

V. THE ORIGIN OF LIFE

A. THE ENVIRONMENT

Cells are made of proteins, which are in turn made of amino acids. Laboratory experiments have shown us that amino acids can come together spontaneously under certain conditions. These include:

1. A mixture of hydrogen, methane, ammonia, and water vapor, commonly known as a “primordial soup.”
2. A reducing atmosphere; no free oxygen present.
3. A way to filter out harmful radiation from the sun.
4. An energy source to produce the amino acids, then a trapping mechanism to remove them from contact with the energy source before they are damaged.

The predictions of each model and our actual observations:

1. “Primordial Soup”

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
Fossil traces of a “primordial soup” containing hydrogen, methane, ammonia, and water vapor.	No such traces should be found since the primordial soup never existed.

What We Observe:

The primordial soup would have had to cover much of the earth for millions of years. Yet no fossil traces of a primordial soup have ever been found.

2. Reducing Atmosphere

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
Oxygen stops the chemical reactions that would be needed to form a cell by accident. We expect to find traces of an early non-oxygen atmosphere.	We expect to find evidence that the atmosphere has always contained free oxygen.

What We Observe:

In even the “oldest” Precambrian layers of the earth’s sediment, all the way down to basement rock, geologists have found traces of free oxygen. This shows the presence of oxygen in even the very “oldest” sediments.

3. The Oxygen-Ultraviolet Dilemma

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
Some natural way to filter out the sun’s harmful long-wave ultraviolet radiation so that the first living cells could have formed spontaneously.	No significant differences in the environment at the time of life’s origin. UV radiation of wavelength greater than 300 nm would have been as deadly then as now.

What We Observe:

The sun produces both short- and long-wave (over 300 nm) UV. Long-wave UV is so deadly to living cells that Carl Sagan (a vocal anti-creationist) tells us that a typical modern organism subjected to the intensity of long-wave UV that would have reached the early earth’s surface in an oxygen-free atmosphere would absorb a lethal dose in an average of 0.3 seconds!

This is not a problem because harmful ultraviolet radiation is filtered out by the atmosphere’s ozone layer. Ozone is a form of oxygen. If there were free oxygen in the early atmosphere (see the preceding topic), the chemical reactions needed for life to begin couldn’t have happened - but if there were no oxygen, long-wave ultraviolet would have destroyed any useful compounds as fast as they could form.

Copyright 2020 by David A. Prentice
Page 4

4. The Trapping Mechanism

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
A natural trapping mechanism to remove amino acids from contact with the energy source that produced them, before the same source could operate again and destroy them.	No natural trapping mechanism should be found.

What We Observe:

No natural trapping mechanisms have ever been observed. Even if one ever did exist, the amino acids would be protected but another problem would arise. In order to form more complex compounds, they would need to be exposed to energy, removed from it, re-exposed, etc., many times, at exactly correct intervals – all by random chance. If there really was a trapping mechanism, they would have no energy to combine further into proteins.

B. OPTICAL ISOMERS

Amino acids produced by lab experiments are an approximately even mix of two “optical isomers,” that is, some have a right-hand twist (the D- form) and some are left-handed (the L- form). There is no way known to produce only one form or the other without constant, careful supervision.

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
Living cells should have about a 50/50 mix of L- and D- amino acids and whatever other chemicals can have L- and D- forms.	Cells should show evidence of careful design and will probably be quite different from what random chemical processes could produce.

What We Observe:

With almost no exceptions, living cells consist **entirely** of L- amino acids and **no** D-acids. (Their DNA contains the opposite: only D- sugars with no L- forms.) This is diametrically opposed to the 50/50 mix that random processes would be expected to produce.

C. BIOCHEMISTRY

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
Chemical processes should naturally tend to produce living cells.	Living cells should be far too complex to be the result of random chemical processes. .

What We Observe:

When the above-mentioned gases are brought together under ideal conditions, they produce not just the 20 correct kinds of L- amino acids used in living cells but also at least 40 incorrect L- amino acids, 60 D-acids, L- and D- sugars, bases, and many other components that have nothing to do with cells. These all come together in a myriad of ways and result in a useless random mix of chemicals. Chemistry is the problem, not the solution.

The simplest theoretically possible living cell (far simpler than any actually known) would contain about 124 proteins, each made up of about 400 of the correct L- amino acids in exact sequence. The chance that the chemicals needed to produce such a cell could come together in exactly correct order has been calculated at less than one in 10^{78,436}. This does not even take into account the complexity of DNA, which is needed for the cell to reproduce. Even “simple” cells contain a vast amount of information in their DNA. For example, the DNA of *Escherichia coli*, a common single-celled bacterium, is made up of over four million nucleotides, each made up of a sugar, base, and phosphate,

Copyright 2020 by David A. Prentice
Page 5

all in correct sequence. If we were to represent each of the nucleotides by a letter, we would need over six volumes of three hundred pages each simply to write down how to put together this one “simple” cell. We may well ask how all this information could have come together by accident.

All in all, random chemical processes are incapable of producing even the simplest forms of life.

VI. COMMON MISCONCEPTIONS

A. EMBRYONIC RECAPITULATION

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
The human embryo should show all the stages of man’s evolutionary history as it develops in the womb.	Since man did not evolve, the embryo should not demonstrate stages of evolutionary development.

What We Observe:

The commonly held belief in embryonic recapitulation is based on the writings of Ernst Haeckel, a German biologist who in the 1860’s published drawings supposed to show that scientific observation proved this claim. However, Haeckel was later convicted of fraud for falsifying his lab results. He made the whole thing up!

Haeckel was convicted in 1907 – but incredibly, his “embryonic recapitulation” fraud is still found in many biology textbooks. As a result, many still think that the human embryo goes through a fish stage with gill slits and a yolk sac, then an amphibian stage, then a reptile stage, etc. This is simply not true. The “gill slits” are not slits and never have anything to do with breathing, but instead are pharyngeal pouches that house a number of glands; the “yolk sac” contains blood, not yolk; the “tail” is the anchoring point for the pelvic muscles; the heart develops before the rest of the circulatory system; the tongue develops before the teeth, and so on. In fact, any competent embryologist can tell the difference between a human embryo and any other kind at any stage of development.

This is not simply a harmless mistake. In 1973, the United States Supreme Court (*Roe v. Wade*) legalized abortion on demand, based on the judges’ belief that the embryo is not fully human until late in its development. Apparently, no one told them that it was a lie – and so far, over sixty million babies (in the U.S. alone) are dead as a result.

B. VESTIGIAL AND NASCENT ORGANS

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
As creatures evolve to higher and higher levels, they must gain new features and organs while losing old ones. Thus, there should be “vestigial organs” left over from earlier stages of evolution that no longer have a function. There should also be “nascent organs” that are not yet fully functional but are beginning to assume a function.	Every organ in the body of every kind of creature was designed to serve a purpose. There may possibly be a few organs that have lost the ability to function because of harmful mutations in DNA, but these should be few and are not the result of evolution. There should be no nascent organs found in any kind of creature.

What We Observe:

It was thought in the 1800’s that the human body contained about 180 vestigial organs (based on a list compiled by Wedersheim). However, there are now at most six organs in the body for which we do not yet know a function. A few examples: the tonsils and appendix contain lymphoid tissue, useful in fighting infection. The “tailbone” (coccyx) is

Copyright 2020 by David A. Prentice
Page 6

the anchoring point for the pelvic muscles. The thyroid, thymus, and pineal glands are now known to have important functions. The functions of the other “vestigial organs” can be found in any anatomy text.

In addition, there is not a single nascent organ known in any kind of living creature.

C. THE MECHANISM OF EVOLUTION

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
There should be some identifiable mechanism that causes creatures to develop more and more complex features as they evolve to higher and higher levels.	There should be no mechanism to cause evolution; instead, there should be a resistance to basic change built into the genetic code of each kind. We expect that mutations should be harmful.

What We Observe:

In Darwin’s day it was believed that as use and disuse of body parts caused those parts to grow stronger or to atrophy, the changes would be passed on to the next generation. The most famous example is the belief that giraffes developed long necks through many generations of stretching them.

This belief has been thoroughly discredited. The effects of use and disuse are **not** passed on to offspring. The characteristics of each living creature are determined by the genetic information it inherits from its parents in its DNA, which is completely unaffected by use and disuse.

How, then, could new features (bones, eyes, wings, etc.) appear in evolving creatures for the first time? The only possible mechanism would be random mutation of the parents’ DNA, which would then be passed on to the offspring. The problem is that every mutation ever observed has **damaged** the genetic information in DNA. Not a single one has ever added any genetic information.

How about beneficial mutations? Only a tiny number of mutations have increased an affected individual’s ability to survive. Even those few give the individual an advantage only in specific environments. If placed in a different environment, it is less fit rather than more. So even though a tiny number of mutations have benefited individuals, not a **single one** has ever been observed to benefit a species. (Species are supposed to evolve, not individuals.) Evolution would require millions of beneficial mutations, each building on the previous ones.

In summary: Use and disuse has been ruled out, and mutations have almost always proved harmful. The result? There is no plausible mechanism for evolution to occur.

D. SELECTIVE BREEDING AND NATURAL SELECTION

By selective breeding, humans have been able to develop various breeds and strains of animals and plants. Can we extrapolate far enough for evolution to be plausible?

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
There should be no limit on the amount of variation available. Natural selection should produce new species by favoring those creatures that have acquired beneficial mutations in their DNA. These mutations must cause them to develop new structures and features.	Variation should occur only within limits set by the genetic information contained in the DNA of each kind. Natural selection should weed out defective specimens, not produce new species. Mutations should be harmful.

Copyright 2020 by David A. Prentice
Page 7

What We Observe:

After thousands of years of selective breeding, we have been able to make chickens lay more eggs, cows produce more milk, beets produce more sugar, etc. However, in every case ever observed, variation has occurred only up to a definite limit beyond which no further change was possible. The chickens are still chickens, the cows are still cows, the beets are still beets, etc.

An even worse problem: contrary to the predictions of evolution, the further the breeding takes the group from its original condition, the less viable (able to survive) the individual members become. For example, chickens have been bred to reach frying size only seven weeks after hatching, but they require a great deal of care simply to be kept alive for those seven weeks. And when groups that have been separated for selective breeding are allowed to mix and interbreed as they would in the wild, the combined group reverts to its original condition in just a few generations.

We already saw that there are no mutations known to benefit a species. In spite of this, some still choose to have faith that millions of beneficial random mutations have been able to accomplish what thousands of years’ worth of man’s best efforts could not do. Such a belief is certainly not “science.” The evidence shows that there are clearly defined limits to variation.

VII. THE FOSSIL RECORD

Fossils provide the only tangible evidence of what actually **has** happened in the past, whether creation (complex initial appearance with no later increase in complexity) or evolution (initial disorganization followed by increasing complexity). Let’s see what they show us.

A. SUDDEN APPEARANCE

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
Each kind of organism evolved slowly and gradually. There should be far more transitional forms than terminal (final) forms.	Each kind of organism was created distinct from all other kinds. There should be no transitional fossils connecting any two major groups.

What We Observe:

Over a trillion fossils have been discovered. They have been classified into about 250,000 fossil species. Not one undisputed form connecting any two major types of creatures has ever been found, despite extravagant claims for the following alleged transitions:

1. Amphibians. There are no fossil specimens showing evolution from fish to amphibians. There are many major internal differences between crossopterygian fish and ichthyostegid amphibians. Their similarities are superficial.
2. Dinosaurs. Like every other creature, each type of dinosaur appears in the fossil record suddenly and fully formed. The only thing they fossils show us is that there used to be dinosaurs. They give no evidence at all that any kind of animal ever evolved into any other kind. The fact that there were hundreds of types of dinosaurs means nothing. There are thousands of types of birds in the world today, but they are not evolving.
3. Birds. Archaeopteryx is supposed to be the transition between reptiles and birds, but fossils of a bird called Protoavis have been found in rocks dated 75 million years older on the evolutionary time scale. If other birds predated Archaeopteryx by 75 million years, it cannot be their ancestor.

Copyright 2020 by David A. Prentice
Page 8

4. Mammals are supposed to have evolved from “mammal-like” reptiles. Once again, the similarities are superficial. There are major structural differences (breathing, jaw structure, organs of hearing, etc.) between the two classes, with no living or fossil transitions showing how the change might have been made.

5. Horses. The “horse series” found in so many books has been discredited and removed from museums because the forms do not show gradual change, because they are found on the wrong continents, and because the modern horse Equus has been found in the same strata as Eohippus, supposedly its distant ancestor. If Equus lived at the same time as Eohippus, then the modern horse predates all of the “transitions” supposedly leading up to it.

6. Apes and Humans. Since humans and African apes (gorillas and chimpanzees) are supposed to have evolved from the same ancestor, there should be thousands of transitions leading up to us from this “common ancestor.” All we find, though, are fossil apes and fossil humans.

Apes and Monkeys:

- Aegyptopithecus, Anthrasimias, Parapithecus, Propliopithecus, Pliobates, Sivapithecus, Ramapithecus, Oreopithecus, Dryopithecus, Rudapithecus, Sahelanthropus, and Australopithecus are now accepted as apes or monkeys. The latter group has been given several names by researchers trying to justify their funding, but the australopithecines seem to have been similar to the bonobo, a living variety of chimpanzee.
- The name Homo habilis (“handy man”) is a broad category originally assigned to a group of australopithecines found with tools. However, true human fossils were later found at the same location. Homo habilis was not the maker of the tools.

Humans:

- Homo habilis may be too broad a category. It is sometimes used to include a different group of fossils that many would classify Homo erectus.
- Homo erectus seems to have had somewhat different skull shapes than typical Homo sapiens, but they fall within the range of human measurements. Homo erectus fossils have always been found near Homo sapiens. They may simply have been humans with non-European features.
- Neanderthal, Cro-Magnon and the like are accepted as variations of Homo sapiens. Both of these had larger brains than typical modern humans and were physically superior to us in many ways. They were not “primitive” ancestors, merely fossil humans.

So what “ape-men” are left? None, just as creation predicts.

B. STASIS

Evolution Predicts:	Creation Predicts:
Each type of organism should be continually evolving to a higher and higher level.	Each type kind of organism should stay basically the same from its lowest to highest appearances in the fossil record.

What We Observe:

From its lowest appearance in the fossil record until the present (or until extinction), every kind of creature exhibits stasis, or resistance to basic change. This is so obvious that an entirely new model of evolution, “Punctuated Equilibria,” had to be proposed. It was necessary because of the overwhelming fossil evidence that each kind of creature first appeared suddenly and fully formed, and has remained essentially unchanged throughout its entire history.

This is precisely what creation predicts.)

Copyright 2020 by David A. Prentice
Page 9

There is so much more scientific evidence we could look at (such as the evidence for a young earth) that we've barely scratched the surface. But you may be asking yourself, "So what if the evidence supports creation instead of evolution? What's the big deal anyway?" It's a big deal for a number of reasons.

WHAT'S OS

When an animal or plant dies, its carcass decays unless it is quickly buried so as to be removed from contact with the air and with scavengers. The great majority of fossils are preserved in water-deposited sediment, often in vast fossil graveyards such as South Africa's Karoo Supergroup with its estimated 800 billion vertebrates. The fossils in these graveyards clearly indicate that their death and burial were not gradual but instead, catastrophic. Many of the graveyards give indications that they were transported into place by violent water action. The violent action would explain the cases where individual creatures are found away from their normal ecological community. In addition, there are several mass extinctions preserved in the fossil record. These too show that slow, gradual processes are not sufficient to explain fossil formation. By the way, researchers have found that under the right conditions, wood and chicken bones can turn into fossils in as little as **five to ten years**. Organic garbage can turn into "fossil fuel" (oil) in as little as **twenty minutes**.

What We Observe:

Creation Predicts: Fossils should be formed rapidly; Great expanses of time are not slowly. The fossil record required in order for evolution to be plausible. Thus, fossils should show evidence of catastrophic events responsible for large-scale fossilization.	Evolution Predicts: Fossils should be formed rapidly; Great expanses of time are not slowly. The fossil record required in order for evolution to be plausible. Thus, fossils should show evidence of catastrophic events responsible for large-scale fossilization.
---	--

D. FOSSIL FORMATION - SLOW OR RAPID?

Geologists assign ages to rock strata not by radiometric techniques, but by the characteristic *strata* of fossils they contain. This holds true worldwide. For example, the same basic suite of fossils is found in Cambrian rocks throughout the world, while different characteristic suites are found in Devonian, Cretaceous, etc. There are many examples of fossils found in rocks of the wrong "age," but the ages assigned to the rocks themselves depend on the clearly defined suites of fossils found in them rather than any verifiable radiometric means. These communities are precisely what creation leads us to expect.

What We Observe:

Creation Predicts: Since living creatures are preserved in independent living creatures from one-celled organisms all the way up to humans, various creatures must be found in the fossil record. There should be a number of recognizable fossil <i>biomes</i> (ecological communities).	Evolution Predicts: Since there is a great variety of living creatures from one-celled organisms all the way up to humans, various creatures must be found in the fossil record. There should be a number of recognizable fossil <i>biomes</i> (ecological communities).
---	--

C. FOSSIL COMMUNITIES

For multiple copies or for foreign-language versions, contact the author at the address above.

1. Copies are to be made for individual use only.
2. The material must be copied in its entirety.

This material is copyrighted for the author's protection. Copies may be made on a not-for-profit basis under the following conditions:

Origins Resource Association
www.originsresource.org



You've seen now that much of what you've been told is nothing but a lie. Perhaps you're satisfied to continue being deceived – or perhaps you want to know the truth. Would you like to learn more? We want to help you. If you want references or more detailed information that what you've read here, if you want more information about the other reasons this is important, or if we can help you in any other way, please contact us. We care about you.

Do you want to know the meaning of life and death? If evolution is correct, you can't. You have no idea how or when life and death began, so you can never be sure what, if anything, they mean. But if creation is true, then ... maybe you **can** really know what life is all about.

Third, we need to understand that the meaning of anything is tied up with its origin. If we want to know the meaning of the colors in the American flag, we need to study its origin. If we want to know the meaning of the Christmas tree, we must go back to its origin. And if we want to know the meaning of life and death, we must go back to their origin.

Second, what you believe about creation and evolution affects how you think about yourself and others and how you act. We already saw the lie of "embryonic recapitulation" was the reason the Supreme Court legalized abortion on demand. Evolution has also been used as the justification for racism, pornography, drug abuse, and many other social problems of our day. And on a personal level, if you think you are nothing more than an evolved animal, you are likely to act like one.

- First, academic and scientific integrity. By now you can surely see that a great deal of scientific evidence has been censored from your textbooks and withheld from you as evolution has been presented as "proven scientific fact."
- Second, what you believe about creation and evolution affects how you think about yourself and others and how you act. We already saw the lie of "embryonic recapitulation" was the reason the Supreme Court legalized abortion on demand. Evolution has also been used as the justification for racism, pornography, drug abuse, and many other social problems of our day. And on a personal level, if you think you are nothing more than an evolved animal, you are likely to act like one.

But when you want to know the truth...

YOU HAVE TO MEMORIZE TO GET THE GRADES.



CREATION/EVOLUTION FACT SHEET

Copyright 2020 by David A. Prentice

You've probably heard people say that creation is religion, while evolution is science. "Creation" and "evolution" are emotionally charged words. But just what do these two words really mean?

Creation is the concept that the universe, earth, and life began in a **mature, complex** state because of an influence outside the realm of nature - a creator. At the time of creation, each would have been in the best condition it has ever been; later changes would tend to be in the direction of deterioration - that is, **complex to simple**.

Evolution is the concept that the universe, earth, and life began in a **simple, disorganized** state. Ever since the initial appearance of each, changes would have had to be in the direction of increasing complexity - that is, **simple to complex**. Theistic evolution says that this increasing complexity is because of the intervention of an intelligent influence (God); atheistic evolution says that it is the result of random chance.

Atheists ask who made God. They say it is unscientific to believe in creation because a creator would have to be invisible, supernatural, eternal, omnipresent, and omnipotent. What alternative does atheism offer? If there is no God, then the universe is the result of random chance. But in this case, notice some of the things that must be true of "Random Chance": It can only be detected by what it does (**invisible**). It established the laws of nature and is not subject to them (**supernatural**). It predated the universe (**eternal**). Its influence extends throughout the universe (**omnipresent**). It is responsible, directly or indirectly, for everything that has ever happened (**omnipotent**). And, of course, nobody made Random Chance.

It is absurd to rule out creation as a possibility simply because it requires a creator. Belief in God and belief in Random Chance are exactly parallel. **Each** would have to be invisible, supernatural, eternal, omnipresent, omnipotent, and self-existent. Neither is any more or less scientific than the other. If we rule out one we should rule out both. If we admit that one is possible, we should admit that the other is also.

Let's look, then, at the question of creation versus evolution. After all, if there is a God, he *could* have directly created or else could have used evolution as the method of creation. The question is, which did he use?

No scientists were around to record whether the universe, earth, and life were disorganized or complex at the beginning. In order to determine whether creation or evolution is more reasonable, then, we must go back to the basic premises, which are:

Creation - **initial complexity** with later changes tending toward deterioration, (**complex to simple**) versus

Evolution - **initial disorganization** with later changes tending toward increasing complexity (**simple to complex**).

Each of these basic premises will lead us to expect to find certain kinds of evidence in nature.

Before we begin to look at this evidence, ask yourself: What evidence are you prepared to accept? If you staunchly refuse to admit that there could possibly be any evidence for creation, then you are totally biased and might as well stop reading because you are wasting your time. If you are willing to admit that such evidence may exist, then let's begin.

I. ORGANIZATION OR DISORGANIZATION?

Evolution Predicts: An innate tendency in matter and energy toward continually increasing complexity.	Creation Predicts: An innate tendency in matter and energy toward continual deterioration.
---	--

What We Observe:

An innate tendency in matter and energy toward continual deterioration. The Second Law of Thermodynamics, the best-demonstrated law in all of science, tells us that any system of matter and energy free from outside influence **always** tends to deteriorate.

What about open systems, those that *are* subject to outside influences? In such systems, a temporary increase in organization is possible. Let's consider a living creature as an example of an open system. Organization increases as the creature grows. However, certain conditions must be met:

1. There must be an outside source of the kind of energy the creature or system needs. Random energy is not enough; a bull may furnish a great deal of energy to a china shop but does not produce an increase in organization. Similarly, a living creature may be exposed to a great deal of energy in the form of a nuclear explosion but will not grow as a result. The energy source must be in a usable form (food) in order for the creature to grow.
2. There must be a way to convert the energy to something the organism's cells can use. Without a digestive system to break down food into proteins, carbohydrates, etc., living creatures will starve to death no matter how much food is available. Where did the digestive system come from?
3. There must be **pre-existing information** to guide the way the energy is used. The body structures (including the digestive system) of each living creature grow in a very specific way because of the genetic information (DNA) it inherits from its parents.

If a system contains pre-existing information such as DNA, its organization may increase. But no system, whether closed or open, has ever been seen to increase in net information content by itself. Its information only increases if there is an outside source putting more in. Since DNA is the most efficient information storage system known, the Second Law points unmistakably to the conclusion that its information is the result of a creative act, not random chance.

II. ORIGIN OF MATTER AND ENERGY

Evolution Predicts: Either matter and energy are eternal or else there is some natural way for them to come into existence from nothing.	Creation Predicts: Matter and energy can only be produced by direct action of a creator outside the realm of nature.
--	--

What We Observe:

The First Law of Thermodynamics tells us that matter and energy cannot be created or destroyed by any known natural process. The Second Law tells us that matter/energy are becoming less and less useful; at some time in the past, they would have been 100% useful. Before that, natural laws break down. Either way, we must look to something outside of nature for their origin.

Evolution has no scientific advantage over creation. Those who believe that God did not directly create matter and energy must themselves appeal to some process that, like God, is not governed by known natural laws. We cannot scientifically prove the existence of God, but neither can we scientifically prove the existence of this unknown process. Either one is a belief, not science.

III. THE BIG BANG

Evolution Predicts: All the matter and energy in the universe started in the most disorganized explosion of all time, the "Big Bang." There should be high-energy radiation left over from the big bang. The universe should be expanding. After the big bang, everything should have become more organized because of natural laws.	Creation Predicts: The universe and its parts began in a mature condition. There was no big bang. It does not matter if the universe is expanding, but there should not be radiation left over from a big bang. A big bang would probably violate several laws of nature. Things should become less, not more, organized.
--	---

What We Observe:

Dozens of big bang models have been proposed. Why so many? Because none is able to account for all the problems with the basic concept. There is a cosmic microwave background (CMB) field throughout space, but it has an energy level of 2.726 degrees Kelvin instead of the 3000 degrees the big bang concept originally predicted. (The theory has been modified to fit the 2.7 degree CMB, but new rules of physics had to be invented that have nothing to do with observable reality.) Contrary to big bang models, the CMB is distributed uniformly and furnishes a frame of reference through which our galaxy moves at about 440 km/sec.

The universe may or may not be expanding. The only indication that it may be, the red shift of starlight, shows expansion only if the theory of relativity is correct, if light travels in deep space the same way it does close to earth, and if astronomers are correct about some major assumptions about distant objects. In addition, red shifts can be equally well explained by other processes besides expansion. (Rotating universe, gravitational red shifts, diffusion of radiation by interstellar dust, etc.) Besides, astronomers have observed pairs of galaxies connected by luminous bridges of matter, in which one galaxy exhibits a red shift (interpreted to mean it is moving away from us) but the other has a blue shift, which should mean it is moving toward us! It may be that scientists just don't fully understand the meaning of red shifts.

A big bang, which nobody observed, would violate at least three natural laws that scientists *have* observed: the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics, the Law of Conservation of Momentum, and the Law of Conservation of Angular Momentum.

IV. ORIGIN OF THE SOLAR SYSTEM

Evolution Predicts: The planets were formed out of the sun. Their composition should be similar to it and to each other.	Creation Predicts: The planets were formed much as we see them today. They did not come from the sun.
--	---

What We Observe:

NASA space flights tell us that each of the planets is composed of materials quite different from the others and from the sun. Also, the planets possess less than 2% of the solar system's mass but over 98% of its angular momentum. There is no way known for the sun to have transferred all this angular momentum to them.

The planets and moons are not likely to have been captured one at a time by accident. Their orbits are delicately balanced with each other, and at least eleven rotate the opposite direction from the rest. The laws of physics tell us that it is virtually impossible for such a highly ordered arrangement to happen purely by random chance. Nevertheless, some insist that the solar system is nothing but a cosmic accident. This is faith, not science.