

## A Young Creation Part 4

Well hey, when it comes to witnessing, how many of you guys would readily admit that your greatest fear is probably **the fear of rejection**, right? Of course, it's commonplace. And how many of you have likewise learned that when you finally do get around to witnessing, it's never as bad as you thought it was going to be, right? But hey, just in case you're one of those who still chicken out, I'm here to help you out! Maybe you should try the **creation versus evolution** witnessing technique. Why? Because apparently, it's a fabulous way to share the Gospel. Just ask these guys.

“I brought my brother Bruce along to a Creation seminar. Three days after the meeting my brother gave his heart to the Lord and is still going on strong. My brother had difficulty believing God because of his thoughts on evolution and how that did not ‘stack up’ with the Bible. The message on a literal creation was a big turning point.”

“My brother-in-law Johnny came with me to a meeting on Creationism. He was so affected by the meeting, he became a Christian shortly after as a result of learning that the Bible really was true from the beginning.”

Now folks, I don't know about you, but it sure sounds to me like this creation vs. evolution thing **really is** a powerful way to share the Gospel, how about you? But that's right, if you don't want to listen to me or those guys, then maybe you should listen to the Apostle Paul.

**Acts 17:22-34** “Paul then stood up in the meeting of the Areopagus and said: Men of Athens! I see that in every way you are very religious. For as I

walked around and looked carefully at your objects of worship, I even found an altar with this inscription: TO AN UNKNOWN GOD. Now what you worship as something unknown I am going to proclaim to you.

The God who made the world and everything in it is the Lord of heaven and earth and does not live in temples built by hands. And he is not served by human hands, as if he needed anything, because he himself gives all men life and breath and everything else. From one man he made every nation of men, that they should inhabit the whole earth; and he determined the times set for them and the exact places where they should live.

God did this so that men would seek him and perhaps reach out for him and find him, though he is not far from each one of us. For in him we live and move and have our being. As some of your own poets have said, We are his offspring. Therefore since we are God's offspring, we should not think that the divine being is like gold or silver or stone—an image made by man's design and skill.

In the past God overlooked such ignorance, but now he commands all people everywhere to repent. For he has set a day when he will judge the world with justice by the man he has appointed. He has given proof of this to all men by raising him from the dead.

When they heard about the resurrection of the dead, some of them sneered, but others said, We want to hear you again on this subject. At that, Paul left the Council. A few men became followers of Paul and believed. Among them was Dionysius, a member of the Areopagus, also a woman named Damaris, and a number of others.”

Now folks, according to our text, I think it's pretty clear. When Paul was witnessing to the Athenians, what witnessing technique, if you will, did he use? People, he didn't quote one single verse. He simply used the argument of creation in that there was a literal Creator God who literally made everything and appointed a literal Day of Judgment, and they better repent and get saved before its too late, right? **And so here's my point.**

What was the response of the people? Did it work? Of course it did! Some rejected it, some told him to come back later, but some did what? Some of them got saved, right? And therefore, once again folks, I don't know about you, but apparently this creation vs. evolution thing **really is** a powerful way to share the Gospel, how about you?

And people, that's precisely why we're going to continue in our study, "**The Witness of Creation.**" And what we've been doing is taking a look at the **five different evidences** of creation that God has left behind for us showing us that He's not just real, but that we really can have a personal intimate relationship with Him, the Creator of the universe!

And so far we've seen the **first evidence** God left behind for us showing us this amazing truth was **The Evidence of An Intelligent Creation.** And then the last **three** times we saw the **second evidence** was **The Evidence of a Young Creation.** And last time we saw how evolution not only **Calls Jesus Christ a liar**, but it even **Calls God the Father a Liar.** How? By denying God's literal account of a literal six-day creation in the Book of Genesis. Evolution says, oh no, God's got it wrong, we know we've been here for millions and billions of years because of **evolutionary dating methods.**

And so we examined these dating methods, starting with the sacred cow of **Carbon Dating** and we saw how they've got some serious problems. The facts showed **It only works with previous living things, It only works with a few thousand years, and It only works with Equilibrium**, which we still haven't achieved and therefore proves the earth is only a few thousand years old! Nanny nanny boo boo in Jesus Name!

But you might be thinking, "Okay, wait a minute. So carbon dating doesn't work on rocks and it doesn't work beyond a few thousand years, **but what about all those other dating methods?** I mean, aren't there other dating methods out there the evolutionists use to prove that the earth is millions and billions of years old?" Well, actually, there are. In fact, there's literally dozens of other methods just like carbon dating. But the problem is just like carbon dating **every single one of them** has got some serious flaws.

And that's why the **second problem with Evolutionary Dating Methods** is **They're All Based on Faulty Assumptions**. And to show you how these assumptions are a huge problem for the evolutionist and **all** their dating methods, let's take a look at the analogy of a burning candle. Imagine you found a candle burning in a room, and you wanted to determine how long it was burning before you found it. Here's what you could do. You could measure the present height of the candle (say, seven inches) and the

rate of burn (say, an inch per hour). But in order to find the length of time since the candle was lit you would be forced to make some assumptions. You would obviously have to assume that the candle has always burned at the same rate, and you would have to assume the initial height of the candle. And because of that, your answer will always change based upon these assumptions. In the same way, scientists do not know that the decay rates of dating methods have been constant nor do they know if the atmospheric conditions have always been constant. Therefore, their answers will likewise always change based on these similar assumptions of the candle.

And people, **here's the point**. All, and I mean all, of these evolutionary dating methods are based on the exact same kind of faulty assumptions. And I'm not talking just about just about one or two assumptions, I'm talking about a lot of assumptions. Let's take a look at just a few of them and keep in mind that **all it takes is just one** of these assumptions to ruin the whole date **just like the candle**.

1. **The Assumption of Contamination:** The belief is that there has never been any contamination. But the fact is that everything can be, and probably has been, contaminated (Especially with a worldwide flood) High energy particles, nearby radioactive minerals or contact with certain chemicals could have significantly altered decay rates.
2. **The Assumption of Decay Rates:** The belief is that decay rates never change. But the fact is we have already found evidence of change in the present and changes in the past.

3. **The Assumption of Past Environment:** Unknown changes in our past environment could ruin all assumptions. There is no way of knowing exactly what each local past environment was like.
4. **The Assumption of Past Atmosphere:** Earlier changes in the atmosphere would have greatly affected decay rates. No one knows whether the earlier atmosphere was identically like our present one.
5. **The Assumption of Magnetic Field:** The strength of the earth's magnetic field affects the amount of cosmic rays entering the atmosphere. We know the energy of the earth's magnetic field has been decreasing, so more C-14 is being produced now than in the past. This will make old things look older than they really are.
6. **The Assumption of Sun Spot Cycles:** Sunspot production greatly affects C-14 activity, yet we know with certainty is that there have been changes in the past.
7. **The Assumption of Volcanoes:** Volcanoes spew out CO<sub>2</sub> which could just as effectively decrease the ratio. Specimens which lived and died during a period of intense volcanism would appear older than they really are.
8. **The Assumption of Warm Weather or Water Vapor:** If the earth was either warmer at an earlier time or had more water in the atmosphere, the C-14 clocks would slow down dramatically; that is, register longer periods of time than they should. (Hey that sounds like the two atmospheres of pre-flood earth in **Genesis 1:6-7** "And God said Let there be an expanse between the waters to separate water from water. So God made the expanse and separated the water under the expanse from the water above it. And it was so." and in **2 Peter 3:5-6** "But they deliberately forget that long ago by God's word the heavens existed and the earth was formed out of water and by water. By these waters also the world of that time was deluged and destroyed.")
9. **The Assumption of Date Comparison:** C-14 dates, Uranium dates, thorium dates, and all the other dating methods ALWAYS disagree with one another. This itself is strong evidence of the unreliability of the various methods.

10. **The Assumption of Moisture:** Moisture intrusion of any kind will dramatically affect the dating outcome. (Question: Is a worldwide flood enough moisture for you?)

Now folks, I don't know about you, but I'd say that's quite a few faulty assumptions, how about you? And **remember**, all it takes is just one of these assumptions ruin the whole process.

Oh, but that's not all. Believe it or not, these assumptions are not only made in **theory**, they're made in **actual practice**. Let's take a look at some of the actual dating methods used by evolutionists to give us these millions and billions of years, and you tell me if there's any way they can ever be accurate.

1. **Amino Acid Dating:** Not only will water contaminate the results but so does temperature. Amino acid dating requires that the temperature not change for thousands of years! Not just coldness but heat as well. Just a one degree increase in temperature at 73.4°F will produce a nearly 16% increase in the rate of measurement.
2. **Lead Uranium Dating:** In the lead-uranium systems both uranium and lead can migrate easily in some rocks, and lead escapes as a vapor at relatively low temperatures.
3. **Thorium-Lead Dating:** The same flaws with uranium are applicable to thorium. A powerful evidence that these dates are useless is the fact that uranium and thorium dates always widely disagree with one another.
4. **Rubidium-Strontium Dating:** This is a widely used dating method at the present time. But, in addition to all the other problems mentioned earlier, the experts have been unable to decide on the half-life of rubidium! This is like saying we will use a certain wall clock to figure

time with, while having no idea what each “hour” that passes on that clock equals: five minutes or two days. To add to the problem, strontium is easily leached away can be leached out of the rock by water or by heat thus ruining the computation.

5. **Potassium-Argon Dating:** Since potassium is found in fossil-bearing strata, this is a favorite method. But the experts cannot agree on the half-life of potassium. Also, argon is a rare gas that quickly escapes from the rock into the atmosphere as well as potassium.
6. **Lead 210 and Helium Dating:** Lead 210 can leak or be contaminated by the entry of other leads and helium, being a gas, leaks so radically that it is also USELESS for dating purposes.

Now folks, I don't know about you, but I'm kind of thinking that carbon dating not the only dating method with some serious flaws in it **but so is every single one of them they come up with**, how about you? In fact, you're not the only ones who've come to that conclusion, let's listen to the evolutionist's themselves.

1. **Henry Faul:** “Most of the ages obtained by the lead-thorium method disagree with the ages of the same minerals computed by other lead methods. The reasons for this disagreement are largely unknown.”
2. **L.A. Rancitelli:** “As much as 80 percent of the potassium in a small sample of an iron meteorite can be removed by distilled water in 4.5 hours.”
3. **M.R. Klepper and D.G. Wyant:** “90% of the total radioactive elements of some granites could be removed by leaching the granulated rock in weak acid.”
4. **E.A. von Fange:** “Some geologists question the use of the C-14 method for samples stored under moist conditions. This is a most serious limitation, for who can be sure that a given sample has not been moistened?”

5. **H.C. Dudley:** “All aside from contamination and other problems, everything hinges on unchanging decay rates. H.C. Dudley noted five ways they could change. He actually changed the decay rates of 14 different radioisotopes by means of pressure, temperature, electric and magnetic fields, and stress. He also cited research by Westinghouse laboratories which changed the rates simply by placing inactive iron next to radioactive lead.”
6. **Professor Gunter Faure:** “These results indicate that even total-rock systems may be open during metamorphism and may have their isotopic systems changed, making it impossible to determine their geologic age.”
7. **Frederick B. Jueneman:** “Just one catastrophe, such as a worldwide flood, would throw all the dating clocks off. Immense contamination of all radioactive sources would occur.”

Now folks, I don't know about you, but I'm kind of thinking if evolutionists are having a problem with the reliability of these dating methods, then maybe there's a problem with the reliability of these dating methods!

But you might be thinking, “Now wait a minute. If these methods are so faulty then surely the results would demonstrate that, right? Well, actually they have. And that's why the **third problem** with **Evolutionary Dating Methods** is **They're Dates are Full of Corruption**. People, we're going to take a look at some of the actual results of these dating methods and you tell me if they're accuracy is just a little bit **corrupted**.

1. New wood from actively growing trees has been dated at 10,000 years!

2. Lava from the 1801 Hawaiian volcano eruption gave a K-Ar date of 1.6 Million years old.
3. Hawaiian lava flows known to be less than 200 years old have been dated up to 3 billion years old.
4. Muscle tissue from beneath the scalp of a mummified musk ox found in frozen muck in Alaska had a radiocarbon age of 24,000 while the radiocarbon age of hair from a hind limb of the carcass is 17,200. A life span of over 7,000 years for this animal is highly doubtful. (Let alone 7,000 years for it to grow hair!)
5. The new lava dome from Mount St. Helens was formed in 1986. In 1997 five specimens were taken from this dome at five different locations and subjected to conventional Potassium-Argon dating. The results indicated ages of less than one half to almost three million years old, all from an 11-year old rock.
6. In Jarmo, a village in northern Iraq, 11 samples were dated from the various strata and showed a 6000-year spread from oldest to most recent. Analysis of all the archaeological evidence though showed that the village was occupied no more than 500 years before it was finally abandoned.
7. Mortar from an Oxford Castle in England gave an age of 7,270 years. The only problem was the castle was built about 800 years ago.
8. Lunar soil collected by Apollo 11 gave ages by different methods from 2.3 billion to 8.2 billion years all from rocks from the same location.
9. For years the KBS tuff, named for Kay Behrensmeyer, was dated using Potassium Argon at 212-230 Million years. But then a human skull was found in 1972 under the KBS tuff making it look like modern humans being dated at 2.9 million years old. If the skull had not been found no one would have suspected the 212 million year dates as being wrong. But immediately seeing the dilemma, 10 different samples were retaken from the KBS tuff and were dated as

being .52- 2.64 Million years old, way down from 212 million. But even the “new and improved” dates show a 500% error!

10. Basalt from Mt. Kilauea Iki, Hawaii (AD 1959) was given the age of 8.5 million years old.
11. Basalt from Mt. Etna, Sicily (AD 1972) was given the age of 350,000 years old.
12. Shells from living snails were carbon dated as being 27,000 years old.
13. A freshly killed seal was carbon dated as having died 1,300 years ago!
14. One part of the Vollosovitch mammoth carbon dated at 29,500 years and another part at 44,000. (That’s not only one slow birth but how many of you ladies would like to give birth for 14,500 years? My wife doesn’t want to do that!)
15. One part of Dima (a baby frozen mammoth) was 40,000 years, another part was 26,000 years and the wood immediately around the carcass was 9-10,000 years.
16. The lower leg of the Fairbanks Creek mammoth had a radiocarbon age of 15,380 years while its skin and flesh were 21,300 years. (Wouldn’t it be horrible to go without your legs for 5,920 years?)
17. J.B. Birdsell, *Human Evolution* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1975), p. 295 “In the last two years an absolute date has been obtained for (the Ngandong beds, above the Trinil beds), and it has the very interesting value of 300,000 years plus or minus 300,000 years.”

Now folks, maybe it’s just me, but I’m kind of thinking those dates are just a little bit wacked out, how about you? **Therefore, here’s the point.** Wouldn’t it be just as wacky to think these dating methods are the least bit accurate, right? Hello! McFly!

But you might be thinking, “Now wait a minute. If these evolutionary dating methods are so wacked out then even the evolutionist would have to admit it, right? Well, actually they have. And that’s why the **fourth problem with Evolutionary Dating Methods is They’re Admitted in their own Quotations**. Let’s take a look at some actual quotes from the evolutionist and you tell me if **even they** think their own dating methods are reliable at all!

1. **Roberta Conlan**, “Frontiers of Time” 1991: “The dating of ancient events (millions of years ago) is an inexact science.”
2. **Curt Teichert**, “Some Biostratigraphical Concepts,” in Bulletin of the Geological Society of America: “At present, no coherent picture of the history of the earth could be built on the basis of radioactive datings.”
3. **J. Ogden III**, “The Use and Abuse of Radiocarbon,” in Annals of the New York Academy of Science: “It may come as a shock to some, but fewer than 50 percent of the radiocarbon dates from geological and archaeological samples in northeastern North America have been adopted as ‘acceptable’ by investigators.”
4. **Professor Brew**: “If a C-14 date supports our theories, we put it in the main text. If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a footnote. And if it is completely out of date we just drop it. Few archaeologists who have concerned themselves with absolute chronology are innocent of having sometimes applied this method.”
5. **Waterhouse**: “Improved laboratory techniques and improved constants have not reduced the scatter in recent years. Instead, the uncertainty grows as more and more data is accumulated.”
6. **Richard Mauger Ph.D.** Associate Professor of Geology, East Carolina University: “In general, dates in the ‘correct ball park’ are

- assumed to be correct and are published, but those in disagreement with other data are seldom published nor are discrepancies fully explained.”
7. **Curtis:** “The thing to do is get a sequence of dates and throw out those that are vastly anomalous.”
  8. **Armstrong and Besancon:** “It is usual to obtain a spectrum of discordant dates and to select the concentration of highest values as the correct age.”
  9. **Robert E. Lee** writing in the Anthropological Journal of Canada, 1981, p.27: “Radiocarbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. There are gross discrepancies, the chronology is uneven and relative, and the accepted dates are actually selected dates. This whole blessed thing is nothing but 13th century alchemy, and it all depends upon which funny paper you read.”
  10. **William Stansfield, Ph.D.**, California Polytech State: “It is obvious that radiometric techniques may not be the absolute dating methods that they are claimed to be. Age estimates on a given geological stratum by different radiometric methods are often quite different (sometimes by hundreds of millions of years). There is no absolutely reliable long-term radiological ‘clock’. The uncertainties inherent in radiometric dating are disturbing to geologists and evolutionists.”
  11. **Frederick B. Jueneman:** “There has been in recent years the horrible realization that radio-decay rates are not as constant as previously thought, nor are they immune to environmental influences. And this could mean that the atomic clocks are reset during some global disaster, and events which brought the Mesozoic to a close may not be 65 million years ago, but rather, within the age and memory of man.”

Now folks, I don’t know about you, but I’m kind of thinking if **even the evolutionists** are having a hard time believing the accuracy of their own dating methods, then maybe there’s a problem with the accuracy of these

dating methods, how about you? **I'd say God the Father was telling the truth all along**, how about you?

But you might be thinking, "Okay, okay, okay. So maybe all these dating methods are completely unreliable and therefore have no bearing on **A Young Creation**, just like Jesus and God the Father said, but what about the **geological column** and **fossils** and **stalactites** and **stalagmites** where they say these are proof positive that we've been here for millions and billions of years? What about that stuff? Hey, great question, I'm glad you asked. We'll take a look at that next time!

---

To find the way to God, to understand the *truth* of God's Word, and to receive the gift of eternal *life*, begin by repentance and faith through a prayer like this:

"Dear God, I understand that I have broken Your Law and sinned against You. Please forgive my sins. Thank You that Jesus suffered on the cross in my place. I now place my trust in Him as My Savior and Lord. In Jesus' name I pray. Amen."

---