

The Age of The Earth

© 2005 - David Todeschini

From goo to you by way of the zoo... A brief synopsis of why the Theory of Evolution is an unscientific pagan religion.

Darwin's Theory of Evolution has been around since the early 1850's or so, when his book "*The Origin Of Species...*" was published. His postulates about the origin of life is based on another book "*Principles of Geology*" which was written years earlier by Charles Lyle, who claimed that the Earth was much older than the people of that time believed. Ten years after Darwin's book came off the press, there was not a single shred of evidence found that would support his preposterous theory. However, one man, a professor at the University of Genna by the name of Ernst Haeckel, decided to make a name for himself by fabricating "evidence" that would support the Theory of Evolution. And so, Mr. Haeckel made drawings of human and dog embryos that he claimed to be "*in the early stages of development*", and made them very similar in appearance. He then traveled all around Germany holding lectures and seminars, teaching that "*Ontology¹ recapitulates Phylogeny²*"; i.e.: that a human embryo actually "evolves" in the womb; that it passes through four stages of development: Fish, Amphibian, Reptile, Mammal - prior to birth. Haeckel perpetuated this fraud for ten years, until his own university brought charges of fraud against him in 1871, to which he pled guilty. However, because his teachings support evolution, some of his ideas are still in the science and biology textbooks to this day. For example, the idea that a human embryo has "gills" (as a fish does) is STILL taught in biology to this day, and even a 1997 edition of a computer CD animation titled "*The Nine Month Miracle*" had Ernst Haeckel's drawings of a human embryo with "gill pouches" 125 years after it was proven to be a fraud.

Evolution in the Darwinian sense that man "evolved" from monkeys, amoebas, and ultimately from rocks (the "primordial soup") is nothing more than a very stupid and very dangerous pagan religion, and nothing more. The following dissertation is, among other equally strong arguments, and irrefutable scientific proof that the theory of evolution needs to be laughed out of existence for the cruel joke that it is.

The "amoeba to man" theory of evolution, when properly examined by scientific analysis, requires three main postulates to be true, in order for life to have "evolved" on earth:

#1: Millions or even billions of years during which slow, gradual processes could evoke beneficial "mutations" at random, so that complex life-forms could emerge in violation of the second law of thermodynamics. These complex life forms would (according to the theory), eventually take over the inferior life forms, and end up as sentient beings.

#2: Random, non-directed changes in pre-biotic "macro molecules" that result in greater complexity, which then "survive" and take over the inferior (less complex) molecules.

#3: The idea that highly complex molecules gestate and become "alive", and then compete with each other for food (survival of the fittest), and somehow are the exception to the law of entropy (2nd law of thermodynamics) to become increasingly complex by the action of "natural forces" alone.

In this discussion, I assert that any one of the three conditions above being absent (proven wrong), would entirely negate the Theory of Evolution and put it in the trash bin along with the "Flat Earth" theory of ages past. I pray that we mere mortals can accept the truth and laugh at our own gullibility (those who believed in evolution before reading this), and look for more plausible or at least logical explanations.

¹ Ontology - the roster of what there is: branches of philosophical inquiry.

² Phylogeny - the development of new biological groups.

The point of contention I make in this discussion, is a challenge of the existence of the “millions and billions” of years that the Earth is said to have been in existence, by proponents of Darwinian Evolution. As you will see, the Earth CANNOT be billions, or even millions of years old, and if the Earth is NOT as old as the evolutionists claim, then even IF an amoeba could turn into something else OTHER than an amoeba, or IF a dog could give birth to a cat (which is essentially what is postulated to have happened), the absence of time that it is said to have taken, completely disproves the “possibility” that life could “evolve”.

Everyone knows that the Earth is spinning. To make the math we will do to prove my point easy, we will use “round” numbers.

The Earth makes a complete rotation on its axis every 24 hours. At the equator, the speed of the Earth’s rotation relative to an imaginary line drawn through the center of the sun is approximately 1,000 Miles per hour. We must consider that there are the laws of thermodynamics:

Law #1 states that matter or energy can neither be created nor destroyed.

Law #2 states that when either matter is converted into energy, or energy is converted into matter,³ there will always be a loss of energy to the ambient environment. There is no such thing as “free” energy, and no such thing as “perpetual motion” - not even on a cosmic scale. Everything left to itself, will rot, corrode, degenerate, fall apart, and lose energy as it seeks its equilibrium, or reduction to the simplest elements of which it is composed. In other words, science holds that order or complexity cannot spontaneously arise from chaos.

The theory of evolution (which is not even a good theory, as we shall see) is the only place in science (evolutionary biology) which is permitted to violate what the scientists themselves claim are immutable laws of physics. These laws are precisely the thing in science, which, coupled with the ability to measure very small time intervals (using atomic clocks), that properly interpreted, prove that the cosmos as a whole is NOT exempt from these laws, and is the direct proof that the Earth cannot be nearly as old as the *“vain and profane babblings of science falsely so-called”*⁴ says it is.

By precise measurements of the time it takes for the Earth to make a complete rotation on its axis using atomic clocks, scientists have discovered that the rotation of the Earth is very gradually slowing down. This should come as no surprise, as the entire universe is subject to these laws - to claim that Earth would be an exception to this rule, would be an unfounded religious belief. However, in order to maintain that the Earth is “billions of years old”, it would have to be immune from the laws of entropy, when certain proven facts like the slowing of the planet’s rotation are considered.

In addition, using reflectors placed on the moon by astronauts, by laser ranging using those reflectors, we find that the moon is slowly moving away from the Earth at a rate of a few inches per year. There are a number of forces at work here:

Earth’s molten core is hot due to the pressure, and the friction created by the Earth spinning around it (like spinning a basketball filled with water) causes the core to become very hot. Some of the Earth’s angular momentum is coupled to the molten core, and therefore lost (converted to heat) and some of that energy is transferred to the moon, which is “pulled” by gravitational attraction into an increasingly faster (and higher) orbit, thereby it gains the ability to overcome the forces of mutual attraction, and slowly move into a wider orbit, thus further from the Earth each day.

³ Science has never observed energy being converted to matter except on a quantum (sub-atomic) level.

⁴ 1 Timothy 6:20 KJV

Therefore, we see that the Earth's rotation is slowing down, which means that in the past, it was spinning faster, and our "days" were shorter "*back in the days*".

In addition, if the moon were much closer in the past (since it is presently moving away), the tides would have been enormous due to the inverse-square law: halving the distance quadruples the (gravitational) attraction. By a simple method of extrapolation of this data back into time, we can mathematically prove the upper limit of the possible age of the Earth, and thereby disprove the notion that it could even have existed AT ALL as recently as 100,000 years ago. The "millions" and "billions" of years needed in the credo of the Darwinian Evolutionist religion, simply do not, and have never existed.

"DOING THE MATH"

60 seconds = 1 minute
3,600 seconds = 1 hour
86,400 seconds = 1 day (24hrs)
28,704,000 seconds = 1 year (Biblical year/Hebrew calendar/360 days)

Astronomy Magazine recently reported that Earth's rotation is slowing down (days are getting longer) at the rate of approximately 1/1,000th of a second per day. Because of this, astronomers must add a "tick" to their atomic clocks; 1 second every 18 months, in order to synchronize their cesium (atomic) clocks with sidereal⁵ time; the passage of time as calculated by the motions and alignment of stars and planets.

That being the case, as a continuously observable, empirical fact, it is then a very simple matter to reverse the calculations, and see how fast the Earth was rotating in the past, since a "day" is calculated on one complete rotation of the Earth, NOT "24 hours" by our clocks and watches. Follow me so far?

It is easier, perhaps, for the non-mathematician, for me to state the problem as a verbal hypothesis and a question:

"How far back in time do we have to go, to where the Earth was rotating TWICE as fast as it rotates now; how long ago was it when a complete rotation of the planet on its axis took only 12 hours instead of 24 hours, given that the earth slows down in its rotation by 1 second every 18 months?"

The answer to that question involves subtracting from the length of our day; one second every 18 months until 12 hours is accounted for. If the length of the day were 12 hours instead of 24, then the Earth would be spinning twice as fast as it is now. That would be a speed of approximately 2,000 miles per hour at the equator.

In our previous table, we see that 86,400 seconds = 24 hours. Half of that is 43,000 seconds (12 hours). If the Earth is slowing down by 1 second every 18 months (1.5 years) (which it IS), then all we have to do is multiply 43,000 by 1.5 years, and we get the answer.

$$43,000 \times 1.5 = 64,500 \text{ months ago, or } (64,500 / 12) = 5,375 \text{ years.}$$

Therefore, 5,375 years ago, the Earth was spinning TWICE as fast as it does today. Since the rate of slowing down can be assumed to be constant, we can safely say that 5,375 years from now (if we are still around), our "days" would be 12 hours *longer* than they are today, and your expensive Rolex "Yacht Master" might be an antique artifact from the days of *swing and bling*, but it would be totally useless for the purpose intended.

⁵ Sidereal - with reference to the stars.

The Earth's rotation, which is inversely proportional to the length of the day, would, in the year 6530, be spinning half again as slowly as it does today. The "day" would be 36 hours from sunset to sunset, and the speed of rotation at the equator would be about 500 MPH. The 36-hour day (assuming we still had 40-hour work weeks) would give you much more leisure time before you'd have to go to work in the morning.

A change in the rotational speed of the Earth would affect many things, one of which is the weather. If the Earth spins faster, extremes of temperature from day to night at any point, would be milder. However, the winds would be increased by the Earth spinning under its atmosphere - a phenomenon known to meteorologists as the Coriolis effect. Also, the Earth bulges at the equator due to its spin, and the bulge would increase proportionately to the rate of rotation. As the rotational speed increases, the molten core of the Earth would get hotter and larger in diameter, due to the increased friction. Volcanic activity would increase, and earthquakes (and Tsunamis caused by quakes in the sea floor) would be devastating.⁶ A point would be reached where the centrifugal force of the rotation overcomes gravity, and the oceans, the atmosphere, and finally the loose rocks and mountains, then the crust of the Earth would be flung off into space.

Archaeologists and Geologists claim that earth "formed" 4-1/2 billion years ago. This is not something that one could scientifically measure. The "carbon dating", which is claimed to be accurate, is a "rubber ruler" that is calibrated by estimation; and the estimation is clearly, not only wrong, but also completely out of the "ball park".

If we use the same mathematical model we used previously, and plug 4-1/2 BILLION years into the equation, we get an absolutely ridiculous figure for the rotational speed of the Earth; as we have shown previously, every 5,530 years, the speed doubles going back in time. 4.5 billion years is 1,000,000 times that!

We can say that assuming a linear slow-down, 4.5 billion years ago, Earth was rotating 1,000,000 times faster than it rotates today. Dividing 86,400 seconds in our 24 hour day by a million, gives us a "day" that is 0.0864 seconds long, which means the Earth would be rotating a bit over 11 full rotations per second. I don't think so!

Admittedly, the calculations are "rough". In reality, the speed calculations are logarithmic; inertia, gravitational interactions, the bulging of the Earth at the equator, and dozens of other factors also play a part. The point I'm trying to make here, without overwhelming the reader with complicated math, is that the Earth could not have existed, because it would have flown apart WELL before its claimed age of 4.5 billion years, and therefore the eons upon eons of time for the postulated "Prebiotic natural selection" (life from non-life) and Darwinian evolution (life becoming more complex and advanced by natural processes) could not have operated for lack of that time.

Now, this does NOT by any means, rule out ADAPTATION (what Evolutionists call "Micro-Evolution"). Adaptation in which fish, alligators, birds, and all life - even humans - change in order to adapt to their environment DOES occur, and is an empirically verifiable, and Biblically-supported scientific FACT. However, a dinosaur never "evolved" into a bird, a dog never gave birth to anything but a dog, and certainly, Man was essentially the same creature since creation, and did NOT come from monkeys, apes, or primordial slime.

Yes, man shares 95% of his DNA with Rhesus monkeys, and 98% with chimpanzees; but that proves nothing in the absence of the acceptance of "evolution" as a viable theory, other than we all share a common design, which implies a designER. What makes a man different from a monkey is not opposable thumbs, the ability to speak, or to think abstractly. What sets us apart from the animals is Genesis 1:27 and Genesis 2:7.

⁶ Note: earthquakes and tectonic plate tension shifts would also occur if the Earth's rotation were to speed up or slow down.

The young Earth also rules out the ridiculous notion of Carl Sagan, *et.al.*, of “Cosmic Panspermia” - life brought to Earth by meteors or “planted” by aliens, which gave rise to incredibly imaginative science fiction such as the “Genesis Device”: of the movie “Star Trek: The Search for Spock” (which I enjoyed for its moral lesson undertones). However, Star Trek is NOT reality.

If life could NOT possibly have “evolved” or had time to “evolve”, makes little difference. Another analysis based upon the mathematics of the possibility of a DNA molecule happening “by accident”, since we now know that its components and number of base-pair (CTGA) sequences, reveals that the odds against it as little as $10^{400,000}$ to 1. There are only 10^{80} atoms in the entire known universe, and 10^{18} seconds in 20 billion years. DNA was DESIGNED, and even if DNA could climb out of the “primordial soup”, it needs an incredibly complex cell to duplicate it, along with the simultaneous availability of over 200 proteins which in themselves, each are hundreds and even thousands of molecules long. The cell needs the DNA, and the DNA needs the cell. The “chicken or the egg” paradox, orders of magnitude removed.

Knowing what we (now) know of biology, and what we can, by a variety of ways prove a young Earth, one must wonder why the scientific community clings so tenaciously to their pagan evolutionist religion. All our leading science journals and magazines, most school textbooks, and all the (secular) media, accept evolution almost without question - as if it were some immutable law of the physical sciences. The answer is that #1, they have too much invested in it. Many of their careers and credentials - such as the 500 Ph.D.s awarded to those who wrote their dissertations on the “Piltdown Man” fossil, which was a very crudely done hoax. #2, the philosophy of science holds that there can be nothing beyond the “natural” world; no force outside our understanding (like God) can be permitted to have an effect in this universe. Outright atheism, agnosticism, and Communism notwithstanding, the philosophy trumps the evidence when the evidence leads to a conclusion that is not acceptable - or goes against what their set-in-stone paradigms dictate.

If life did not create itself, or could not have happened by accident, then I see no other alternative; it was designed. Design, by definition, is the arrangement of something for a purpose that serves the designer; it implies and requires intellect, and certainly, an interminable litany of sequentially fortuitous accidents cannot be said to have purpose.

The question of the identity of the designer is not the subject of the discussion here; the issue is design vs. Fortuitous accidents, IS. If there be any other options, or “parties” to the argument; *i.e.*: other explanations or positions outside of designer or accident, no one has ever come forward with one, despite a \$250,000 reward posted on www.drdino.com for anyone with empirical proof for evolution. Speak now; a fortune awaits you.

Since neither side can offer empirical evidence for “primal cause”, I can no more prove to an atheist that there IS a God, than he can prove to me that the universe could arise WITHOUT one. The question, limited to purely scientific debate, becomes a question of which is the more credible scenario; *i.e.*: in what direction does ALL the evidence lead? Of course, we must instantly rule out fraud and fabrications, hoaxes, and speculations based on circular reasoning, all of which have been hallmarks of the evolutionist’s postulated “proofs” ever since Darwin set sail on the HMS Beagle.

We must consider that DNA is information, and even the simplest life form requires DNA. If DNA is not an accident of eons of time, neither is the organism that requires DNA for its existence. There is no maneuvering around those facts.

The fact of the matter is that belief in evolution is just as much a religion as Christianity, Buddhism, or Islam; it requires much more “faith” than any Deistic religion, since evolution operates in the face of logic and reason, and relies increasingly on preposterous “proofs”, the half of which are outright lies or frauds (such as Piltdown Man, Neanderthal Man, Lucy, *et. al.*).

The only difference between the evolution religion and other faiths is that the evolutionists are not a “church”; they do not qualify under IRS 501(3)(c) for tax-exempt status, but the doctrines of their religion are taught in public schools and colleges with OUR tax money. Perhaps some enterprising individual will incorporate “*The First Church of Chance*”, and apply for tax exemption as a bona-fide religion. It would be a simple matter for Bible-believing Christians then, to bring a lawsuit in Federal Court, to have the evolutionist religion textbooks removed from our public schools citing “separation of church and state” in the same context as the evolutionists used to get prayer outlawed, and allege that the government is using taxpayer funds to sponsor a “State religion” (which is precisely what is happening).

Because Evolution is not “officially” a religion, is why this cause of action cannot be filed. It seems to me that some enterprising hotshot legal beagle or “jailhouse lawyer” could figure out a legal way to fix this.

I am a Christian, and a de-facto creationist. One cannot “*waver between two opinions*”, and so has I been an atheist or evolutionist when I started to examine the evidence critically, I would necessarily have had to admit that something was wrong with my view of the world. This discussion is by no means exhaustive; it is intended to induce dissonance in those who have accepted evolution as “science”, or who have tried to incorporate evolution into their Bible, as the [Catholic Church in 1948](#) had stated:

The simple fact, however, is that evolution is a process. It demands a cause just as truly as direct and immediate creation demands a cause.

The existence or non-existence of God as an empirically proven fact notwithstanding, an intelligent, well-informed individual who examines all the data, could no more accept the theory of evolution than he could believe in the tooth fairy (sorry, kids!). Evolution, in light of modern science i.e.: biology, astronomy, and particle physics to name a few, is quickly but reluctantly becoming the criteria by which one’s belief is qualification to occupy a padded room, as the definition of insanity is one that cannot correctly perceive reality.

In years past, one could cite ignorance and accept preposterous theories as fact. There was a point in time that people believed (and science taught) that the sun and the stars revolved around a stationary Earth. Had anyone in those days proposed that the Earth was spinning 1,000 MPH and orbiting the sun - traveling 68,000 MPH through space, he would have been declared insane, and (if it were around then) given Thorazine™ or Paxil-CR™, But the Earth is moving exactly as described, and our ability (now) to be extremely precise with time and distance measurements, enable us to discern previously unknown facts. We can no longer hold evolution as a viable or credible tenet of science; there is no other option than to consider what the data clearly tells us. It is time to acknowledge that the universe and the Earth LOOKS as if it is designed. We needn’t complicate the discussion any further; if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, it certainly cannot be a moose... It’s probably, most likely, almost certainly, the (created) duck it appears to be.

Being that evolution IS a religion, albeit not recognized the such; it masquerades as “science”, but even scientists are beginning to turn red in the face when confronted with proof beyond a reasonable doubt, that the major tenet of their religion, the age of the Earth, has been proven to be absolutely, certainly not billions or even millions of years old. A young Earth necessarily raises other questions like how the Grand Canyon formed, and the issue of dinosaurs, fossils, and cave formations, which are easily answered and proven by modern research, all to have it fit into the Biblical account in Genesis (the paucity of detail in the Scriptures does not discredit the Bible), and easily could have occurred since the creation (approximately 6,000 years ago), and after Noah’s flood (approximately 4,400 years ago).

For example, in Dinosaur Valley State Park in Texas, footprints of man dinosaurs can be seen together in the same rock strata. Grand Canyon walls are decorated with Indian paintings depicting dinosaur hunting. The age of fossils is calculated by approximation, according to which rock layer they are found in, however, what the evolutionists won’t tell you is that all of the layers of rock -- which are stacked up like pancakes, could

easily have been deposited in a global flood. Carlsbad cavern in New Mexico, is said to have taken 250 million years to form. Obviously this is not true, since Earth wasn't around 250 million years ago, and it can be demonstrated that those are same rock formations could have formed since the (Biblical) flood.

It is good for Christian to have faith in the Bible, and God wants us to have a sound factual basis for, if only for nothing else than to examine for ourselves, that we are not "*following cunningly devised fables*", but are reading the very word of the creator God, who created all this for his children to inherit.

What you choose to believe is certainly up to you, but as I hope to have convinced you here, that belief in evolution is tantamount to stupidity, and is dangerous for other reasons, primarily because it will rob you of your identity: You are made in God's very image (Genesis 1:27) and "*a little lower than God*" -- (Psalms 8:5b - NLT translation).



† Peace and Godspeed - WebPastor David Todeschini

