

The Case Against Cosmic Evolution:

Cosmology Today:

“Astronomy, rather cosmology, is in trouble. It is, for the most part, beside itself. It has departed from the scientific method and its principles, and drifted into the bizarre; it has raised imaginative invention to an art form; and has shown a ready willingness to surrender or ignore fundamental laws, such as the second law of thermodynamics and the maximum speed of light, all for the apparent rationale of saving the status quo. Perhaps no 'science' is receiving more self-criticism, chest-beating, and self-doubt; none other seems so lost and misdirected; trapped in debilitating dogma.”¹

See Movie Clip: Cosmic Evolution

(This clip is part 3 of “A Question of Origins” found free at:
http://www.eternal-productions.org/question_video/question_video.html)

Details of clip:

- The clip starts where evolutionists claim it started – the Big Bang
 - Evolution has been applied to all areas of science so that it is now as if the universe itself is evolving. So not only did life come together by purely natural means, the sun, moon and stars also came together in this way.
 - **Problem 1:** If all matter was found at one point and exploded it would create chaos, not order. Explosions always form a random distribution of parts – not what we observe in the universe (planets, stars, galaxies, clusters, super clusters...). If the universe is the product of an explosion we would assume a universe with dust everywhere.
 - **Problem 2:** The second law of thermodynamics talks about entropy. Entropy is the measure of useless energy and the second law states that as time goes on, entropy (useless energy) increases. We observe this today – that there is only destruction, never innovation. The universe is as if it was wound up and carefully put into place – not the product of random chance.
 - **Problem 3:** Science today has confirmed to the dismay of evolution that the universe had a beginning. So the great question of causality will always be asked – what was the cause of the Big Bang?
 - **Problem 4:** Variation in our solar system poses huge problems for the evolution theory that claims everything came from the same swirling cloud of gas – every planet has different chemical compositions and they're all very different from the sun. Planets should spin in the same direction but they don't. The moons on the planets present similar problems – some planets have moons that rotate the planet in opposite directions. The formation of gaseous planets like Jupiter and Saturn by natural means is also a great mystery because gas dissipates rapidly in space – the Sun also does not have enough orbiting gas to create even one Jupiter. The fact that some planets have rings is also a mystery. The earth's moon also poses great problems for the theory of evolution. Its elements are too dissimilar from earth's to have come from earth. It also has a very circular orbit which gives difficulty to any theories stating it may have come from an outside source (this would give it a more oval orbit).
 - **Problem 5:** The anthropic principle – thousands of parameters that if they were changed in the slightest bit, life on earth could not exist. How could such a delicate balance form from randomness?

Big Bang – Did it bang?

One evolutionist objection to **Problem 1** in the video is that they're not saying that the universe exploded or blew up, they're saying it expanded. So we need to be careful in our terminology. However, the video is a classic example of Creationists putting science into layman's terms so as to be easily understood by Christians – not necessarily a bad thing. But we need to know that their position can still be defended. Here are some facts about the big bang:

¹ Roy C. Martin Jr., *Astronomy on Trial: A Devastating and Complete Repudiation of the Big Bang Fiasco* (New York: University Press of America, 1999), p. xv.

- The initial energy of the Big Bang would have greatly increased entropy in moments. The initial order of the singularity would have been reduced to total chaos almost instantly.²
- First law of Thermodynamics – energy cannot be created or destroyed. It only changes form.
- Second law of Thermodynamics - “the energy in the universe available for useful work has always been decreasing.”³ The measure of this decrease in useful energy is called entropy. The eventual “heat death” of the universe is when entropy reaches its maximum. Therefore the universe cannot be eternal, there must have been a point of low or zero entropy – regardless it would be less than today. This seems difficult to fit into a theory that presupposes a naturalism and randomness
- “A final point to be made is that the second law of thermodynamics and the principle of increase in entropy have great philosophical implications. The question that arises is how did the universe get into the state of reduced entropy in the first place, since all natural process known to us tend to increase entropy?... The author has found that the second law tends to increase his conviction that there is a Creator who has the answer for the future destiny of man and the universe.”⁴
- Dark matter/Dark energy are supposed to form the majority of our universe, yet have never been observed. They were invented to preserve the big bang theory because this theory assumed a decelerating expansion of the universe (it is in fact accelerating) and a much denser universe than what we have today. After over 30 years of looking, these two ideas have not been found in reality. See Walt Brown's book “In the Beginning for much more information.
- One creationist theory that may be a solution to this problem is “White Hole Cosmology.”⁵ Walt Brown also has a theory that escapes many problems of “Big Bang.”

More Evidence for a Beginning:

An argument against evolution is that the universe must have had a beginning in time – and something that transcends time must have put it into action. Well how do we know? There is a mathematical reason why time needs a beginning:

If you count one at a time will you ever reach infinity? What if you multiply the highest number you can count to by the highest number you can count to? You can still go higher. In the same way it is impossible for an infinite amount of time to pass. Therefore there could not be an infinity past – because that would require an infinite number of events to pass before today. The only mathematical explanation that can prevail is one that has an agent outside of time. The Bible is the only holy book to claim such a creator.

Big Bang vs. The Moon

Since it is our closest neighbor, we have more information about the moon than any other planet, star or moon in our universe. So you would think that the Big Bang theory could adequately explain the origin of our moon, right? Wrong. The Moon has a nearly circular orbit – which would not allow for it to have been thrown up from the earth or caught by the orbit of the earth.

“These explanations have many other problems. Understanding them caused one expert to joke, 'The best explanation [for the Moon] was observational error – the Moon does not exist.' ”⁶

The Anthropic Principle:

“The Anthropic Principle says that the seemingly arbitrary and unrelated constants in physics have one strange thing in common--these are precisely the values you need if you want to have a universe capable of producing life.”⁷

2 <http://www.creationwiki.org/CE441>

3 Walt Brown, In the Beginning 8th edition, p. 55

4 Don N. Page, “Inflation Does Not Explain Time Asymmetry,” Nature, Vol. 304, 7 July 1983, p. 39

5 http://www.creationwiki.org/White_Hole_Cosmology

6 Walt Brown, In the Beginning 8th edition, p. 27

7 Patrick Glynn

- Gravity is roughly 10^{39} times weaker than electromagnetism. If gravity had been 10^{33} times weaker than electromagnetism, "stars would be a billion times less massive and would burn a million times faster."
- The nuclear weak force is 10^{28} times the strength of gravity. Had the weak force been slightly weaker, all the hydrogen in the universe would have been turned to helium (making water impossible, for example).
- A stronger nuclear strong force (by as little as 2 percent) would have prevented the formation of protons--yielding a universe without atoms. Decreasing it by 5 percent would have given us a universe without stars.
- If the difference in mass between a proton and a neutron were not exactly as it is--roughly twice the mass of an electron--then all neutrons would have become protons or vice versa. Say good-bye to chemistry as we know it--and to life.
- The very nature of water--so vital to life--is something of a mystery (a point noticed by one of the forerunners of anthropic reasoning in the nineteenth century, Harvard biologist Lawrence Henderson). Unique amongst the molecules, water is lighter in its solid than liquid form: Ice floats. If it did not, the oceans would freeze from the bottom up and earth would now be covered with solid ice. This property in turn is traceable to the unique properties of the hydrogen atom.
- The synthesis of carbon--the vital core of all organic molecules--on a significant scale involves what scientists view as an astonishing coincidence in the ratio of the strong force to electromagnetism. This ratio makes it possible for carbon-12 to reach an excited state of exactly 7.65 MeV at the temperature typical of the centre of stars, which creates a resonance involving helium-4, beryllium-8, and carbon-12--allowing the necessary binding to take place during a tiny window of opportunity 10^{-17} seconds long.⁸