



Why Scientists Dispute Darwin

by Russell Leitch (January-February, 1999)

[editorial note: This now 15 year old article makes several claims that are no longer used by most creationists, including dust on the moon, and Paluxy River tracks. Science with its theories and laws is forever changing, so both evolutionists and creationists often abandon "evidences" that they previously found compelling. Creationists should always make a clear distinction between unchanging Biblical truth and changing scientific claims (see LSI Journal article "Essential Tools for the Creationist" 2010). Also see LSI Journal article, "Shaky Creationism: Questionable Arguments Sometimes Used by Creationists" 2006. Mark Bergemann – April, 2014]

Do all scientists accept evolution? No, but it is "politically correct" to do so and schools believe they cannot teach a divine creation legally (they can according to the US Supreme Court.) An impressive group of scientists with advanced degrees does not accept evolution. Why do they differ?

Space research shows many reasons to believe in a recent creation. Our moon should have millions of years of cosmic dust covering it, yet we found only a trace. Comets now are known to lose matter at a rate showing they have been formed only recently. Earth's magnetic field declines so rapidly it would be close to that of a magnetic star if over 30,000 years old (impossible). Carbon 14 atmospheric equilibrium would have been established if it was 30,000 years old. It has not!

Geological strata once thought to have formed over millions of years, have been seen to form in days at the formation of Spirit Lake as a result of the Mt. St. Helen's eruption. Trees, once thought to have been deposited at different layers over millions of years also were found suspended at various layers with silt beginning to cover them, at Spirit Lake. Coal now is known to form rapidly under pressure rather than after millions of years. Stalactites now are known to form in a few years rather than in thousands.

Oceans contain deposits showing only a few thousand years of deposition: cobalt only 18,000; bismuth 45,000; The decay of C-14 in pre-Cambrian wood indicates about 4,000 years. (See Prehistory and Earth Models, Dr. Melvin Cook, London, Max Parish.)

Paleontology no longer has many of the "missing links" once claimed. Neanderthal and Cro-Magnon are now known to be modern men. Piltdown Man was a fraud. Java Man, Peking Man and others were bits and pieces from different layers and places, now discarded. Ramapithecus is known to be an extinct ape. The Leakey family discoveries of "later" fossils in strata lower than "earlier" and the refusal of some evolutionists to accept them as pre-men shows the confusion in what remains of the "ascent of man."

Biology knows more today and shows the "simple" cell is not simple. The simplest contains at least 20 enzymes and 20 co-enzymes- all extremely complicated. Cells are made of ribosomes, centrioles, vacuoles, chromosomes and the fascinating mitochondria which contain 50,000 tri-partite units that oscillate 1,500 times a minute! Experiments tell us all components must be present before the cell can operate. The cell cannot live until it is complete. If it came together over thousands of years, what kept the components going until they met up with all the other components and so could live? Life forms must be complete before they can live! If the original cell

was formed at one time, it wasn't by accident.

Dating fossils and rock is a shambles. Example: tests of lava in Hawaii indicated it was up to 160 million years old, yet it had been seen to form 177 years ago. Numerous Carbon 14 tests have shown ages of fossils only thousands, though "the earth strata is supposed to be millions of years old. Human tracks can be seen in the Paluxy River bed (Texas) crossing dinosaur tracks, though dinosaurs are supposed to have died out 80 million years before men arrived. And ancient drawings by humans in Africa and Arizona depict supposedly extinct dinos.

The Big Bang. Evolutionists need an old universe because they believe any life form can arise if given enough time. So the universe must be very old. But we find many problems and no consistent pattern among the objects in space. For example, we find Jupiter's moon, Io, is very warm inside though it should be cold, if existing millions of years. We should find Venus worn smooth after millions of years subjected to its rapidly circulating, heavy atmosphere, but it is craggy and mountainous. Because evolutionists could not explain where matter came from, they proposed that it always existed and alternately pulled into one mass and then exploded (Big Bang) to form galaxies. But research shows matter clumps up in space while a massive explosion should disseminate it equally in all directions. In the '90s the Hubble telescope found "ripples" in radiation throughout space supposedly remaining from the Bang that could have caused clumping. They claimed it proved the whole theory. But, what they measured was a heat variation they interpreted as a ripple in radiation; it was at a distance of 14 billion light years away (their estimate) and measured a difference of only 0.00007 of a degree, in temperature only 2.7 degrees above absolute zero! Small wonder the test is hard to verify, much less interpret as the salvation of the theory.

These are only a few Darwinian problems. Others include the absolute lack of any fossil in the state of getting a new feature — a wing, lung, etc., No fossils of giraffes with only short necks; no fish with developing wings or legs. Evolution claims life forms were always changing, becoming more complex. Not one fossil has ever been found in the state of change! *LSI*