white poles out front with a red stripe around it - the barber was the blood letter. So, even if the majority of scientists do believe in something - that doesn't make it true.

Let me give you an example here from the book of John chapter 7: "The people therefore", they were arguing about Christ, and they said, "when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth, 'This is the prophet'. Others said 'This is the Christ', but some said 'Shall Christ come out of Galilee. Have not the scriptures said that Christ cometh of the seat of David, out of the town of Bethlehem where David was?'" Here's the Hovind translation: They're arguing about the wrong subject. They were arguing should Christ come out of Bethlehem or Galilee, and they thought Jesus came from Galilee so he can't be the Christ. They didn't realise he came from Bethlehem. So he was and Christ and did come from Bethlehem but was raised in Galilee. In John chapter 7 it says, "There was a division among the people because of him and some of them would have taken him, but no man laid hold on him." What I get from this verse is, if you don't like somebody, if you don't like their message, kill the messenger; and this you see a lot in the creation / evolution arguments. If you watch some of my debates, I've had over 80 debates now at universities, often times they get so angry at me because of what I'm saying. Wha... I'm just delivering a message, I'm just telling you what the truth is from science and what God's Word says. Don't get angry at me. They're folks... they are over 500 anti-Hovind websites, they really don't like me. They all want to get me into an email debate, and then they say I won't debate them - I won't email debate them, but I'll debate them publicly anytime, anywhere. Ah, I don't have time for an email debate, I type twelve words a minute with 19 mistakes! I simply don't have time ok. I run a real busy ship around here. Next verse says, "Then came the officers to the chief priests and Pharisees, and they said unto them, 'Why have ye not brought him?'" I get the picture here. The Pharisees sent the officers off to get Jesus, and then the came back without him and they said, "Why didn't you get him?", and the officers said, "Never man spake like this man." Here's the Hovind translation: The professors sent their students off to ask a heretic question, but the professors didn't go themselves. I get this a lot. I speak at universities and, a professor doesn't show up to ask questions, but he sends his students with a list of questions. And you see the student pull out a list of questions and they're going to trip up Hovind on something you know, so they ask me a question, and I answer all of them. And then they go back and tell the professor, "Well he answered all my questions", and the professor says, "Well you should have asked him this, and this, and this... ." Well, you coward, you should have come yourself professor! Not send your students off to do your dirty work, if you've got a question, give me a call. What I also get from this verse is, that Pharisees decided they're going to use the law, they're going to legally try to stop this guy sharing this message. They wanted to shut Jesus up. And there are people who have used legal tactics to try to shut up the Christians, they try to exclude Christianity from public schools. They can't handle the message, so they shut down the message, so people don't get a chance to hear it; and that's what I see from John chapter 7. "Then answered them" - the Pharisees - "are ye also deceived?", the Pharisees are saying are you stupid? Then they said, "Have any of the rulers or Pharisees believed on him?" Notice this, their evidence that Jesus could not be the Messiah, was because they didn't believe he was the Messiah; therefore it can't be because we don't believe he is. You get the same kind of logic with some of these professors in colleges, they'll say, "Well all scientists believe in evolution therefore, it must be true." That's ridiculous! Ok! They don't all believe in it, and even if they did, that doesn't make it true. You see, the same trail of 2000 years ago in the book of John, "Then the Pharisees said this 'people who know not the law are cursed'." Here's the Hovind translation to this verse: We have knowledge, you don't! We don't approve of your degree, you're ignorant if you don't believe in evolution. And you'll see this a lot in the

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

creation-evolution argument. They say we're smart, everybody else is dumb. I get this a lot when I do debates, they'll say, "Well the average person in the audience probably doesn't understand the complexity of this topic", and I'll say, "Folks what he's trying to tell you is: you're dumb, he's smart?" That's precisely what they're trying to say in a subtle way. Next verse, verse 50 says, "Nicodemus saith unto them, (he that came to Jesus by night) 'Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?', they answered and said unto him 'Are thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet', and every man went to his own house." Even some of the non-believers were smart enough to realise this guy's telling the truth, and we get people by the thousands, who write our ministry, or call us, and say, "Look, I was not a believer, but I saw your material on creation and I'm convinced creation is true." And that's what we're trying to do, we want to convince you that God's word is true. The whole argument here in John 7 started with a false assumption that Jesus came out of Galilee. Ok, they're arguing about the wrong topic. The Pharisees didn't believe in him, so that said "that's proof he can't be the Christ because we don't believe in him, if he was, we would believe in him." That's silly! That's the same thing people use today. The sceptics will say, "Well, has Hovind or any of these creationists published in science journals?" and when they say, "No", they'll say, "See. That proves he can't be right." That's their logic, ok! Let's take a few seconds to think how dumb that is. First place creationist material is routinely excluded from creation... from science journals, because... I should say science journals... because they started with the definition that science cannot include the supernatural; therefore, if your explanation isn't 100% natural, it's not science. Therefore, creation is, by definition, not science - that's their thinking. They don't realise, evolution is not science. Evolution is based purely on the assumption that things happen, it's never observed or tested or demonstrated in the laboratory. It's purely religious.

The majority can often be wrong; the majority followed Aaron in rebellion in Exodus chapter 32. The majority voted not to go into the Promised Land in Numbers chapter 32. The majority followed false gods many times throughout the Old Testament. Read through it and you'll see - the majority was wrong. The majority of religious leaders hated Jesus. The majority of the world hates Christians. So, it is not true that all scientists believe in evolution. If it were it wouldn't matter, ok; and you don't determine truth that way, but let me share with you a few Christians who are scientists who are strong believers in creation and are also very brilliant scientists. Robert Gentry, a friend of mine from Tennessee, is a brilliant scientist when it comes to radioactive material and the disposal of radioactive waste. He worked at Oakridge laboratories, he published this book here: Creation's tiny mystery. Excellent book about radio polonium halos, you can get it through our ministry, in our book store or on our website. Robert Gentry was doing tremendous work; he was published in many major science journals about radio polonium halos being found in granite all over the world. I went and met with Robert Gentry, saw the polonium halos through the microscope in his laboratory, and everybody was fine until they realised, wow his research proves the big bang theory's not true. And boy, they shut off his funding and his grant money in a hurry, they finally... said we're not going to have a job for you anymore, just because his research was supporting creation. Doctor Robert Gentry up in halo... look up www.halos.com and see for yourself. Doctor... Ah, sorry, Roger DeHart was a science teacher in... near Seattle, Washington. He was told he could not inform his students of errors in the textbooks. Here they've got textbooks with mistakes in them, but he couldn't tell the students about the mistakes because those mistakes were used to support the evolution theory. They said you can't even pass out current science journals to inform students of mistakes in the textbooks. That's not science! That's a, you know, burn the heretic attitude that some people get or burn the witch, you know, there's a... talk about a witch hunt. The evolutionists run a witch hunt against the creationists in the public schools. They will try desperately to get them fired from their job. Kevin Haley was a biology teacher at Central Oregon Community College in Bend, Oregon; he lost his job

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

simply because he was exposing errors in the textbooks. He'd say, "Kids information on page 87 has been proven wrong, disregard that, that won't be on the test." And he's right it was proven wrong.

I debated one professor one time and I gave out like 20 or 30 lies in the textbooks. He got up and said, "Now folks, Hovind's right, all these things are not true. But..."; he said, "Hovind, I have a question - what are you going to replace all this with?" In other words, we can't take the lies out of the books until I find a replacement. In other words, I've got to provide evidence for his theory, or else we can't take the lies out of the books - talk about dumb! Ah, that's not the way science works, okay; you teach the kids the truth, just teach the truth, okay. And if all you have is lies to back up your theory, then get a new theory.

In Texas, Baylor University, they fired William Dembski just because he advocated there might be an intelligent designer. Whoa! That's heresy! There could be a designer! You're out of here, you're fired. Forrest Mims was a science writer for several years he published in National Geographic, Science digest, American Journal of Physics, over 60 magazines and newspapers. He was denied a job as a science writer for Scientific America, simply because he was a creationist. They didn't want to have a creationist on their staff. Teacher Rod LaVake was told he could not share information that might help students doubt Darwin's theory. You see Darwin's theory is sacred. You don't question it without loosing your job in many school systems, okay. The same thing happened in Russia, 10-15 years ago. If a teacher got up in class and said I don't believe communism works, he'd be out of a job. Maybe out of a country, or out of his life - they'd kill him, or send him off to Siberia. You get the same kind of academic Siberia, people get sent off to academic Siberia if they don't support the evolution theory - right here in America, the land of the free and home of the slave. Mr. Eller told his teacher Dan Clark in Lafayette Indiana, Mr. Eller was the superintendent, that he could not introduce creationism to his class. So, Dan Clark resigned, he quit. Many good teachers are dropping out of the public school system because they're not allowed to teach kids the truth. The problem is not the law, the law says you can teach creation, it's not a problem to teach creation legally. The courts have ruled it's okay to teach creation. But the boss says don't do it. The ACLU, which is the American Communist Lawyers Union, they learned years ago, all you have to do is threaten to sue, and the school will back down, even though the ACLU knows they will lose the suit. It doesn't matter. The threat of a suit is enough to make the teachers get fired, just the threat of a suit. So that's what's happening, we're loosing by default, and we're not even putting up a good fight. Dean Kenyon was a professor at San Francisco State University, in San Francisco, he wrote many books about evolution. He was the poster boy for the evolutionists, he was a strong believer in the theory. And one day he got converted, and began to believe in creation, and they fired him. He sued, they put him back in as a lab assistant, you know washing test tubes, which the students do normally, here's a guy, I believe 10-year professor. Finally, after a long battle, he was reinstated with his job, but if he hadn't continued, he wouldn't have kept his job. That's what happened to Dean Kenyon, he wrote the book 'Of Pandas and People', which you can get through our ministry. Doctor Dini, at Texas Tech University, has on his website for years, that if you want to get recommended for medical school, he's from Lubbock Texas, that you had to confess to believing in evolution. If you don't believe in evolution, he's not going to recommend you for medical school. When I spoke in Lubbock Texas, in the fall of 2002, the students there got together and offered Dini 900 dollars if he would debate me. He refused, he wouldn't debate for 2 hours for 900 bucks. I don't know how much he makes an hour, but I suspect it's not that much. So, Mr Dini, I'll come anytime, anywhere, and take you on intellectually in a debate on creation/evolution - evolution's one of the dumbest theories in the history of humanity, and the Devil is laughing at you for believing in that silly theory. And, I said, if you don't trust Christ, you're going to go to Hell. I'm not your enemy, I'm your friend, I don't want to see you go to Hell, I'd like to see you get converted; but what you're doing is unfair, and certainly unwise, and I think un-American. To require a student to believe a certain religion,

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

and all you have is a religious worldview of evolution, and you require students to believe that before you give them a recommendation letter... come on, grow up, let kids learn the truth. We can go on and on how people are discriminated against because of their belief in creation. Now Patrick Henry College, was notified they were going to deny their recommendation to be accredited, simply because they didn't believe in evolution. We have lots of information on their website on how students, or universities, or teachers are discriminated against because of their belief in creation.

It wasn't always this way, if you go back in the past, a hundred years ago, two hundred years ago, all the scientists believed in creation. Here's a list of quite a few scientists: Francis Bacon, Johann Kepler, Blaise Pascal, Robert Boyle, Isaac Newton. These guys were in founders of major branches of science, Carolus Linneaus, and they were creationists. Georges Cuvier, on and on the list goes, hundreds and hundreds, if not thousands, of very famous scientists, who were creationists. Not always young Earth creationists, but certainly creationists - many were young Earth creationists.

Now, Richard Owen, Louis Agassiz, James Joule, all you got to do is notice folks that many... nearly all branches of science were started by people who believe in creation - not people who believed in evolution. The evolutionists don't come up with anything, they don't create anything, they come in and take over an institution that's already going, and many Christian colleges have been taken over by evolutionists - Harvard, Princeton, Yale started off as a Christian schools and now they've been taken over by those who believe in Evolution. The evolutionists don't go start something, they take over like a leach, you know or a tick... or a parasite, what someone else has already created. Now Wernher Von Brown, a space scientist, was a strong believer in creation.

There are many books out. There's a good book 'In Six Days', why 50 scientists chose to believe in creation. There are quite a few books on this topic; you can see our website drdino.com and get more.

Okay, next question. What about separation of church and state? Is it okay to discuss creation in public schools? Well first place, the phrase 'separation of church and state' is not found in the constitution, don't let somebody tell you that the law says 'separation of church and state', that's baloney. That phrase was used by Thomas Jefferson in a letter he wrote to some pastors in the Danbury association, a Baptist association, in Connecticut. He's the one who said, "The first amendment has erected a wall of separation between church and state." Thomas Jefferson said that, it's not in the constitution. And, by the way, if there's a wall between the two, it's a one-dimensional wall - it keeps the government out of the church, it is not designed to keep the church out of the government. So, there's no such thing as 'separation of church and state' found in the constitution. The fact of the matter is the founding fathers when they gave the first amendment, article one, the same day (I believe), voted to give 7 or 10 or 15 thousand dollars, or something, to a mission in St. Louis to help a Catholic mission reach the Indians there with what they thought was the gospel. So, just go through the history, go to wallbuilders.com, David Barton's excellent website, and get some of his material, and you can see how the founding fathers were certainly strong believers in creation, and had no intention of the government getting involved in the church, but they had every intention of the church getting involved in the government. And the idea of no Christianity in public schools would have been an anathema of the founding fathers. They would have sent those guys off on a ship to some other country.

How do we see stars that are millions of light years away?

Okay, next question: "How do we see stars that are millions of light years away?" I get this question every seminar I do, I believe. There's no question, there's an awful lot of stars out there. The Bible says in Nehemiah chapter 9: "Thou, even Thou, art Lord alone. Thou hast made the heavens and the

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

heaven of heavens.” God created all the stars - there's an awful lot of stars out there. It's interesting, stars blow up every once in a while - they run out of fuel, or whatever happens, and they implode and then explode, it's called a nova or if it's a big one it's called a supernova. It seems that about every 30 years a star explodes. Well, after searching the heavens they've only found 300 supernova rings, so the question would be, “If the universe is millions of years old, why aren't there more supernova rings - the remnants of these blown up stars?” That indicates only a few thousand years. Of course the Bible says God made everything six thousand years ago, and the textbooks say millions of years old; I think the textbooks have a problem because there should be a lot more supernova rings. Plus, obviously, you have a problem, stars being born should equal stars dying, or else you're going to have a real serious problem. There are plenty of stars out there, though we've never seen one star forming. We see stars blow up every 25-30 years; we've never proven the formation of one new star. One atheist I debated said, “Oh Hovind, there's a new star forming right now in crab nebula and some of the different clouds out there in space you see stars forming” - no you don't! you see spots getting brighter. You are assuming these are stars forming, but actually all you're seeing is a spot getting brighter. It could be there's a dust cloud clearing and there was already a star behind it, any forth grader would know that. So, nobody's ever proven the formation of one star. Science magazine in 1986 they said, “The silent embarrassment of modern astrophysics is that we do not know how even a single one of these stars managed to form.” The situation's no better now, nobody can prove any star form by natural processes. If dust tries to get together as it increases in density, it increases in temperature which increases the movement and it drives them back away, it's called Boyle's gas laws. You cannot compress dust into solid matter without creating a real serious physical science problem of overcoming the gas laws. If pressure increases, the temperature increases which drives them out again. It's not going to happen. One professor said, “Oh Hovind, we figured if 20 stars explode near each other, they'll produce enough energy to squeeze the gas and make a new star.” I said, “Well sir, that's just brilliant - you're saying, if you lose 20 you can gain one”, man you ought to run for congress and help those guys borrow their way out of debt. That's a dumb idea! We've never seen it happen, it's purely theoretical that 20 stars could do that, but that is a losing proposition - not gaining; there are lots of stars. The Bible says 'God created the stars' in Genesis 1:16. He created them to be lights on the Earth. Psalm 1:47 says 'He counts the number of the stars and gives names to all of them'. The Bible says 'He layeth the beams of His chambers in the waters and maketh the clouds His chariot to walk on the wings of the wind'. It is possible that Psalm 104 ties in with Psalm 148, that there is still water above the heavens. Nobody knows what's beyond the stars, if there's an end at all, but it could be this verse and the verse in Revelation where The Lord sits on many waters, is talking about the fact that there's... there was a layer of water above the Earth, then there may be another layer of water beyond the stars. I don't know, it's just a theory, something to chew on, there's no way we could tell anyway.

Okay, there's a lot of stars out there. It's been estimated that everybody on Earth could own 2 trillion stars to yourself. That's a lot - million... billion... trillion. The stars are really far away. Hubble telescope focussed in on a dot, they thought they'd found a black spot in space, about the size of a grain of sand held at arms length, they looked at that spot for ten days, and in that one spot there were so many stars - they'd never even seen before - that they couldn't even count them. That's just one spot, the size of a grain of sand, of new stars just discovered. There's a lot of stars. Stephen Hawking, who hates Christians and creationists, said (and he won't debate me by the way - Steve I'll take you on anytime), he said: 'Stars are so far away, they appear to us to be just pinpoints of light'. He said 'There's only one feature we can observe that is the colour of their light'. So when you look at a star, you cannot see the size or shape of the star, all you see is what colour it is. We assume that stars are like the sun, and the sun is like stars, but that is purely an assumption, we don't know that.

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

Some people say 'Oh yeah we can tell by the elements that it's burning, it gives a colour characteristic, you know - the signature, you can tell the elements'. You know evolutionists never talk about this, but they of course are assuming that even the molecules evolved in other places just like they did on Earth. They are assuming the same 92 elements we have here will be the same found throughout the universe. They never talk about that, but you have a real serious problem if you just assume that the same molecular arrangement evolved. The molecules would have to evolve too, by your theory, which I think is a dumb idea. Okay, I taught high school trig for many years, which is one of the subjects I taught; if you want to find the distance to an object you can't possibly touch, like a star, you have to measure it with what is called parallax trigonometry. You have to know two sides and one angle, or two angles and one side, in order to calculate the unknown distance to this point. With simple Sine, Cosine, Tangent. The problem is, Earth is only 8 thousand miles in diameter, which is basically nothing compared to star distance, so to find the distance to a star you have to get your observers further apart to make a triangle that's, you know, a decent angle. Well, they look at a star in January. Then they look at the star in June, and they get a much bigger base on their triangle - this is Earth's orbit around the sun. Well it's 93 million miles to the sun, which is a long way. But it takes light 8 minutes to get here from the sun. It's called one astronomical unit. That is the distance from the sun to the Earth is an astronomical unit. So, if we are 8 light minutes from the sun, it means the diameter of our orbit is 16 light minutes, that would be the diameter of Earth's orbit around the sun. This diagram here shows the little yellow dot on the far left, that would represent Earth's orbit - 16 light minutes. A year has 525 thousand minutes in it. That's a real skinny triangle - if you did it to scale - it's like having two surveyors with telescopes 16 inches apart looking at a dot 525 thousand inches away, which is eight and a third miles. You set that up, and draw it out on a piece of graph paper; you'll find you've got a real skinny triangle. It works out to be an angle of .017 degrees at the apex. Ah, I think they'd have a hard time measuring something like that. If you want to measure 100 light years (by the way that was just to measure one light year)... if you wanted to measure 100 light years, you'd have to move your dot 830 miles away keeping your surveyors 16 inches apart. That's like having two guys on my roof here, in Pensacola Florida, looking at a dot in Chicago. If the guys are 16 inches apart and they're focussing on a dot in Chicago, that's a real skinny triangle, okay. Figuring 16 billion light years is clearly impossible. It just can't be done. And I don't think you can tell exactly where you were 6 months ago on opposite sides of Earth's orbit - that would be a stretch also. Okay, this textbook says, "Parallax trigonometry can be used to measure distances less than 100 light years." I agree. Much less! I think you'd have a hard time measuring 20 light years, but I'll give them a hundred - I'll give them 5 hundred for the sake of the argument. The fact is you can't measure a billion. I'm not saying the stars aren't that far away - they probably are; I'm just pointing out, we have no way of measuring it, we don't know how far away they are. If somebody tells you, "That star's 7.9 billion light years away", just say, "how did you measure it?" Was it a Stanley, a Luftman or a craftsman? Who held the other end of that tape measure, 'cause I want to meet this guy? It just can't be done.

So:

- Number 1: you cannot measure the distance to the stars.
- Number 2: we don't know what light is. Is it a wave? Is it a photon? Is it a particle? It behaves sometimes like waves, sometimes like energy. Nobody knows for sure what light is. We know what it does and we use it all the time, obviously, but nobody's ever defined what light is very clearly. So, the entire principle or concept behind a black hole is the idea that light can be attracted by gravity. Well if light can be attracted by gravity, if black holes exist - nobody's proven that either, then the speed of light cannot be a constant. At Harvard University in 1999 they slowed light down to 38 miles an hour. The next year, they slowed it

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

down to 1 mile an hour, in the year 2000. The next year they brought it to a complete stop - they took light and absolutely stopped it. This was done at Harvard, at Smithsonian and it was done at Cambridge. And by the way, that's how science works - an experiment to be demonstratable, repeatable, testable. Evolution is none of those - nobody's ever demonstrated, tested or proven any of it, it's all in the mind - they think it happened - it's not science. Okay, at Princeton University in the year 2000, the speeded light up to 300 times the speed of light. Why would the speed of light be an unbreakable barrier. Barry Setterfield, an Australian astronomer, did a lot of work on the speed of light question. He says, "The speed of light has decreased." He said, "In the last 300 years at least 164 measurements of the speed of light have been published" - 16 different ways it was measured. He says, "The speed of light has apparently decreased so rapidly that experimental error cannot explain it." Here's a chart showing that the speed of light has declined in the last 150 years. About 1960 the chart seems to level off, and everybody since about 1960 has gotten the same number. If you measure the speed of light today, you're probably going to get 186,282 point something miles per second. Okay, that could be because in the late 50's and early 60's they began using the atomic clock to measure the speed of light, and the atomic clock uses the wavelength of a Cesium 133 atom. Which means we're using light to measure light - we have a rubber ruler! Of course you're not going to see it if it's declining. It maybe we're on the tail end of a logarithmic digression or it simply may be we're using a rubber ruler by using an atomic clock to measure it.

Here're a couple of articles showing about how the speed of light was apparently exceeded by a factor of as much as 100. Clear back in '88 and '95 there were articles published about this. The speed of light is not a constant! The radio-physical research institute in Russia, the cosmologist there, said, "The speed of light was 10 billion times faster at time zero." Astrophysics and Space Science magazine, 1987. According to the big bang theory, the speed of light had to be much faster initially. Here's an article from 2001, Science News, saying about the speed of light may have changed over history - study says. Imperial college in London, a man wrote an article and said, "The shocking possibility is that the speed of light might change in time during the life of the universe." At Reuters news service put out an article for Sydney about a team from Australia that said, "The speed of light may not be a constant", in August of 2002. So the speed of light can change. "The speed limit of the cosmos is being questioned", September 2002. There's a book out called 'faster than the speed of light', and I'm sure this feller who wrote this book was persecuted for daring to suggest a heresy as this. Discover Magazine ran an article about 'Was Einstein wrong about the Speed of Light?' A recent article saying Einstein was wrong, the speed of light is not a constant. So, I don't think we can prove what light is, and I don't think we can prove light has always travelled the same speed.

- Number 3. The creation was finished when God made it. It's interesting; Jesus made wine out of grapes that never existed, turned water straight to wine. Where's the grape stage? He can make full-grown man out of the dirt and then make a woman out of his rib, and make animals out of the dirt, he can make the earth out of nothing. Jesus made enough to feed five thousand people out of a little boy's sack lunch. We're always trying to limit God. I get real worried about folks who try to put human limitations on God. Now, God didn't make two babies and put them in the Garden of Eden and hand them a packet of seeds and say, "Here, plant these quick, you're gonna need supper." He made a full-grown man and a full-grown woman in a full-grown garden. That's the only way it's going to work.
- Number 4 of things to consider. A light year is a distance - not a time. It's a distance. It's the distance light can travel in a year at today's speed. A light year could be done in one second

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

if you speeded the light up. It's simply a distance, it's like so many gazillion miles - I think it's six trillion miles - is a light year.

- Number 5. Since the speed of light is not proven to be consistent, why would star distance have anything to do with the age of the universe? Some people say, "Oh, wait a minute now! I know we can't measure the distance with triangulation - parallax trigonometry - what about measuring with separate variables or red shift?" That's the other way they try to do it, and it's also loaded with flaws in the theory there. The red shift is the idea that when light goes from a star, the red is shifted over - they look at the light through a spectroscope, and you'll see black lines on there, and the black lines are shifted towards the red-end of the spectrum. You get the normal spectrum: Red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet. But the black lines are shifted red. And they say, "Wow, this is proof the star is receding, it's moving away from us." That could be, I don't know, but there may be other ways to answer this. This is called the Doppler effect. If a train is coming towards you, it's squeezes the sound waves in as the train makes noise, and you hear Eeeeeeeeeehhhhhh...Awwwwwwwwhhhhhhh [makes the sound of a train sounding it's bell while going through a tunnel]. It drops pitch as it goes past you. It's called the Doppler effect. If you're going past a sound source, or the sound source is going past you, either way it works the same. Sound is called 'compressed' coming in and 'refracted' or 'stretched' going out. Well, they thought possibly if the star's coming in it would squeeze the light waves - whatever light waves are - and make a blue-shift, if the star's leaving it would make a red-shift. And so, when the red-shift was discovered years ago, the looked around the heavens and found most of the stars are giving a red-shift. And then said, "Wow, this proves they're leaving"; no it doesn't, but that was the assumption. And then they said, "If all the stars are moving away, that proves there was a big bang." That was the evidence for the big bang theory - the red-shift. How about a lack of logic, but that's what they said. Okay, this feller says, "There was an early sign that red-shifts reliably indicate the distance of galaxies. For quasars, however, the diagram shows a wide scatter and apparent brightness at every red-shift." He said, "In fact, there is little correlation of brightness to red-shift at all. Either quasars come in an extremely wide range of intrinsic luminosities, as most people believe, or red-shifts do not indicate distance." Sky and Telescope, December 1994. The same magazine said, "Thus the only conclusion that can be drawn is at least some quasars are relatively nearby, and a large fraction of their red-shift is due to something other than expansion of the universe." If somebody tells you, "We know to stars because of red-shifts", say, "I'm sorry but that is simply not correct." We don't know the distance because of red-shift. Get the book 'The evolution cruncher' from our ministry, it's 5 dollars for a 900-page book. Excellent book - loaded with stuff on creation/evolution. He's got a whole section about the Doppler effect and the expanding universe. Science News 1995 said, "Another set of observations indicates that the universe appears to be 8.4-10.6 billion years old. The new work relied on the Hubble space telescope to obtain distance to far away galaxies. The team led by Nail Tanvir of the University of Cambridge in England used a two-step method to estimate the Hubble constant." I always get a kick out of that! Here they've got an equation which involves a number which you're going to multiply - like an Algebraic equation - and they can change that number. They call it a constant, but they change it all the time. I taught algebra for years - I'm telling you, if you change one letter in an equation, or one value in an equation, you change the outcome. That's why they're always getting wild numbers for the age of the universe - because the Hubble constant is not a constant at all.

Okay, let's go on here. He [Tanvir] said, "First they observed a type of standard candle and started off with a set of variables to find the distance to the spiral galaxy M96." He said, "You have to be

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

very careful about drawing conclusions because of the Hubble constant because the measurements have huge systematic errors.” Astronomers believed that Vale, one of the best studied supernova remnants was 25 hundred light years away and 18 thousand years old. They were quite wrong - in fact Vale was only 15 hundred light years away and 5 thousand years old. From Discover Magazine, January 2001, an article by Rip Van Winkle showing stars are much younger than thought. The article 'University around us' at Cambridge University, said, “Even the nearest Cepheids are so remote, it's difficult to determine their absolute distance with any great accuracy.” All large distances in Astronomical literature are subject to an error - of perhaps 10 percent - from this cause alone. He said, “We know that faintness”, that's how bright the star is, “arises from two causes: distance and absorbing matter in space, and it's generally not possible to apportion it between the two.” Get the book *The Evolution Cruncher* and find out what happened to Halton Harp who dared to question the red-shift theory. Good way to lose your job as discrimination against those, because they're looking for anything to hang on to this dumb big bang theory's the problem. Big bang theory is a dud, Fred Orwell said that 20 years ago.

Okay, Isaiah 40 [v22] tells us, “The Lord sits on the circle of the Earth”, and it says, “He stretched out the heavens like a curtain.” Isaiah 42 [v5] talks about the stretching of the heavens. Isaiah 45 says, “He stretched out the heavens.” Jeremiah 10 [v12] says. “He stretched out the heavens.” There's several theories of what's causing the red-shift. One theory is the stretching from the creation. This is the normal thing you'd expect because 'He stretched out the heavens like a curtain' just like the Bible told us. Maybe that's the only reason we have a red-shift. Second theory is: the light's getting tired travelling great distance. Third theory is as it travels through whatever space is made of - maybe space is nothing, maybe space is something, we don't know what space is - but as the light travels that may automatically be a phenomena that causes the red-shift. It could be the Doppler effect, the star could be moving away - I don't know and nobody knows - okay. It could be the light is being speeded up or slowed down as it goes past a dense gravitational mass of space. We simply don't know what's causing the red-shift.

Is the sun shrinking?

Next question: - I get asked this question quite frequently actually - is the sun shrinking? The sun is obviously burning, just step outside and look at it - in the daytime. The sun is loosing about 5 million tonnes of mass every second. The sun is obviously burning and loosing an enormous amount of fuel. So, if you go backwards in time, and add 5 million tones per second back to the sun, you start to create a problem at some point. I don't know what the number is, but I wouldn't give a number because as soon as I give a number and say x number of million years ago this would have happened, the atheists, or the sceptical, pick on the number and miss the concept. The fact is the sun is burning. If the sun were larger, it would begin to suck Mercury and Venus in first of all, Mercury first, and then Venus and slowly affect Earth. Now the bulletin of America Astronomical Society in 1979 said, “Since 1836, more than 100 direct observers - different observers - at the royal Greenwich observatory, and at the U.S. Naval observatory, have made direct visual measurements that suggest the sun's diameter is shrinking at the rate of about a tenth of a percent each century.” Which works out to be 5 feet per hour. Now, whether the number's right, I don't know, but the fact is it's pretty obvious the sun is burning and the sun is, for a hundred years of measurements, they said it's shrinking about 5 feet an hour. Of course now, the sun is gigantic, about 880 thousand miles in diameter. So, it's not a problem - we're not going to lose it anytime soon. Science Magazine ran an article in 1980 that said, “Several indirect techniques also confirm the sun is shrinking. Although these inferred collapse is only about one seventh as much.” By that thinking the sun would have been touching the Earth 158 million years ago. And again, that's not my number, somebody else

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

came up with that as a possible calculation that the sun would have been touching the Earth. The fact is the sun is shrinking. This chart shows the measurements of not only the polar diameter but the equatorial diameter - the sun has north and south pole like the Earth does. Both measurements are diminishing in the last 160 years. It's been observed - the sun is shrinking. Now the sun oscillates, it swells and shrinks and swells and shrinks, but the overall trend is quite obviously toward shrinking - the sun is burning. That creates a problem if you go backwards in time, the sun would be bigger and more massive, which is going to upset the gravitational pull. So I don't think it's logical to say that the Earth's been going around the sun for billions of years while the sun is constantly losing its mass, and losing its gravitational pull. To me, that invokes a miracle, but it's simpler to say that the system is not billions or years old like they're telling us, and God created everything about 6,000 years ago exactly like the Bible says.

Carbon dating

Okay, what about carbon dating? In every seminar I do, somebody will say, "Wait a minute, carbon dating proves the Earth is billions of years old." Ah, no it doesn't. The fossils are actually dated by their position in the geologic column (we cover that in seminar part 4) and the geologic column does not exist any place in the world. Radiometric dating would not even be possible if the geologic column had not been erected first. An article in American journal and science magazine talks about this. Ever since William Smith at the beginning of the 19th century, fossils have been and still are the best and most accurate method of dating and correlating the rocks in which they occur. Apart from very modern examples, which really are archaeology, this guy said, "I can think of radioactive decay being used to date fossils." So, they don't date fossils by carbon dating or potassium argon dating - this is a mammoth tooth, they date them by the geologic column. They pick a spot and say: Wow, that era was so many thousand years ago, so this must be that old. Fossils are not dated by carbon dating.

Well let me explain how carbon dating works. The Earth's atmosphere is about 100 miles thick, on this globe it doesn't even show up - I mean it's the thickness of the paint, basically. A hundred miles is not much. The space shuttle whizzes around just above the atmosphere so as to cut down on drag - and there's no friction out there. They still get lousy gas mileage though. The air, 100 miles thick, is mostly nitrogen - 78% nitrogen, 21% oxygen, 0.06% carbon dioxide (and that's that plants breathe - CO₂, some people say 0.09 or 0.03 I don't know, it varies I'm sure from location to location). There's not a lot of CO₂ in the air, if you increase CO₂, plants grow faster, which is a frustration for the environment whackos when they burn forests, you know, all the CO₂ is released and the trees next door grow faster. So it doesn't create an environmental crisis like they want you to believe. There's extremely small quantities of radioactive carbon 14. The way this works, radiation from the sun strikes the atmosphere, super high-speed energy comes down, bangs into the nitrogen and changes it to carbon 14. Just a quick simple chemistry lesson here: carbon and nitrogen are right next to each other on the periodic table; nitrogen is number 14, carbon is number 12. But if the nitrogen gets blasted by radiation it turns into carbon 14. Normal carbon is called carbon 12; here what we have is called radioactive carbon - carbon 14. It's very rare, and it doesn't stay stable because it's always breaking apart. You can hear it with a Geiger-counter, you know in the movies they've got the Geiger-counter and get near the Uranium going click... click... click... click. Well the same thing with carbon 14 - it breaks apart, it keeps falling apart. And it's turning back into nitrogen, and disappearing, which is a gas, so it disappears into the air. Carbon 14 is produced in the atmosphere by the sun, it breaks down at the rate of: about half of it will break down every 5,730 years. It's called the half life. So if I gave you a pile of carbon 14, and you waited 5,730 years, half of it would turn back to nitrogen, and you'd end up with half a pile. If you wait another 5,730 years,

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

half of that is going to turn to nitrogen, you end up with a fourth of a pile. In theory it never goes to zero, it goes from half to a fourth to an eighth to a sixteenth, etc... But plants are always breathing in Carbon 14, in the photosynthesis process - they're breathing in carbon - some of it's carbon 14, but most of it is normal carbon 12. Animals eat the plants, and make it part of their body, probably during your lifetime you've either eaten plants, or you've eaten animals that have eaten plants. That's about all there is to eat out there. And so, you're absorbing radioactive carbon into you, just like I am into me, because we're getting it through the food chain, the plants got it from the air, the air got it from the sun. This carbon 14 got into the plants then it got into you or to the animals, and then into you, but either way we all contain some radioactive carbon. When the plant or animal dies, it's not going to get any more, obviously, so several assumptions are involved in carbon dating. First of all, they assume that the amount of C14 in the atmosphere - the ratio - which is a very small number is the same found in the plants and animals. For instance the atmosphere contains 0.0000765% radioactive carbon 14. It is assumed that I have the same. I've never been tested for C14 and I've never met anybody who has, but I would say that's a reasonable assumption - but it is an assumption. Okay, when the plant or animal dies it doesn't get any more C14, so whatever it had begins to decay, it was decaying while it was alive, but you never noticed it because it was being replenished, so the balance would stay. But as soon as it dies, it begins to go out of balance, so basically carbon dating is measuring the amount of carbon in the object with the amount of carbon in the atmosphere and getting a balance. If the atmosphere is 0.0000765% and the object you're taking is only half as much, they would assume it's been dead for one half life. If it's only one fourth as much, it's been dead for two half lives - 2 times 5,730, and then it goes to a fourth, to an eighth, to a sixteenth. So they're comparing the amount in the object with the amount in the atmosphere. This is how carbon dating works. Sounds good, scientific, but it's based on some serious assumptions that mess up everything - it doesn't work. If I told you to fill a barrel with water, but I have drilled holes in the barrel, while you're putting water in, it begins to leak out. So you have a process of filling, and a process of leaking at the same time. You have adding and subtracting going on simultaneously, at some point you're going to reach a stage called equilibrium - you'll never fill the barrel past that point unless you speed up the input or decrease the output, one or the other. Well, first atmosphere is constantly taking in carbon 14 from the sun and it's constantly losing it to decay. You have the same thing with the barrel. The question would be: How long would it take the Earth's atmosphere to reach equilibrium? Well, when carbon dating was first discovered or invented in early 1950's, or late 1940's actually, Willard Libby did this at the university of Chicago. He said, "I wonder how long it would take the Earth's atmosphere to reach equilibrium?", 'cause he knew about the equilibrium problem. They said, after doing some studies, it would take about 30 thousand years. Basically, if you made a brand new planet Earth, poof - create one, cover it with air, start it spinning around itself and spinning around the sun. The sun is going to strike the atmosphere, produce carbon 14 and it's going to start decaying. They said within 30 thousand years, the atmosphere would be equalised, you would reach this point called equilibrium. You're never going to get more C14 and you shouldn't get any less unless something changes in the system. Well, sounds good - I don't know if the number's right, but the concept is. Within 30 thousand years the Earth's atmosphere would reach equilibrium. The problem is we still haven't reached equilibrium. There's more C14 now, than there was 20 years ago. Actually, radio carbon is forming 28-37% faster than its decay. So, if we still haven't reached equilibrium, then the Earth is less than 30 thousand years old - which is what the Christians have been saying all along. A friend of mine has a website arky.org, you can get information there about Earth's atmosphere still not reached equilibrium. There's been a lot of people doing research on this, and they say we're not there yet. This chart indicated how carbon 14 is supposed to work, in theory. An object that is still alive should be in balance with the atmosphere, which will give you 16, I'm going to simplify this a little

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

bit, give you 16 clicks a minute per gram on your Geiger counter. You're listening to, testing a sample and it goes click, every 4 seconds, you know, click... click. If it's only giving you 8 clicks per minute, then you're assuming it's 5,700 years old - it's been through one half life. If you're only getting 4 clicks a minute, then it's been through 2 half lives. If you're getting 2 clicks a minute, then it's been through 3 half lives, it's 11,000 years old. This is how carbon dating is done. If you test a sample and you find out you're getting 2 and a half clicks a minute or 2.9, or something like that, you look at the chart and read over and find the age by the simple calibration curve they call it. Sounds good - doesn't work.

If you walked into a room and found a candle burning on a table, and I asked you the very simple question: "When was it lit?", you say, "Well, I don't know, it was burning when I got here." Okay, let's do what's called empirical science - things we can test and demonstrate and weigh and prove. Okay, we're going to measure the candle. We measure the height of the candle, we find out the candle is seven inches tall. "Okay, when was it lit?"; you say, "I don't know." Okay, let's do some more science. Let's measure how fast it burns. Suppose we get an Olympic stopwatch and we measure this thing very carefully, and find out the candle is burning one inch every hour. Now, we've got two hard science empirical facts: the candle is seven inches tall, it is burning an inch an hour. "When was it lit?" You still can't tell me unless you make some assumptions. How tall was it? And has it always burned at the same rate? Neither of those assumptions can be proven - they are purely assumptions. Okay, if you find a fossil in the dirt, all you know is - it died! You don't even know where it died, you just know where it ended up buried - that's all. Now the amount of carbon 14 could be measured very precisely, and the rate of decay could be determined. But when did it live? I have no idea, and nobody does, 'cause you'd have to know how much was in it when it was alive, that would depend on the assumption that the Earth's atmosphere has reached equilibrium - and we haven't, and you'd have to know whether it has decayed at the same rate. Now if the Bible is right, and the Earth has a canopy of water overhead, like I think the Bible clearly teaches in 2 Peter 3 and in Genesis 1 6-7. This canopy of water would filter out quite a bit of radiation and they probably had a lot less carbon 14 in the original creation than we do today. So, if you dig up a fossil from an animal that drowned in the flood, I don't know if any of these are or not, but if you find a fossil and say, "Wow, I believe this one, this Amorite, may have drowned in the flood", it probably did. And we want to find out if it's got carbon - it probably doesn't, it's probably been totally replaced by minerals, but let's assume it has an organic material, and so we carbon date it. They would assume that it lived in an atmosphere just like we have today. Nah! Faulty assumption! Not a good idea.

Here's some examples of how carbon dating doesn't work (we'll go in chronological order here):

- Back in 1949 an article came out in Natural History Magazine that said, "The lower leg of a Mammoth dated 15,000 years old, but the skin dated 21,000 years old. It didn't work in 1949.
- 1963 - a living mollusc shell carbon dated at 2,300 years old. Well, here we are 14 years later - carbon dating is still not working.
- 1970 - this article came out and they said, "If a carbon date supports our theories, we put it in the main text, if it is not entirely in contradiction we put it in the footnote. If it's completely out of date we just drop it."
- 1971 - a freshly killed seal carbon dated at 1,300 years old. Still not working folks!
- 1975 - a baby mammoth was found frozen, part of it dated 40,000 years old, another part was 26,000 years old and the wood next to it was 9,000 years old. Still not working in 1975!
- 1981 - they tried it again. This guy said, "No matter how useful it is; the radio carbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. They are gross

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

discrepancies, the chronology is uneven and relative, and the accepted dates are actually selected dates. This whole blessed thing is nothing but thirteenth century alchemy. It all depends on which funny paper you read.” Still not working!

- 1984 - Shells from living snails were carbon dated at 27,000 years old. Still not working!
- 1985 - They took 11 human skeletons, the earliest know human remains in the western hemisphere, and they were carbon dated, or dated by accelerator mass spectrometer, all 11 dated 5,000 radio carbon years or less. Here, these things were supposed to be a quarter of a million years old, or something. It's not working in 1985!
- 1992 - Two Colorado Creek mammoths, side-by-side, buried frozen mammoths, were dated, one was 22,000 years old, the other is 16,000 years old. Still not working in 1992!
- In 1996 - at Berkeley University, they've got the Geochronology Centre - Carl Swisher used the most advanced techniques to date human fossils. This article said, “Last spring, he was re-evaluating Homo Erectus skulls found in Java by testing the sediment found with them. A Hominid species, assumed to be an ancestor of Homo Sapiens, Erectus was thought to have vanished a quarter of a million years ago. Even though he used two different dating methods, Swisher kept making the same startling find: the bones were 53,000 at most and possibly no more than 27,000.” Well, I'd like to point out your honour, that is a 96% error. So, it's not working in 1996 either.

It's not logical to say that carbon dating works. One part of a mammoth dated 29,000 years old, another part was 44,000 years old. This article said, “In the last 2 years, an absolute date has been obtained for the Ngandong Beds, it has the very interesting value of 300,000 years plus or minus 300,000 years.” So, Ah, it doesn't work!

We have in our library the geological survey professional paper 862, some sceptics on the web have argued that I didn't understand what the paper was saying - I think I do, it shows the charts here of the different carbon dates that they got from different animals in different organic material found all over Alaska, it's a geologic survey paper. Sample number 454 carbon dated at 17,210 years old, sample 455 gave a carbon date of 24,000 years old. People say, “See, what's the big deal?” “Well, look at it.” This is the same sample as 454. 455 and 454 are the same creature - they're getting different ages. Sample 299 was dated at less than 20,000 years old, sample L-137X was dated at greater than 28,000 years old. Well, read it carefully, that's the same sample as 299! He gave it a different number and a different laboratory, but it's the same sample. Two different numbers - same sample. Living penguins date 8,000 years old. Material from dinosaurs layers were found and dated at 34,000 years old. They find organic material with dinosaurs, sometimes frozen dinosaur bones, sometimes unfossilised dinosaur bones are found.

Two Russian scientists dated dinosaur bones at less than 30,000 years old. Hugh Miller in Columbus Ohio had 4 dinosaur bone samples carbon dated. They told them they were 20,000 years old. He didn't tell them they were dinosaur bones. If he would have said, “This is a dinosaur bone, I want you to carbon date it”, they would have said, “Oh, we can't date that because it's too old”, you see, they start - this is a dinosaur bone by the way, it's been replaced by minerals - they start with the assumption that dinosaurs lived 70 million years ago. If I took this to a laboratory and said, “Would you please date this?” They would say, “Oh well, we'd have to use something other than carbon dating because this is too old for carbon dating.” They've already decided what range it fits in. That's not how science ought to work. You ought to be able to say, “Well, Ah let's just be open-minded about this.” They can date the same sample 10 ways and get 10 different numbers.

Here's some things to consider about carbon dating:

- If you date a sample of known age - I mean you know how old it is, like a tree ring, carbon

Seminar 7a: Questions and Answers Session (previous 2003 version of this seminar)

dating doesn't work.

- If you date a sample of unknown age, it's assumed to work.

It's not science and it's not common sense.

As elements decay, they produce helium. One of the by-products of carbon decay, or radioactive decay of any kind, is that it produces helium gas; which, unless you're in the ground where it can be trapped in a cave, it's going to escape into the atmosphere. But helium in the atmosphere indicates the Earth is not billions of years old, actually less than 2 million years old - just based on the helium content in the atmosphere. If radioactive decay has been going on for millions of years, there should be a lot more helium; taking all factors into account, the helium escape mechanism and everything, it just is not more than 2 million years old. There's an excellent book if you want to get more on 'the go down deep stuff' on carbon dating [called 'The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods' by John Woodmorappe, you can get it from our bookstore if you want or call icr.org - they have the book there.

This guy said, "The rocks date the fossils, but the fossils date the rocks more accurately"; I tell you what folks, the cheese fell out of his sandwich, alright. He said, "Circularity is inherent in the derivation of timescale", they use circular reasoning.

Specimen 10017 from the moon was divided into 6 pieces and dated many times, the ages range from 2.5 to 4.6 billion - notice there's nearly a 500 percent error - it doesn't work.

I talked to a J P Dawson in Oklahoma, he was the chief on engineering and operations for the Luna and Earth science division at NASA in Houston, he said they worked on the Luna samples including the Genesis rock, he told me they found ages from 10,000 years to several billion years in the same rock. So basically you kind of pick what you want. There's an excellent chapter in this book called 'Bones of Contention', the last chapter deals with what is called 'The dating game'. It's hilarious to see how they change the dates to make them fit, you know, if any new evidence comes in, we'll just change the date to make it fit the theory. Alright, we'll take a little break here and we'll come back and talk about the other dating methods, potassium argon and some of the other ones, and then we'll go on to some more of your questions.

Acknowledgements:

Made available on the Internet
by [Michel Snoeck](#) (2003).

Creation Science Evangelism

c/o 29 Cummings Rd.
Pensacola, Florida [32503]
(850)479-3466
<http://www.drdino.com>