

CREATIONISM IS NOT SCIENCE

Religious believers in the war with science concentrate more on the alleged fact that God created all things out of nothing and don't show the same interest in the notion that God is a friendly presence in our hearts which guides to live as a servant of love and as a person for others. One would think the creator role of God would be less important.

Creation is the notion of God making something where there was nothing. There was change. There was a cause of all things. For something to be really caused there has to be continuity and also something new. There is a necessary connection between cause and effect. The cause has to be like the effect and vice versa. Cause and effect describe something going from one state into a different or another one. But there is no similarity or connection between something and nothing. Those who believe in creation are in fact saying that God has the power to make something that has no cause!

Creationists say that the Bible gives the truth about the creation and the origin of all things and that science fits in with and/or supports the Bible account. This approach necessarily denies that the scientific method is the only way and the only chance of finding out the truth about reality. Science can be wrong sometimes. That does not discredit the scientific method of testing and investigating. It is needed more than ever. It will be respected and encouraged and praised despite the schemes of Creationism to ruin it.

Creationism is popular because people find that the notion of simple laws becoming complex ones rings true. They think the universe came from a simple God. An explanation for the creation is not an explanation unless it is simpler than what it explains. But this shows ignorance of physics in which everything is bewilderingly complex. Hardly anybody can understand the science of physics. The brightest physicists only understand a little.

Physics says the laws of nature are intrinsic to nature. To say the laws come from God is flatly to deny they are intrinsic.

Peter Atkins wrote: "Creationism is fundamentally dishonest, for as well as having no mechanism of self-control, it distorts the evidence to suit its prejudices; science though occasionally corrupted by false practice when practitioners are overcome by their own ambition and perhaps thwarted by their own incompetence, has a powerful public procedure of self-policing that sooner or later flushes out malpractice and exposes simple unintended error. Creationism is dangerous to society, for it undermines the rational; science contributes positively to society, for it is the apotheosis of the rational." page 27, *On Being, A Scientist's Exploration of the Great Questions of Existence*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2011

Creationism is really down to the religious desire to show that life has a divine purpose. There are entities in the universe that have no purpose. What purpose can a speck of dust at the other side of the universe have? Depressed people feel life has no purpose and they won't recover unless they learn to give it a purpose. Belief in God is not going to do it for them. If people say it is then they forget that it is how people respond to their beliefs or circumstances that helps them feel their lives are important and meaningful. Creationism is based on the illusion that you must show God exists and made all things just as the Bible tells us in order to have meaning in life! Scoffers at the Bible who believe in God have a sense of meaning. Creationists seem to forget that. Science shows that the creation of the universe and more importantly our evolution was agentless - there is no need to assume a God. Thus our existence is necessarily purposeless in terms of an ultimate purpose. We have to make our own purpose.

Science has helped us see that the universe can be accounted for without a God. There is a tendency starting in God religion now to say that God made something from which the universe could build itself! They have not fully realised the implications of this. If God hides like that and wants the universe to at least act independent of him then the miracles reported by religion must be hoaxes. God would not cover his tracks and then do miracles that uncover them! Deism, at best, is what is implied by their teaching. Deism teaches that a God who is not interested in a relationship with us, is behind all creation.

The notion that God set things up to make themselves is akin to finding a fine doll in your Christmas stocking and because you can't explain how it got there you say thin air was set up to make itself. That is not science but the perception you impose on the situation.

Physics is about the how and why of existence. It is a Christian lie that science is about the how and religion is about the why. And religion does not believe it itself for it says that God is the ultimate answer to how all things came to be. Also, if

chance is how all things started off, the answer to the why is, "Chance is real. We know that. Chance is the reason why all things exist." The why in that case is the how.

In physics, you ask a question. You get an answer. But the answer raises a hundred questions. And each of those can raise thousands of questions. Given this complexity, religion's simplicity is anti-science, anti-verification and anti-rational. It's fundamentalist. Even the most liberal Christian must have some fundamentalist opinions and doctrines.

It is known that information is not abstract in the ultimate nature of reality. It seems to be encoded in the heart of the universe. The Christians are making out that it is encoded in God and deny that God is part of the universe. There is no need to assume the existence of God. And God is that which we must adore totally therefore religion is a threat to the open-mindedness we need. It is an attempt to make physicists fail to see the information in at the heart of reality if that information makes God redundant.

Creationism takes the Bible account of the origin of the universe and of man as true history. It denies evolution. It often asserts that the world is only a few thousand years old. It treats the Bible as a science text book and bends scientific evidence to make it fit this theory. Even liberal Christians who are horrified by creationism must admit that religion does not use evidence to help it form a theory. Rather it forms the theory and then may look for evidence. You can make anything superficially convincing with that approach. Whatever the creationists get up to and regardless of how much they deceive, the criticism they get from liberals is a case of kettles and pots. Liberal Christians are as bad as the fundamentalists for bending scripture. They do the manipulating equally - the fundamentalist twists scripture to fit science and the liberal does it too in a different way.

Creation Science is an embarrassment so it is sometimes disguised as Intelligent Design.

Religion says the big bang doesn't address the issue of why there was nothing before it. But it can never be proven in religion that there was nothing before it. What if God made a spirit force that existed in all eternity and then which turned into whatever exploded?

In relation to the big bang, we know that the speed expansion that took place after it is significant. Too fast and the atoms would be all over the place and there would be no order. Too slow and the power of gravity pulls everything back in making a black hole. This leads some to surmise that the universe must have come into being through intelligent design. Intelligent design could refer to God. Or it might not.

The odd thing is we have chaos and disorder. Then order appears. Does the designer not act at first? It looks more like a case of luck. There was no force behind it.

Is an uncaused God worse than an uncaused big bang? Or vice versa?

We cannot look into the heart of everything. We know the big bang happened but we don't know if God exists. So we have to take it for granted that an uncaused big bang is a simpler explanation than God. We cannot always directly show if something is simple and have to make do with indirect.

Some scientists who believe in God have a God in the background of their science. Anything that science can't explain they think he is behind it. But this God of the Gaps has a problem. As the gaps get smaller there is less room for him. This is a God in the background. It is degrading to God, if he exists, to use belief in him to fill holes. He is not much of a God if his self-respect is poor enough that though he controls all things he wants to be believed in in such a stupid and disrespectful way. Is the view that God hides his role in evolution so that it looks like the work of chance advocating the God of the Gaps? No. If we can account for evolution without him then there is no gap. Evolutionists who believe are guilty of pretending that God is needed when he is not. They are worse than the God of the Gaps brigade.

Those who believe in God and those who do not, often do agree that the universe had no beginning in the sense that there was always something there. Even the Bible does not rule out there always being something. It has no word for making things out of nothing. It just speaks of God making the heavens and the earth.

Creation out of nothing is about protecting God's power and nothing else which is why it is nothing special. In other words, it is needed to give us a God of unimaginable power who can make things pop into existence. A God who does not have responsibility for every single thing is not a God for then there is something he cannot do anything about and he is not completely his own boss. So he is not literally almighty and he must fight if he wants more power. Creation as a theory is not about explaining anything for it is not science and logic does not suggest creation. It is about giving us a God and

nothing else.

Creationism is not science but is religious bigotry disguised as science and which steals scientific terminology.

THE WWW

Creationism

This shows that the prime creationist apologist Duane Gish has been corrected many times for his errors and misunderstandings of his subject and has still repeated the same errors afterwards to make his case look good. He is perverting the evidence purposely. He has been known to make up quotations for the authorities he cites as evidence. He lies to prove that the skeleton Lucy which shows a transition between animal to man was just a monkey and could not walk upright. Both of his claims are false.
<http://mypage.direct.ca/w/writer/gish.html>

Dennis Mc Kinsey, Biblical Errancy

<http://members.aol.com/darrwin2/iss171.html>

Argues against the Fundamentalist claim that when the book of Leviticus says that the life is in the blood it was stating an unknown scientific fact and showing that the book was written by God. McKinsey says that since the context of this verse is about sacrifice to God it means spiritual life or holiness is in the blood and is not on about physical life. This page gives some excellent criticisms of the fantasies and lies of Henry Morris and the Institute of Creation Research. It is obvious that the fact that the Institute of Creation Research could not possibly be called scientific though it claims that label as its bedrock next the Bible for you cannot prove something as odd as creation. Creation is something coming out of nothing and who is to say that something just as bizarre as this and something that we cannot even think of is not the reason why things exist? Creation is an assumption and the idea of a God making a creation that is not part of him is incoherent. If there was only God and God is his power and God is infinite (infinite means God has all power and no power exists that isn't his) and it takes infinite power to put something where nothing was then it follows that far from creating God just metamorphosed himself into the cosmos so that Morris and me and everybody else is God.

Science in the Bible? Dr M Magee

www.askwhy.co.uk/truth/440BibleScience.html

Why It's a Load of Old Cobblers, Adrian Barnett

www.abarnett.demon.co.uk/atheism/noahs_ark.html

Exposes the utter absurdity of the Noah's Ark story in the Bible

The Bible as History Flunks New Archaeological Tests

www.10.nytimes.com/library/arts/072900david-bible.html

[Talk.Origins archive](#) - presenting the mainstream scientific viewpoint of the Creation/Evolution controversy.

[Artificial Life Online](#)

[NCSE](#) - science/evolution resources for Teachers.

[Many evolution and musuem links](#)

[The Virtual Library on evolution](#)

[Radio Carbon Dating](#)

[Skeptic's Dictionary](#)

[sci.skeptic newsgroup FAQ](#) - good intro to skepticism

[Massive evolution resource page](#)

[The Hawaiian Islands, creation science and the age of the Earth](#)

[Thorough demolition of Creationism - well worth a look.](#)

[The Geologic Column](#)

[Hydrologic sorting](#)

[Online dictionary of geology.](#)

[In-depth analysis of the Noah's Ark myth](#)

[Debunking Creationism](#)

[Polonium haloes](#) problem. It's just Radon 222 after all.

[Plate tectonics / continental drift](#)

[The Lost Diaries of Noah](#)

[Facts about Koala Bears](#) - They were on the Ark? Yeah, right...

[Dr. Hovind](#) debunked (not difficult)

[Oldest living thing on the planet](#) - Mojave Desert creosote plant, estimated at 12,000 years old, (6,000 years before alleged Creation, and still going strong. Oh no - Genesis is not a science book!)

[Bristlecone Pines](#) - **almost** the oldest living things on the planet, and an unbroken history dating back at least 9,000 years (3,000 years before the alleged Creation)

[Ice core hotlist](#)

[GISP2 Ice Core sample](#) dating back 110,000 years (104,000 years before the alleged Creation)

[The receding moon problem sorted out.](#)

[The incredible age of coral reefs.](#)

[Excellent article calculating the size and age of the universe.](#)

[Index of Creationism and Pseudo Science](#)

[Suspicious Creationist Credentials](#)