

Analysis of the Nye/Ham debate – evolution officially debunked on evolutionist’s terms!

Matthew Cserhati

On February 4th we bore witness to the clash of two worldviews at the Creation Museum. Bill Nye, president of the Planetary Society and Ken Ham, CEO of Answers in Genesis debated the viability of creation and evolution. It is in this debate that we bore witness to nothing less than the official debunking of the myth of evolution.

Ken Ham’s strong point was that he demonstrated that evolution itself was a religious viewpoint, thereby separating observational science and historical science. Evolution is a theory, and neither a law, nor a fact. Evolution should not be mixed up with observational science, by which we discover natural laws, and based upon which we are capable of inventing things and designing new technologies. This is why Nye’s challenge to Ham to point out a single invention by a creationist is a moot point – neither does the theory of evolution lead to new inventions. Ken Ham rightfully pointed out that we have the same evidences, which are all neutral. A DNA sequence is a DNA sequence, and a toad is a toad, but explanations as to how they came about can differ, and it is true that evolutionary theory is a monolithic explanation of origins, invoked everywhere to explain everything, even if it may sound like a shallow just-so-story.

That evolutionary theory is just a religious viewpoint was really driven home when Nye made the statement several times that if a modern fossil could be found mixed in with older fossils, then evolution would fall. This is because we would expect older organisms to be found in older and lower lying geological layers than modern fossils which would be expected to lie further up in the geological column. Nye stated that we would have to find but one single example of such a fossil. Ham pointed to an example of how a piece of wood was dated to be 45,000 years old, while the encasing basalt rock deep down was dated to be many millions of years old. This is not 100% exactly what Nye asked for, but it is enough to show that radioactive dating methods are seriously flawed (because of the subjective assumptions that they are based on as Ham pointed out), or that the geological column is inconsistent. Nye said that scientists would be overjoyed to find such evidence, but as we saw, he was not overjoyed, but rather tried to explain it away because of his religious bias. Nevertheless Nye proposed his challenge, Ham accepted, and delivered. **The myth of evolution has officially been debunked!!!**

And this is not the only case. Examples abound where fossils or geological layers were grossly misdated. And we’re not talking about ± 1000 years, but orders of magnitudes of difference. Evolutionists will try to come up with ad hoc explanations such as contamination, and some of these may be valid, but for all cases? I don’t think so.

As Ken Ham rightfully pointed out that there are creationists out there who are inventors, such as Raymond Damadian, the inventor of MRI. As to the statement that creationism does not lead to scientific predictions is simply not true. Dr. Russell Humphreys published a theory of the creation of the Earth’s and other planets’ magnetic field in the Creation Research Science Quarterly in 1984 based on 2Peter 3:5: “. . . and the earth was formed out of water and by water”. According to Humphrey’s theory, in the beginning the Earth was covered with water, and the decay of the magnetic spin of hydrogen

atoms lead to the creation of a current within the Earth and thus a magnetic field. His theory was verified for the prediction of the magnetic fields of Uranus and Neptune, more precisely than evolutionary models. And then again we can also mention the fact that as medical science makes progress more and more functions are being found for so-called vestigial organs, as Ham pointed out. We could also point out that many bacterial resistances to medication are due to a loss of genetic information. Thus, major advances could be made in medical science due to taking creationist aspects into consideration. Think about that if you ever come down with a serious illness.

As to Nye's criticism of the creation model, we must take note that he clearly misunderstood the creationist Flood model. The Bible does not teach that examples of all species or life forms were taken onboard the ark. Furthermore, Noah was instructed to build the ark by God, Who, being omniscient is better than all human shipwrights combined, past, present, or future. According to Genesis 7, only vertebrates living on land were taken onto the ark: "Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by sevens, the male and his female: and of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female. Of fowls also of the air by sevens, the male and the female; to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth... Of clean beasts, and of beasts that are not clean, and of fowls, and of every thing that creepeth upon the earth, there went in two and two unto Noah into the ark, the male and the female, as God had commanded Noah".

This is very important to note because this means that there would be more space for other animals on the ark. Furthermore, it helps solve the problem of the creation of the 16 million species that we see today. According to the World Conservation Union, there are some 31,005 vertebrate species (discounting fish which could have survived in the water) living today (The World Conservation Union. 2010. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Summary Statistics for Globally Threatened Species). Creation science has also predicted that living species can diversify fairly rapidly. For example, anole lizards can change their body form and the length of their limbs within generations.

Furthermore, we can also think about how densely rich some parts of the world are such as the Amazon rainforest. Some species such as bacteria can also multiply very rapidly, once every half hour. With a large number of organisms per species, species diversification can also thus exponentially explode with enough members. Furthermore, it is ironic that evolutionists themselves posit the idea of land rafting, by which lemurs populated Madagascar, and iguanid reptiles got from South America to islands in the South Pacific (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oceanic_dispersal). Of course, both evolutionists and creationists have to prove how land animals could have reached remote islands from the larger continents.

As to the 9,550 year old spruce tree in Sweden, it is a well-known fact in plant biology that trees may produce multiple rings in a year, by which their age may be deduced. Multiple tree rings within one year may be the result of alternating favorable and stressful environmental conditions. This would especially be true for Fulufjället Mountain where this tree is located, just north of the southern tip of Greenland in latitude.

As to one of Nye's points about human evolution, they are easily addressed. Human skull sizes can vary by as much as 500 cm³. There is variability within the human species, yet we are all unified. Nye presented a diagram of all these different hominid skulls, each differing in size and shape. Yet anthropologists say that modern human and Neanderthals could have been inter-related. Mixed human and Neanderthal fossils have been found, and signs that Neanderthals had religion have also been found. According to creation theory, Homo sapiens, erectus, and neanderthalensis could all be part of the human kind. In the beginning due to a larger, more intact gene pool, humans could have exhibited more genetic variability. Even secular scientists acknowledge that a genetic bottleneck happened in recent human history.

Another important point is the question of whether nature and natural laws have always been the same. You really cannot prove it one way or the other, since we stand in the present and can detect signals only in the present. The idea that natural laws have always been the same is based on your acceptance that nature is everything that was, is, and will be. This means that it might be possible that the universe is 15 billion years old due to light coming from supposedly distant galaxies. But then again, how do we really know that those galaxies are that far? We cannot observe the past, we can only observe light in the present. Bill Nye even made a statement that some stars appear to be accelerating. Does this mean that these stars will eventually travel faster than the speed of light? Stars can exist only so long before travelling faster than the speed of light. That's impossible. However, according to some creationist theories, based on observations made in secular journals, the speed of light itself might not have been constant all the time. Thus, if it was faster in the past, this means that stars might not be that old as believed.

Ken Ham appealed to the authority of Scripture many times to support his worldview. Is this valid? Scripture can indeed be used as an authority because it presents to us a model of beginnings embedded into a historical context. The Bible presents to us a history of mankind and the universe, from beginning to end. That is, it gives us a concrete worldview model. In this for example, it far excels the Qur'an, which describes origins in a lot less detail, and does not even make pretenses about making historically accurate claims (it makes several historical errors, for example claiming that the disciples of Christ called themselves Muslims, 600 years before Mohammed ever lived), much less make prophetic predictions about the future (meaning that it is void of any kind of eschatology). That is why Nye was unable to answer the question as to how consciousness could arise from matter, yet Ham had a ready response. Indeed, if matter is everything that was, is, and will be, matter can give rise only to matter, and not non-matter, yet consciousness exists. Clearly there has to be some form of Being which gave rise to, created mankind who has consciousness.

Fish: just because some fish reproduce asexually, sometimes sexually, and sexually all the time simply does not mean that they evolved that way. It is hard to understand how since some fish reproduce this way, then evolution follows. We are only talking about the sexual reproductive patterns of some fish. This only proves that sexually reproducing fish are healthier, because of hybrid vigor. Hybrid vigor means that when 2 fish reproduce sexually, they are likely to produce offspring which are heterozygous for many, many genes. Because they are diploid, they have 2 copies for all genes, and it is highly unlikely

that both mother and father would bring the same gene variant for all genes; both parents would necessarily be clones of each other for that to happen.