

## Articles and Sermons :: Bill Nye 'The Science Guy' Hits Evolution Deniers

**Bill Nye 'The Science Guy' Hits Evolution Deniers - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2012/8/27 16:39**

Bill Nye 'The Science Guy' Hits Evolution Deniers

By Kevin Dolak | ABC News Blogs – 8 hours ago

In a clip posted to online knowledge forum Big Think via YouTube, former children's show host Bill Nye spoke out against the denial of evolution, saying such views harm young people especially and hamper scientific progress.

Nye, who hosted the educational show "Bill Nye the Science Guy," which aired on PBS Kids from 1993 through 1998, made the statements in a clip posted online on Thursday, and has since been viewed over one million times. In the clip, Nye praises the United States for its contribution to technological innovation, but says that the denial of evolution is unique to the country.

"People still move to the United States. And that's largely because of the intellectual capital we have, the general understanding of science," Nye said in the clip. "When you have a portion of the population that doesn't believe in that, it holds everybody back, really.

"Evolution is the fundamental idea in all of life science, in all of biology. It's like, it's very much analogous to trying to do geology without believing in tectonic plates. You're just not going to get the right answer. Your whole world is just going to be a mystery instead of an exciting place," he added.

Nye made a three-stop tour through New Hampshire earlier this summer to tout President Obama's education policies while making a push for science and engineering programs. He has endorsed Obama's reelection bid.

In the clip, Nye said that one's "world just becomes fantastically complicated when you don't believe in evolution."

"Here are these ancient dinosaur bones or fossils, here is radioactivity, here are distant stars that are just like our star but they're at a different point in their lifecycle. The idea of deep time, of this billions of years, explains so much of the world around us. If you try to ignore that, your world view just becomes crazy, just untenable, itself inconsistent," he said.

Nye then goes on to urge adults not to deny the teaching of evolution to young people.

"And I say to the grownups, if you want to deny evolution and live in your world, in your world that's completely inconsistent with everything we observe in the universe, that's fine, but don't make your kids do it because we need them. We need scientifically literate voters and taxpayers for the future. We need people that can - we need engineers that can build stuff, solve problems.

"It's just really a hard thing, it's really a hard thing. You know, in another couple of centuries that world view, I'm sure, will be, it just won't exist. There's no evidence for it."

**Re: Bill Nye 'The Science Guy' Hits Evolution Deniers - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2012/8/27 16:43**

before i get asked, no i do not believe in evolution. i do believe in creation. i do not believe the 6000 year old earth theory that most christians believe. i do think evidence shows the earth is much older than that.

**Re: - posted by iceman9, on: 2012/8/27 17:56**

SkepticGuy:

You said "i do think evidence shows the earth is much older than that"

What evidence are you referring to?

I have seen people claim to have evidence for billions and billions of years and others who have evidence towards ten thousand years or less.

I was interested in hearing what evidence you have read about that confirms what you read in the scriptures to an earth that is "much older than that".

I am not trying to start an argument just interested in your story of evidence.

Thanks

**Re: Bill Nye 'The Science Guy' Hits Evolution Deniers - posted by MaryJane, on: 2012/8/27 18:36**

Nye then goes on to urge adults not to deny the teaching of evolution to young people.

---

Greeting

I believe in creation to just in case you were wondering :) I thought this was an interesting article because of what he says about parents not teaching their children that evolution is not real. I wonder if the next step will be for the government to interfere in families teaching their children their christian beliefs and demand that all children be taught evolution?

God bless  
mj

**Re: - posted by IssacharSon, on: 2012/8/27 18:55**

Good question, SkepticGuy!

I would predict that, yes, there is a possibility that "the next step will be for the government to interfere in families teaching their children their christian beliefs and demand that all children be taught evolution?" (SkepticGuy).

Extreme Atheist, Richard Dawkins wrote that he would have parents arrested for raising their children to believe in God. He is a very influential thinker, unfortunately. Science has always been jealous of God.

Love-in-Christ,

KP

**Re: SkepticGuy - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/8/27 19:13**

Hi SkepticGuy.

RE: SkepticGuy wrote ///i do not believe the 6000 year old earth theory that most christians believe. i do think evidence shows the earth is much older than that.///

Something to consider that many Christians in their zeal neglect is this fact. God did not create Adam and Eve as infants, He created them as Grown Adults, He Did not create the Plants as seeds but rather Created the plants and trees already Grown, He did not create all the animals as babies but rather as grown animals thus we can conclude That He Created the Earth already aged and most likely with an already preexisting fossil record.  
Just something to consider and meditate on

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/8/27 19:19**

MJ wrote:

"I wonder if the next step will be for the government to interfere in families teaching their children their christian beliefs and demand that all children be taught evolution?"

---

I don't think there is anything wrong with teaching our children the THEORY of evolution. I think it is important that they know what this theory is; after all they are going to hear about it and we can't shelter them forever.

We obviously do not need to teach it as fact (because it isn't) but we should teach them what it is.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/8/27 19:40**

proudpapa wrote:

"thus we can conclude That He Created the Earth already aged and most likely with an already preexisting fossil record."

---

I think we must be careful when making statements like this. Granted, God did create Adam and Eve as adults, and put full grown plants in the garden.

But did He create Adam with signs of wear and tear in his joints? Did his teeth show any signs of wear? Were there callouses on his hands or feet?

Did the adult trees have growth rings?

God is truth; he is not going to intentionally trick us, which is just exactly what He would be doing if he "planted" a pre-existing fossil record, or created mountains that looked like they had eroded for many, many years, or a grand canyon fully formed showing all the various layers.

Greg Koukl, a Christian apologist, makes this point about the young earth argument which holds that God created light from stars that are millions of light years distant in transit (because if the earth is only 10,000 or so years old we shouldn't be able to see any stars more than 10,000 light years away). You see, if the universe is only 10,000 years old, then there really CAN'T be stars over 10,000 light years away, or else we would be able to see every star in the universe. So, if we are seeing light from a super nova that is a million light years away, and it is true that the universe is only 10,000 years old, we have a dilemma-- because that means there never was a star that blew up and became a super nova, and that God MUST have just created the vision of the light from a super nova without ever having actually created the star that exploded. But the Bible says that God created actual stars and other heavenly bodies, not just the light from them.

I do not think God is trying to trick us. He has revealed Himself in the heavens, if we are willing to look.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2012/8/27 20:07**

by TMK on 2012/8/27 13:19:03

MJ wrote:

"I wonder if the next step will be for the government to interfere in families teaching their children their christian beliefs and demand that all children be taught evolution?"

---

I don't think there is anything wrong with teaching our children the THEORY of evolution. I think it is important that they know what this theory is; after all they are going to hear about it and we can't shelter them forever.

We obviously do not need to teach it as fact (because it isn't) but we should teach them what it is.

---

You caught my goof in how I worded that:) I should have said,"I wonder if the next step will be for the government to interfere in families teaching their children their christian beliefs and demand that all children be taught evolution as fact?"

Anyway yes thanks for catching that for me :)

God Bless  
maryjane

**Re: TMK - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/8/27 20:09**

Hi TMK, you bring up some good thoughts.

I would have used the word possibly rather than most likely but I was not sure if it was spelled possibly or possably and I was to lazy at the time to look it up.

RE: TMK wrote ///did He create Adam with signs of wear and tear in his joints? Did his teeth show any signs of wear? Were there callouses on his hands or feet?

Did the adult trees have growth rings?///

What was the need or purpose of having the tree of life also in the midst of the garden ??

What was the purpose of man having food to eat??

Did the garden with the trees and plants have to have water??

Would the plants ever die??

umm as I ask, I too am struck to ponder, The world was clearly physical rather than spiritual before the fall but to what extent did the natural decaying process already exist before the fall is some intense thinking.

**Re: TMK - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/8/27 20:34**

RE:TMK wrote ///I do not think God is trying to trick us. He has revealed Himself in the heavens, if we are willing to look.//

The ones looking to Science and the fossil record for answers are often, and of course I know not always (there are many Christian Scientists but they are the minority) are many times trying to disprove the Christian concept of God and as Dawkins and many others trying to disprove God altogether by their Science and putting the voice of their conscience to silence by their natural wisdom their SARX mind.

Did God not predetermine this by His infinite Wisdom??

For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.

Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom

Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called:

But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the

world to confound the things which are mighty;

And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:

That no flesh should glory in his presence.

For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.

And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.

Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are your's;

**Re: - posted by DEADn (), on: 2012/8/27 21:07**

I wrestle with the theory of evolution and wonder about its chance within the creation model. I don't agree in evolution that we can go from a whale to a wolf as I was taught in biology but we see alot of instances of mutations when going from a wolf to a dog. Mutations are really the big thing taught in evolution and it is one of the things that we see causing some of the ailments we see in the modern society like downs and so forth. I tend to believe in the mutation example that evolution puts forth but I don't agree that it ends up causing the whale to go to the wolf or even vice versa.

Age of the Earth? Have no idea because it seems as if it is the bible vs carbon dating and it is used to show the age of so many things. I think we tend to agree with carbon dating on many things but when it tries to say things such as the Earth being millions of years old vs. what we think the bible saying of 6,000 years old we all have a cow over it. It is a very touchy subject but these are the things that flow through my mind when thinking of these ideas.

**Re: DEADn - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/8/27 21:21**

Hi DEADn! I think you bring a good point up, Microevolution is a reality.

**Re: , on: 2012/8/28 5:27**

All creationists,

Physics:Newton,Faraday,Maxwell,Kelvin

Chemistry:Boyle,Dalton,Ramsey

Biology:Ray,Linnaeus,Mendal,Pasteur

Geology:Steno,Woodward,Brewster,Agassiz

Astronomy: Kepler,Galileo,Herschel,Maunders

Didn't seem to hold them back!!

**Re: , on: 2012/8/28 6:58**

You may like seeing the rich information about creationism from this free online book. its called "Refuting Evolution" by John Sarfati

<http://creation.com/refuting-evolution-index>

Creation.com hold a view that the Bible is the authority being God inspired but are also scientists.

Here's an excerpt Chapter 3 pp 49-51:

/"Teaching about Evolution avoids discussing the vast gulf between non-living matter and the first living cell, single-celled and multicelled creatures, and invertebrates and vertebrates. The gaps between these groups should be enough to show that molecules-to-man evolution is without foundation.

There are many other examples of different organisms appearing abruptly and fully formed in the fossil record. For exam

ple, the first bats, pterosaurs, and birds were fully fledged flyers. The photograph to the right shows that bats have always been bats.<sup>6</sup>

Turtles are a well designed and specialized group of reptiles, with a distinctive shell protecting the body's vital organs. However, evolutionists admit 'Intermediates between turtles and cotylosaurs, the primitive reptiles from which turtles probably sprang, are entirely lacking.' They can't plead an incomplete fossil record because 'turtles leave more and better fossil remains than do other vertebrates.'<sup>7</sup> The 'oldest known sea turtle' was a fully formed turtle, not at all transitional. It had a fully developed system for excreting salt, without which a marine reptile would quickly dehydrate. This is shown by skull cavities which would have held large salt-excreting glands around the eyes.<sup>8</sup>

All 32 mammal orders appear abruptly and fully formed in the fossil record. The evolutionist paleontologist George Gaylord Simpson wrote in 1944:

The earliest and most primitive members of every order already have the basic ordinal characters, and in no case is an approximately continuous series from one order to another known. In most cases the break is so sharp and the gap so large that the origin of the order is speculative and much disputed.<sup>10</sup>

There is little to overturn that today.<sup>11</sup>//

I have a paper copy and I am reading it slowly to really understand the ins and outs... before I move onto another "refutation" book.

edit: also, Creation.com and other biblical creation sites don't deny natural selection in the microevolutionary sense. But they argue that virtually all these mutations/selections don't give rise to more information in the genome, thus secular scientists don't have a mechanism for molecules-to-man evolution. see also the first two sections of Chapter 3 <http://creation.com/refuting-evolution-chapter-3-the-links-are-missing>

**Re: , on: 2012/8/28 9:02**

Think Maybe the "Gap theory" might answer the "gap" between the Bible detailing 6,000 years of human history, & carbon dating spitting out numbers in the millions. Gap theory says there is an unspecified gap between Genesis 1:1 & 1:2. This might help explain dinosaurs, why Satan was in the garden of eve, some carbon dating, etc., etc. Also, Carbon dating is somewhat flawed anyways and has been proven to be inaccurate, at least at times. This may be partially attributed to God's Power to create something new in an already developed state like its been there for some time developing. Like Adam. Adam was created in an instant as a man, not a Baby. After Adam, men always started out as babies, but God has creative power to birth something already "old" though brand new. Could be the Same with the earth.

**Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2012/8/28 9:17**

this is a great conversation! i like to make people think and not just accept everything blindly. there is obviously someone who designed everything. it would be crazy to think we need people to design even the simplest products we buy at walmart and yet the earth and all of its complicated features just happened. but yet there are some questions concerning time and mutations that we can ponder and think about. i like to be around thinking christians. christians that just accept everything they are told are gullible to be deceived. God gave us a brain!

**Re: , on: 2012/8/28 11:35**

Quote:

-----i like to be around thinking christians. christians that just accept everything they are told are gullible to be deceived. God gave us a brain!  
-----

And He encourages us to reason with Him.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/8/28 13:34**

A couple of points:

It is interesting to note that Bill Nye's education and work experience is quite limited. He earned a BS (four year) degree in Mechanical Engineering about 35 years ago. While it is commendable to earn a degree in engineering, it does NOT make a person an expert in the fields of biology, physics, geology, anthropology, ethics and, most importantly, theology. In fact, an engineer is not a scientist at all.

Many people in this world are very skeptical (and perhaps rightfully so) at the claims made by many of the holistic and alternative medical practitioners that often don't pass the scrutiny of scientific inquiry or verification. Yet, those same individuals who are so critical about such things will accept the results from individuals from fields of which they are not experts or who cannot validate their claims either.

The media will embrace the claims of a politician (Al Gore) with a bachelor's degree in Broadcast Journalism when he makes bold claims on Global Warming. They will publicize the statements from a celebrity (Bill Nye) with a bachelor's degree in Mechanical Engineering if he takes a shot at the Biblical idea of Creation. Yet, they will ignore individuals with higher and more specific levels of education who don't embrace the "New Morality" of the Far Left.

There is something incredibly hypocritical about this. The story has been posted on many websites and a couple of local newspapers. With so much coverage, it is almost as if the media is trying to use a celebrity's thoughts to influence others. Now, I am not saying that a degree is necessary to pass scrutiny with such things; however, the media often uses the education and vocational background of a person to validate someone with "expert" status UNLESS they say something that the media largely agrees with.

That said...

When I was a young child, I used to play with toys. I had Transformers, Voltron, Star Wars figures, spaceships, robots, legos and other things that a child of the 1980s enjoyed. I would lay out all of my toys on my bedroom floor and build my own little kingdoms with them. I would allow my young imagination to create all sorts of things. One thing that I noticed is that I would always build something complete with imaginary scenarios that I would jump in with my imagination. As "unspiritual" as that may have been, it makes me think about the Creation of this world.

Is it possible that God -- in His infinite wisdom -- created a world that was set in motion from the moment that he created it?

When God created this world, He was not confined to science (or earthly understanding of science). God did not have to "play by the rules" because God wrote the rules. After all, He is the Author of what men call "science."

I had a Physics professor who was a Christian. He was educated at a top university and his specialty was in General Relativity. I would spend quite a bit of time sitting in his office and engaging in conversation with him. Once, I asked him what he thought about Creation. While he admitted that he didn't have all of the answers, he theorized that it is possible that God could have created a "mature Earth."

In other words, this professor thought that it was possible that God created a "mature" universe in which it would only seem like things were older than they were. This would be akin to what Jeffmar said about God creating Adam as a man and not a baby...or...how, as a child, I would create my little toy kingdoms and scenarios from my childlike imagination. By His word, God could have made it so that light was able to instantly travel from stars many millions of light years away.

On a personal level, I understand the hesitations that scientists often hold when it comes to faith. They see apparent examples of microevolution and theorize possibilities to explain where we came from. Yet, "evolution" is not the reason that many scientists don't believe in a "young Earth."

The age of the universe as determined by the measurement of the speed of light is one of the main reasons that many scientists give for believing in a very old universe. You can measure the speed of light by observation. It takes nearly five minutes for light from the sun to reach the Earth. It takes nearly 15 minutes for a broadcast from a rover on the planet Mars to reach the Earth (and vice versa). The Voyager probes launched in the 1970s are traveling at enormously high speeds and still have not yet breached the outer edge of the heliosphere of our own solar system.



Even at such a high speed, the Voyager spacecraft would not reach the nearest star for over a million years. So, the age of the universe appears to be much older than what we cite from Scriptures. Yet, like this professor pointed out, God is not confined to the speed of light or having to wait for light to reach Earth before creating life on it.

Scientists are merely observers. Well, at least, they are supposed to merely observe and then record and theorize what it is that they have observed. Unfortunately, many scientists have become activists.

Many approach their science and research as avowed atheists (rather than agnostics or with open-mindedness). It is as if they are looking for reasons to not believe in God or validate their views of atheism. I even had another professor tell me that He would reject God even if all evidence pointed to His existence. Yet, I know many scientists who do believe in God. When I worked at NASA, I knew scientists and engineers who were quite vocal about their faith in God. After earning advanced degrees in their fields and through years of practice, they held firm to their faith and relationship with God.

Personally, I tend to embrace the idea of a young Earth. I believe that Earth is unique in this universe and that God designed it because of His plan for man. I will admit that I am not knowledgeable enough to know the certainty of this. There may very well have been a "gap theory" as mentioned by Jeffmar. Regardless, I do know the God in whom I believe. I have a relationship with Him. My approach to science will always be influenced by the God that I know and have given my heart to.

**Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2012/8/28 13:38**

that was very thought provoking chris.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/8/28 14:21**

Chris wrote:

"By His word, God could have made it so that light was able to instantly travel from stars many millions of light years away."

AND

"The age of the universe as determined by the measurement of the speed of light is one of the main reasons that many scientists give for believing in a very old universe. You can measure the speed of light by observation. It takes nearly five minutes for light from the sun to reach the Earth. It takes nearly 15 minutes for a broadcast from a rover on the planet Mars to reach the Earth (and vice versa). The Voyager probes launched in the 1970s are traveling at enormously high speeds and still have not yet breached the outer edge of the heliosphere of our own solar system.

Even at such a high speed, the Voyager spacecraft would not reach the nearest star for over a million years. So, the age of the universe appears to be much older than what we cite from Scriptures. Yet, like this professor pointed out, God is not confined to the speed of light or having to wait for light to reach Earth before creating life on it."

But if the universe is young (i.e. around 10,000 years old) then there CAN'T be any stars in existence over 10,000 light years away. Because, for example, if we are seeing a galaxy or star that is, say, 100,000 light years away, that means God had to have created it 100,000 years ago (for the light to reach us). But if He did, how can the universe be young?

So we either have to disregard all the science regarding astronomical distances (which would be pretty silly to do IMO), or accept the idea that there REALLY aren't stars way way out there-- we are just seeing a light that God placed in the sky to make us THINK there are stars and galaxies etc way way out there.

Here is a link to the article by Greg Koukl that explains this far better than I can:

<http://www.str.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=5639>



**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/8/28 14:52**

Hi TMK,

I'm not sure that you understood what I was saying.

In my post, I was attempting to point out that God is not confined to the "rules" of nature and physics. He is not confined by the speed of light. He is eternal and omnipotent.

At creation, God could have easily sent light from an object 50 Billion light years away to the Earth in an instant. In other words, the "mature" creation idea is that God was not bound by "scientific limitations," "observations" or "speed limits" when He created the universe. He could easily have created this world in an "as is" setting when He spoke it into existence and set it in motion.

I will also say that we are extremely limited in our understanding of the universe. Scientists are searching for answers regarding many of the mysteries of this universe. They are looking for something to explain "inconsistencies" to the "rules" of physics and relativity. For instance, there is "missing mass" in the known universe. So, they theorize about dark matter, parallel universes, gravity-breaking particles, invisible fields, white holes and exemptions to space-time. They are trying to measure the "bends" or "shortcuts" in space-time too to explain the differences in the direction of light.

Yet, all of these things may never be explained because of limits to science (or scientists). But, as people with relationships with God, we trust in the limitless of our Creator. If God wanted to create the Earth with light from extremely distant stars having arrived instantaneously, it was well within His power to do so.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/8/28 22:28**

From Greg Koukl's article:

"The counter from a young-earthier is, No, wait, you don't understand. God actually created the light in transit. If God created everything in six days, then He had to create the star, too, because it does say He created the heavens and the earth. I'm thinking this is what they're going to hold.

So, He created the star and the earth and the light in between, which sounds fine if you're thinking of the star like a light bulb that is giving off a steady glow. But what we have in the galaxies are not just simply light bulbs giving off a steady glow, and you have this undifferentiated stream of glow flowing through the universe that God creates. Rather, what we have are light images of specific events in the universe, like super nova explosions, for example. So, if we see a super nova explosion that appears to be a billion light years away, this suggests, from my view, that it actually happened a billion years ago.

But a young-earthier is going to have to say, No, that image is just something God created in transit. He just created it. It didn't really happen because there was no "billion years ago." Instead, the only thing that God actually created are all these little bits and pieces floating around in the universe that look like they were the result of that explosion that never happened.

You call that deception? That's my point. God doesn't do that, I suspect."

**Re: ccchhhrrriiisss - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/8/28 22:45**

Hi ccchhhrrriiisss, You have brought up many good points

RE: ccchhhrrriiisss wrote ///In my post, I was attempting to point out that God is not confined to the "rules" of nature and physics. He is not confined by the speed of light. He is eternal and omnipotent.///

absolute agreement.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/8/28 23:33**

Hi TMK,

I disagree with the underlying sentiment in this article, TMK. I think that such thinking potentially limits the realization of the creating power of God.

Yes, when we see a star, we are looking at light that has arrived from many "light years" away. A light year, of course, is the DISTANCE that is measured by how long it would take for light to travel in space.

Yes, a star can be millions of light years from Earth. To see that light under the normal laws of physics would suggest that at those stars were there millions of years ago -- the time it took for that light to reach our eyes.

Yet, God did not explain to us what specific measures He took during Creation. We don't know if "sped up" light to reach Earth the instant that it was created. We don't know if God created this world in a way that light from distant stars arrived instantly during creation by the command or design of God. We don't know HOW it was done...because the Word of God simply explains THAT it was done. However, we know that God didn't "rest" until the seventh day of Creation and finalized the universe during that time.

I am simply saying that God is omnipotent. He wasn't confined to the laws of nature or physics when He created this universe. Those laws were designed by God but they do not constrain Him. If He so desired, the Lord could annihilate the sun but keep this world warm and filled with light. There is NOTHING that He cannot do now...and there was nothing that constrained Him during creation.

I hope that this makes sense.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/8/29 7:42**

Hi Chris-

Neither I (nor Greg Koukl) is suggesting that God could not have created the light from these far distant stars and galaxies already visible on the earth when He created the earth.

The question, rather is WOULD He have done this; is it in His character to this.. is it not deceptive to do this.

I am not questioning God's omnipotence; I am questioning whether He would do something to intentionally deceive us.

Using the super nova example again: If the universe is only 10,000 years old, and we see a super nova that APPEARS to be a million light years away, this SHOULD mean that a star exploded a million years ago. But it couldn't have been a million years ago because the universe is only 10,000 years old. So was there ever really a star there? Or did God create an already exploded star? (appearance of age).

The whole issue of "appearance of age" has nothing to do with God's ABILITY to create something with an appearance of age. But it has all to do with His character and whether He would actually do this.

Yes, God can do what He wants. But scientists use the rules HE set up when making their measurements of the universe, etc. Don't you think God knew when He created the universe that someday we would be exploring and trying to figure it out?

Creating Adam and Eve as adults or creating adult fruit bearing plants in the garden is totally different than creating them with "the appearance of age." Like I said initially, aging implies a process. Humans, as they age, show some signs of wear and tear. Trees have growth rings. I don't think that God put signs of wear and tear into Adam and Eve's bodies and I don't believe the trees had growth rings. If He did, that would have been deceptive and out of God's character. It is not that he was unable to do this from a POWER standpoint (of course He could have) but rather that he was unable to do this from a CHARACTER standpoint.

And, like I have said here on some other thread on this issue, accepting an ancient, billions of years old universe does NOTHING to help macroevolution. There STILL is not nearly enough time. I believe that is why many Christians are fearful about accepting the possibility that the universe really is really old-- because they fear this will then "allow" for macro-

volution. Nothing could be further from the truth.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2012/8/29 8:02**

Christ wrote:I am simply saying that God is omnipotent. He wasn't confined to the laws of nature or physics when He created this universe. Those laws were designed by God but they do not constrain Him. If He so desired, the Lord could annihilate the sun but keep this world warm and filled with light. There is NOTHING that He cannot do now...and there was nothing that constrained Him during creation.

I hope that this makes sense.

---

Thanks Chris for sharing these things here with us. I really appreciate you taking the time to share these things. I found it very interesting and helped me better understand some things as well.

God bless  
mj

**Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2012/8/29 10:25**

Microevolution was touched earlier, questions:

1. is mutation and evolution the same. I am thinking that evolution is the process where lower forms of organisms (RNA, DNA, single celled organism) developed into multi-cellular or higher forms or complex forms of organisms (ex. homo sapiens).
2. is there an actual case where mutation resulted into a new species and not just another strain of the same species.

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2012/8/29 13:59**

Hi TMK,

Quote:

-----  
Neither I (nor Greg Koukl) is suggesting that God could not have created the light from these far distant stars and galaxies already visible on the earth when He created the earth.

The question, rather is WOULD He have done this; is it in His character to this.. is it not deceptive to do this.

I am not questioning God's omnipotence; I am questioning whether He would do something to intentionally deceive us.

-----  
First of all, I will point out that the days of Creation were very different than the "seventh day" when God rested (ceased) from His work. Thus, it can be argued that those laws of nature weren't established until God rested from His work in creating this universe.

I don't think that anyone should assume that it would be "deceptive" for God because He is not confined to the laws of science. He is the Author, the Designer, the Artist and the Engineer (so to speak). Yet, He was not (and still is not) confined to the laws of physics that He designed.

After all, He already "broke" the laws of physics by speaking this physical world into existence from NOTHING during the days of creation. This is a direct conflict with the Laws of Conservation of Mass and Conservation of Energy. There is nothing new except what God created.

Moreover, God continues to "break" the laws of physics (and nature) when He answers our prayers in miraculous ways. Thus, a true act that God (established in his infinite wisdom) cannot be described as deception because even defines what is right and wrong.

God doesn't operate on the same plane of understanding that we do. He isn't confined to "obey" laws....and this was especially true while He was in the process of creating the universe. I have always thought that the term "theology" was odd because mankind cannot fully understand the mind, thoughts or motives of God. Job learned this firsthand. There can be a real distraction in trying to "guess" God's thoughts, ways or motives -- especially when they are outside the realm of our ability to understand.

Quote:

-----  
Using the super nova example again: If the universe is only 10,000 years old, and we see a super nova that APPEARS to be a million light years away, this SHOULD mean that a star exploded a million years ago. But it couldn't have been a million years ago because the universe is only 10,000 years old. So was there ever really a star there? Or did God create an already exploded star? (appearance of age).

The whole issue of "appearance of age" has nothing to do with God's ABILITY to create something with an appearance of age. But it has all to do with His character and whether He would actually do this.

-----  
The issue that I have is with what you are saying about this. Yes, this is a clear yet simplified version of how we view stars and their relation with the age of the universe. When we see this supernova that we determine to be a million light years from Earth, a simple explanation is that we are looking at the past -- at the light that traveled from that supernova a million years ago and took that million years to reach our eyes on the Earth. Since we have measured the speed of light (at roughly 186,000 miles/second), we can determine the distance (1 light year = ~5.9 million miles).

Yet, this simplified view doesn't take into account a few things.

On a physical level, it doesn't take into account the path that the light takes from Point A (the supernova) and Point B (Earth). There are measured bends in the plane of space time (including bends caused by gravity itself) and scientists have long pondered the existence of what they call probable "shortcuts" in space time (light traveling through anything from blackholes, whiteholes, wormholes to mere warps in space time).

Moreover, physicists have long wondered about the speed of light and whether it can be surpassed. Einstein studied this but postulated that nothing with significant mass could accelerate and reach the speed of light. The resulting mass of that object would devastate the universe via a gravitational pull. However, he (and other physicists) still postulated what would happen IF something could accelerate to -- or surpass -- the speed of light. This is where theories of time travel come into play in regard to breaking the standards of space time.

In the discussion of this topic, it is relevant because we are talking about LIGHT. Light has no significant mass. Thus, many scientists have stated that the only thing that they can accelerate past the speed of light would be light itself. What would happen if light sped past the upper "speed limit" determined by relativity. This is when perception of light via "relativity of simultaneity" enters the debate but on a grand scale. So, even via the laws of physics, there is so much that we don't know especially in terms of how God "played by the rules" of physics during creation if he was so constrained.

The idea that I brought up was in regard to the nature of light and the unlimited opportunities of God.

Scientists have difficulty in explaining just what "light" is. We know how it behaves. We make guesses about what it is. Yet, since we can't contain, observe or photograph light (unless we actually approached its speed and observed the individual particles around us), we are left with an incomplete science.

In your supernova anecdote, I am simply stating that God could have easily "sped up" those particles during creation -- easily exceeding the current postulated upper speed limit -- before that "seventh day" when He rested from Creation. He could have sped them so much that He broke the plane of space time and our observations then become nothing more than a "perspective" that is relative from our time and place in space time. Thus, the light that we see from a million light years away (5.9 quadrillion miles) might not have taken a million years to arrive. We wouldn't be looking at the light from a million years ago, but from the time of Creation that God initially exceeded any "speed limits" that light was confined to from the seventh day of creation onward. In other words, we could currently observe light from thousands of years ago that actually traveled a million light years through space time.

We can't ignore the fact that God is not confined to those laws of physics. This is especially true of the time in which he

was creating the physical universe. It is not a deception for God to act via His omnipotence and unlimited ways.

Quote:

Yes, God can do what He wants. But scientists use the rules HE set up when making their measurements of the universe, etc. Don't you think God knew when He created the universe that someday we would be exploring and trying to figure it out?

This is certainly a good point. God knows the end from the beginning. God is Spirit. He is Eternal...and already sits in the timelessness that He has allowed some men to glimpse. After all, John saw things that were to happen far in the future.

Yet, why would God allow for scientists to assume things that neglect the spiritual creation of the physical universe? I asked this question to the physics professor that I mentioned previously. He also thought that it was a good question. He pondered whether it could be that men would simply look for an answer apart from God. After all, the Word says that those who come to God must "believe that he is" (Hebrews 11:6).

So, there are "distractions" in this world via pleasure, sickness, happiness, pain, joy, hurt, wealth, poverty, ignorance and, yes, knowledge or science. After all, knowledge can "puff up" if we don't seek it in an effort to seek and please Him. Sometimes, we choose to believe what we cannot see even when it goes against our physical observations or own earthly understanding.

Quote:

Creating Adam and Eve as adults or creating adult fruit bearing plants in the garden is totally different than creating them with "the appearance of age." Like I said initially, aging implies a process. Humans, as they age, show some signs of wear and tear. Trees have growth rings. I don't think that God put signs of wear and tear into Adam and Eve's bodies and I don't believe the trees had growth rings. If He did, that would have been deceptive and out of God's character. It is not that he was unable to do this from a POWER standpoint (of course He could have) but rather that he was unable to do this from a CHARACTER standpoint.

To touch on the trees: How do you know? How do you know that those trees didn't have "growth rings?" What if God speeded up the growth of those trees -- including the yearly growth rings -- when He created them? Did He just make them appear...or did He speed the rate of growth at Creation. How do you know that God didn't speed up creation rates when He created it? The same question can be asked light that He might have designed to reach Earth the moment that He created it.

This would not pose a problem with His character.

Quote:

And, like I have said here on some other thread on this issue, accepting an ancient, billions of years old universe does NOTHING to help macroevolution. There STILL is not nearly enough time. I believe that is why many Christians are fearful about accepting the possibility that the universe really is really old-- because they fear this will then "allow" for macro-evolution. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I agree. However, my rationale in regard to these things has nothing to do with perceived notions about macro-evolution. Evolutionary biologists, on the other hand, do disagree. They feel that the ancient age of the Earth theorized by physicists gives adequate time for the evolution of species. They can't, however, explain how they embrace evolution on a cellular level but fail to determine why plants with complex cellular structures didn't "evolve" on a macro-scale similar to animals. But, of course, that is another discussion altogether.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/8/29 14:51**

Hey Chris--

I appreciate your spirit in discussing this.

You wrote:

"In your supernova anecdote, I am simply stating that God could have easily "sped up" those particles during creation -- easily exceeding the current postulated upper speed limit -- before that "seventh day" when He rested from Creation. He could have sped them so much that He broke the plane of space time and our observations then become nothing more than a "perspective" that is relative from our time and place in space time."

Or, the universe really could be billions of years old ;)

I know we aren't going to agree on this-- this is one of those topics that most people don't change their minds on.

But I do find it interesting to discuss because I like to speculate about such things.

As far as the tree rings go, it is my understanding (i am no botanist) that rings form because of one year's cycle of photosynthesis followed by a period of dormancy, etc. Yes, God could have grown the plant from an acorn to a mature oak in one day, but did he also speed up the time so that many seasons passed in one day. You see, if there were tree rings in the adult trees in the garden, but there was no background cause (other than that God painted them there) it still seems deceptive to me.

But oh well, maybe that's just me!

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiss (), on: 2012/8/29 16:03**

Hi TMK,

Thanks...and I appreciate your spirit as well.

Now, I will be the first to admit that I do not know with absolute certainty whether or not the universe is billions of years old or much younger in line with a strict acceptance of the Genesis account. I just see ways in which spiritual faith and natural science can simultaneously coexist -- not as enemies -- but as two entities created by the same Author. This allows me to freely accept the possibility that God's creation could have occurred precisely as it was written.

As for that pesky tree: We just don't know how it happened because the Word of God does not include the details. There could have been rings because trees need photosynthesis to grow...and God could have provided the photosynthesis necessary for that growth in a quick or instantaneous time. After all, "God planted a garden..."

Most importantly, my point has been that God doesn't need to obey the rules or laws that He designed. Remember: We can say to those trees to get up and plant themselves in the ocean and it would be done. There aren't any "laws" in this universe that would permit such a thing...yet it is as possible as setting the sun's shadow back several degrees as a sign.

Science is a very deep and thought provoking subject. It is no wonder that it almost becomes a "religion" for some people. However, I have known some brilliant, beautiful minds that are "experts" in their fields and still choose to put their faith in God. Such faith even led a scientist-astronaut to read the Scriptures while circling the Moon in space or another to take communion on the surface of the Moon.

A few years ago, NASA allowed individuals to include names that would be etched onto microchips on probes or rovers that went to Mars and other missions in space. For the Curiosity rover that recently landed and is currently exploring Mars, I included "JESUS CHRIST IS THE SAME YESTERDAY, TODAY AND FOREVER. - Hebrews 13:8" among several of her verses that I chose.

I remember telling my wife that it is great to know that the Word of God is present on the surface of the planet Mars. However, my wife pointed out that the universe was spoken into existence by the Word of God. "God is already there," she

reminded me. How true that is! God is here on Earth, at the supernova that we talked about and even to the beginning and end of the universe. Physicists are looking for the origins and causes of the Big Bang. Won't they be surprised to learn where that actually leads?

**Re: - posted by Earendel (), on: 2012/8/29 18:46**

Quote:  
-----by SkepticGuy on 2012/8/27 11:43:26  
  
before i get asked, no i do not believe in evolution. i do believe in creation. i do not believe the 6000 year old earth theory that most christians believe. i do think evidence shows the earth is much older than that.  
-----

do you believe the bible? ...I Do !

Time is subjective in understanding what it is.

example:

Look at what science calls a black hole.

Anything caught past the event horizon is sucked in faster than the speed of light, as light itself cannot escape the velocity of gravity of a black hole pulling it in.

...so anything that goes past the event horizon gets sucked in faster than a pico-second if you were viewing the event from inside the event horizon.

but outside the event horizon the same event can take millions of years to take place.

so which is true...is an object sucked in at faster than light speed and occurring faster than a pico-second, or is the event taking millions of years to take place as viewed from outside the event horizon?

both are true, it happens faster than a pico-second and it takes millions of years at exactly the same time. the difference is "where" you are viewing the event taking place as to which time frame is being considered.

one event, not two events taking place at exactly the same time.

So when God said creation took six days, it is absolutely true. do you understand?

don't get sucked into unbelief.

We know for certain that from Adam approx, 6000 years has transpired. The "days" in creation as written in Genesis may very well be periods of time spanning several billions of years. To a timeless being such as our Creator, time is nothing, a billion years may as well be 24 hours when it passes. There is an example in creation that God has given us to help us understand the concept of eternity and we can plainly see this. It helps us understand how God Himself is eternal without beginning and without end.

Is there an end to space? Is there an end to the universe as we see it when we look up into the skies. When the first star was born what was in the expanse of the heavens? We can see that everything was formless and void. How many universes has there been? At the end of our known universe, where the first/last star exists, what lies beyond it in the sea of space...another shore...another expanse of formless and void space once again?

Travell a trillion^trillion light years in one direction in a straight line and do we find yet another universe, and so on and so on? These are things we can acknowledge because we see the stars in space to give it depth, and by it we perceive the expanse of space and understand what eternity is, and thereby can understand that God Himself can be and is eternal...because He made all things that are, including our consciousness and the vastness of space.



Of the vastness of all of creation and eternity itself, did you know that God has to humble Himself to look at it?

Psalm 113:5-6

5 Who is like the LORD our God,  
Who dwells on high,  
6 Who humbles Himself to behold  
The things that are in the heavens and in the earth?

Personally, it does not matter to me if creation occurred in 144 hours of "our time" or not; I believe God could have done it in a pico-second if He so wanted to. ...because He does not exist in our realm and is all powerful beyond our understanding.

Time can be controlled and manipulated...as explained by the event horizon of a black hole. I won't delve into the physics aspect of space/time relativity and gravity here. Think about this one though...Without mass there is no gravity, without gravity there is no time...just the emptiness of space in a timeless ether.

...time can be controlled and manipulated...even by us.

there was an experiment done with two atomic clocks that proves this.

So, can the universe occur in a second?

The point being is time is nothing to God the Creator of the Universe. So, that leaves a question...is the Earth 4 billion years old or is it 6000 years old? Well, both are correct at the "same time". ...depending on where you exist in time, and how and where you are viewing a particular event.