

WHO'S RIGHT?

Samuel H. Nodal

GOD'S CREATION or the Evolutionists



**IN THE BEGINNING
GOD CREATED**
(Gen. 1:1...)

**If my Great Grandfather and
my Father became Human;
How come I'm still a Monkey?
This Stinks to high Heaven!**

Three Reasons For Deception!

1. **Fear of the LORD** is the **foundation of wisdom**. Knowledge of the Holy One results in good judgment. (Prov. 9:10) NLT
"No fear of God, brings Deception, rebellion and stupidity"
2. THE [empty-headed] **fool** has said in his heart, **There is no God**. They are corrupt, they have done abominable deeds; there is none that does good or right. (Psa. 14:1) AMP
"God hates pride and will deal with it severely"
3. Satan, who is the god of this world, has **blinded the minds** of those who **don't believe**. They are **unable to see** the glorious light of the Good News. They **don't understand** this message about the glory of Christ, who is the exact likeness of God. (2 Cor. 4:4) TLB
*"God's great enemy has blinded the whole world into thinking that God is not real. That clever devil reversed the Truth, making us think; Man created God - instead of **God Created man**. He twisted the Truth into a lie!" (political correctness)*

*There Are Presently **Hundreds** of Empirical Parameters in Every Field of Science; Mathematical Scientists tell us anything over one to the 40th Power Cannot come to Pass by Chance! In other words it is impossible, it will Never Happen! In study # 9 (Bible Studies) we proved to you through chemistry (like math it cannot be wrong) that the human body is **none living** without the Spirit of God, so that alone kills evolution... and at the end of this study you will see that **every field of science** was given to us by **men of God** (christians) who God anointed to bring us a better life through science. This can be verified by the book (research) Men of Science Men of God by Henry M. Morris.*

The Foundation of All Science Disciplines were given to us by Christians (Men of Science - Men of GOD)

1. **Leonardo da Vinci** (1452-1519) *Experimental Science ; Physics*
2. **Francis Bacon** (1561-1626) *Scientific Method*
3. **Johann Kepler** (1571-1630) *Scientific Astronomy*
4. **William Petty** (1623-1687) *Statistics; Scientific Economics*
5. **Blaise Pascal** (1623-1662) *Hydrostatics; Barometer*
6. **Robert Boyle** (1627-1691) *Chemistry; Gas Dynamics*
7. **John Ray** (1627-1705) *Natural History*
8. **Nicolas Steno** (1631-1686) *Stratigraphy*
9. **Isaac Newton** (1642-1727) *Dynamics; Calculus; Gravitation Law; Reflecting Telescope*
10. **William Derham** (1657-1735) *Ecology*
11. **John Woodward** (1665-1728) *Paleontology*
12. **Carolus Linneaus** (1707-1778) *Taxonomy; Biological Classification System*
13. **Richard Kirwan** (1733-1812) *Mineralogy*
14. **William Herschel** (1738-1822) *Galactic Astronomy; Uranus*

15. **John Dalton** (1766-1844) *Atomic Theory; Gas Law*
16. **Georges Cuvier** (1769-1832) *Comparative Anatomy*
17. **Humphrey Davy** (1778-1829) *Thermokinetics; Safety Lamp*
18. **John Kidd, M.D.** (1775-1851) *Chemical Synthetics*
19. **David Brewster** (1781-1868) *Optical Mineralogy; Kaleidoscope*
20. **William Prout** (1785-1850) *Food Chemistry*
21. **Michael Faraday** (1791-1867) *Electro Magnetism; Field Theory; Generator*
22. **Charles Babbage** (1792-1871) *Operations Research; Computer Science; Ophthalmoscope*
23. **Samuel F. B. Morse** (1791-1872) *Telegraph*
24. **William Whewell** (1794-1866) *Anemometer*
25. **Joseph Henry** (1797-1878) *Electric Motor; Galvanometer*
26. **Matthew Maury** (1806-1873) *Oceanography; Hydrography*
27. **Louis Agassiz** (1807-1873) *Glaciology; Ichthyology*
28. **James Simpson** (1811-1870) *Gynecology; Anesthesiology*
29. **James Joule** (1818-1889) *Thermodynamics*
30. **George Stokes** (1819-1903) *Fluid Mechanics*
31. **Rudolph Virchow** (1821-1902) *Pathology*
32. **Louis Pasteur** (1822-1895) *Bacteriology; Biochemistry; Sterilization; Immunization*
33. **Gregor Mendel** (1822-1884) *Genetics*
34. **Henri Fabre** (1823-1915) *Entomology of Living Insects*

35. **William Thompson, Lord Kelvin** (1824-1907) *Energetics; Absolute Temperatures; Atlantic Cable*
36. **William Huggins** (1824-1910) *Astral Spectrometry*
37. **Bernhard Riemann** (1826-1866) *Non-Euclidean Geometrics*
38. **Joseph Lister** (1827-1912) *Antiseptic Surgery*
39. **Balfour Stewart** (1828-1887) *Ionospheric Electricity*
40. **Joseph Clerk Maxwell** (1831-1879) *Electrodynamics; Statistical Thermodynamics*
41. **P.G. Tait** (1831-1901) *Vector Analysis*
42. **John Strutt, Lord Rayleigh** (1842-1919) *Similitude; Model Analysis; Inert Gases*
43. **John Ambrose Fleming** (1849-1945) *Electronics; Electron Tube; Thermionic Valve*
44. **William Ramsay** (1852-1916) *Isotopic Chemistry, Element Transmutation*

A **Scientific law** is a statement based on **repeated experimental observations** that describes some aspect of the created universe. Unlike a theory, Laws are etched in stone - in other words they do not change. One can always expect the same outcome. A scientific Law is associated with Math and Chemistry.

Law of Bio - Genesis

This law states that in nature, **life comes only from life; and that of its own kind.**

Entropy - Second Law of Thermodynamics

A thermodynamic quantity representing the unavailability of a system's thermal energy for conversion into mechanical work, often interpreted as the degree of disorder or randomness in the system. Lack of order or predictability; gradual decline into disorder. ***Everything is Devolving - Not Evolving:***

CONCLUSION

The secular world (universities) and media, try to convince us that the Bible and Science oppose each other. They say “The Bible is a fable, and Science is true,” therefore, you cannot be a Bible Believing Scientist! Based on the empirical evidence above; What kind of Idiot would make such a statement? (the evolutionists) - I prove my case: CASE CLOSED. Amen.

So, seeing there is so much evidence for creation, why is creation not at the forefront of education. If you read carefully, this question was answered in the beginning of this study. Evil men have ceased power (the Media, the Government, and the Education fields) and made it their mission to stamp out God and Christianity from the face of the earth. They have cleverly developed strategies (like political correctness) to make people go against their will and do what they know is not Right. Top universities prohibit scientists from teaching what they know is True (creation) while rewarding those that teach evolution. If they teach any aspect of creation, they get fired! Here’s God’s Final Word on the issue!

And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. (John 8:32)

ANTHROPIC FINE TUNING OF THE UNIVERSE

The nature of the universe reveals that a purely naturalistic (evolution) cause for the universe is impossible and, therefore, illogical. One cannot say that a miraculous naturalistic event is a scientific explanation. Miracles are only possible when an immensely powerful Being intervenes to cause them. The Bible says that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and that He created the universe. When a model doesn't work, scientists must be willing to give up their model for a model that fits the facts better. In this case, the supernatural design model fits the data much better than the naturalistic random chance model.

Fine Tuning of the Physical Constants of the Universe

Parameter	Max. Deviation
Ratio of Electrons:Protons	1:10 ³⁷
Ratio of Electromagnetic Force:Gravity	1:10 ⁴⁰
Expansion Rate of Universe	1:10 ⁵⁵
Mass Density of Universe ¹	1:10 ⁵⁹
Cosmological Constant	1:10 ¹²⁰

These numbers represent the maximum deviation from the accepted values, that would either prevent the universe from existing now, not having matter, or be unsuitable for any form of life.

Degree of Fine Tuning. (by Rich Deem)

*The ripples in the universe from the original Big Bang event are detectable at one part in 100,000. If this factor were slightly smaller, the universe would exist only as a collection of gas - no planets, no life. If this factor were slightly larger, the universe would consist only of large black holes. Obviously, no life would be possible in such a universe. Another finely tuned constant is the strong nuclear force (the force that holds atoms together). The Sun "burns" by fusing hydrogen (and higher elements) together. When the two hydrogen atoms fuse, 0.7% of the mass of the hydrogen is converted into energy. If the amount of matter converted were slightly smaller—0.6% instead of 0.7% - a proton could not bond to a neutron, and the universe would consist only of hydrogen. With no heavy elements, there would be no rocky planets and no life. If the amount of matter converted were slightly larger - 0.8%, fusion would happen so readily and rapidly that no hydrogen would have survived from the Big Bang. Again, there would be no solar systems and no life. The number must lie exactly between 0.6% and 0.8% (Martin Rees, *Just Six Numbers*).*

Fine Tuning?

Skeptics like to say that fine tuning cannot be proven by science, since we have only one universe to study. However, the discovery and quantification of dark energy has puzzled a number of scientists, who realize that its extremely small value requires that the initial conditions of the universe must have been extremely fine tuned (supernaturally) in order that even matter would exist in our universe. By chance (evolution), our universe would have been expected to consist of merely some thermal radiation.

Fine Tuning Parameters for the Universe

1. strong nuclear force constant - *if larger: no hydrogen would form; atomic nuclei for most life-essential elements would be unstable; thus, no life chemistry if smaller: no elements heavier than hydrogen would form: again, no life chemistry.*

2. weak nuclear force constant - *if larger: too much hydrogen would convert to helium in big bang; hence, stars would convert too much matter into heavy elements making life chemistry impossible if smaller: too little helium would be produced from big bang; hence, stars would convert too little matter into heavy elements making life chemistry impossible.*

3. gravitational force constant - *if larger: stars would be too hot and would burn too rapidly and too unevenly for life chemistry if smaller: stars would be too cool to ignite nuclear fusion; thus, many of the elements needed for life chemistry would never form.*

4. **electromagnetic force constant** - *if greater: chemical bonding would be disrupted; elements more massive than boron would be unstable to fission if lesser: chemical bonding would be insufficient for life chemistry.*
5. **ratio of electromagnetic force constant to gravitational force constant** *if larger: all stars would be at least 40% more massive than the sun; hence, stellar burning would be too brief and too uneven for life support if smaller: all stars would be at least 20% less massive than the sun, thus incapable of producing heavy elements.*
6. **ratio of electron to proton mass** - *if larger: chemical bonding would be insufficient for life chemistry if smaller: same as above.*
7. **ratio of number of protons to number of electrons** - *if larger: electromagnetism would dominate gravity, preventing galaxy, star, and planet formation if smaller: same as above.*
8. **expansion rate of the universe** - *if larger: no galaxies would form if smaller: universe would collapse, even before stars formed.*
9. **entropy level of the universe** - *if larger: stars would not form within proto-galaxies if smaller: no proto-galaxies would form.*
10. **mass density of the universe** - *if larger: overabundance of deuterium from big bang would cause stars to burn rapidly, too rapidly for life to form if smaller: insufficient helium from big bang would result in a shortage of heavy elements.*
11. **velocity of light** - *if faster: stars would be too luminous for life support if slower: stars would be insufficiently luminous for life support.*
12. **age of the universe** - *if older: no solar-type stars in a stable burning phase would exist in the right (for life) part of the galaxy if younger: solar-type stars in a stable burning phase would not yet have formed.*
13. **initial uniformity of radiation** - *if more uniform: stars, star clusters, and galaxies would not have formed if less uniform: universe by now would be mostly black holes and empty space.*
14. **average distance between galaxies** - *if larger: star formation late enough in the history of the universe would be hampered by lack of material if smaller: gravitational tug-of-wars would destabilize the sun's orbit.*

15. density of galaxy cluster - *if denser: galaxy collisions and mergers would disrupt the sun's orbit if less dense: star formation late enough in the history of the universe would be hampered by lack of material.*

16. average distance between stars - *if larger: heavy element density would be too sparse for rocky planets to form if smaller: planetary orbits would be too unstable for life.*

17. fine structure constant - *(describing the fine-structure splitting of spectral lines) if larger: all stars would be at least 30% less massive than the sun if larger than 0.06: matter would be unstable in large magnetic fields if smaller: all stars would be at least 80% more massive than the sun.*

18. decay rate of protons - *if greater: life would be exterminated by the release of radiation if smaller: universe would contain insufficient matter for life.*

19. ^{12}C to ^{16}O nuclear energy level ratio - *if larger: universe would contain insufficient oxygen for life if smaller: universe would contain insufficient carbon for life.*

20. ground state energy level for ^4He - *if larger: universe would contain insufficient carbon and oxygen for life if smaller: same as above.*

21. decay rate of ^8Be - *if slower: heavy element fusion would generate catastrophic explosions in all the stars if faster: no element heavier than beryllium would form; thus, no life chemistry.*

22. ratio of neutron mass to proton mass - *if higher: neutron decay would yield too few neutrons for the formation of many life-essential elements if lower: neutron decay would produce so many neutrons as to collapse all stars into neutron stars or black holes.*

23. initial excess of nucleons over anti-nucleons - *if greater: radiation would prohibit planet formation if lesser: matter would be insufficient for galaxy or star formation.*

24. polarity of the water molecule - *if greater: heat of fusion and vaporization would be too high for life if smaller: heat of fusion and vaporization would be too low for life; liquid water would not work as a solvent for life chemistry; ice would not float, and a runaway freeze-up would result.*

25. supernovae eruptions - *if too close, too frequent, or too late: radiation would exterminate life on the planet if too distant, too infrequent, or too soon: heavy elements would be too sparse for rocky planets to form.*

26. white dwarf binaries - *if too few: insufficient fluorine would exist for life chemistry if too many: planetary orbits would be too unstable for life if formed too soon: insufficient fluorine production if formed too late: fluorine would arrive too late for life chemistry.*

27. ratio of exotic matter mass to ordinary matter mass - *if larger: universe would collapse before solar-type stars could form if smaller: no galaxies would form.*

28. number of effective dimensions in the early universe - *if larger: quantum mechanics, gravity, and relativity could not coexist; thus, life would be impossible if smaller: same result.*

29. number of effective dimensions in the present universe - *if smaller: electron, planet, and star orbits would become unstable if larger: same result.*

30. mass of the neutrino - *if smaller: galaxy clusters, galaxies, and stars would not form if larger: galaxy clusters and galaxies would be too dense.*

31. big bang ripples - *if smaller: galaxies would not form; universe would expand too rapidly if larger: galaxies/galaxy clusters would be too dense for life; black holes would dominate; universe would collapse before life-site could form.*

32. size of the relativistic dilation factor - *if smaller: certain life-essential chemical reactions will not function properly if larger: same result.*

33. uncertainty magnitude in the Heisenberg uncertainty principle - *if smaller: oxygen transport to body cells would be too small and certain life-essential elements would be unstable if larger: oxygen transport to body cells would be too great and certain life-essential elements would be unstable.*

Quotes from Scientists Regarding Intelligent Design of the Universe

Fred Hoyle (British astrophysicist): *"A common sense interpretation of the facts suggests that a super-intellect has monkeyed with physics, as well as with chemistry and biology, and that there are no blind forces worth speaking about in nature. The numbers one calculates from the facts seem to me so overwhelming as to put this conclusion almost beyond question."*

George Ellis (British astrophysicist): "Amazing fine tuning occurs in the laws that make this [complexity] possible. Realization of the complexity of what is accomplished makes it very difficult not to use the word 'miraculous' without taking a stand as to the ontological status of the word."

Paul Davies (British astrophysicist): "There is for me powerful evidence that there is something going on behind it all... It seems as though somebody has fine-tuned nature's numbers to make the Universe... The impression of design is overwhelming".

Paul Davies: "The laws [of physics] ... seem to be the product of exceedingly ingenious design... The universe must have a purpose".

Alan Sandage (winner of the Crawford prize in astronomy): "I find it quite improbable that such order came out of chaos. There has to be some organizing principle. God to me is a mystery but is the explanation for the miracle of existence, why there is something instead of nothing."

John O'Keefe (astronomer at NASA): "We are, by astronomical standards, a pampered, cosseted, cherished group of creatures... If the Universe had not been made with the most exacting precision we could never have come into existence. It is my view that these circumstances indicate the universe was created for man to live in."

George Greenstein (astronomer): "As we survey all the evidence, the thought insistently arises that some supernatural agency - or, rather, Agency - must be involved. Is it possible that suddenly, without intending to, we have stumbled upon scientific proof of the existence of a Supreme Being? Was it God who stepped in and so providentially crafted the cosmos for our benefit?"

Arthur Eddington (astrophysicist): "The idea of a universal mind or Logos would be, I think, a fairly plausible inference from the present state of scientific theory."

Arno Penzias (Nobel prize in physics): "Astronomy leads us to a unique event, a universe which was created out of nothing, one with the very delicate balance needed to provide exactly the conditions required to permit life, and one which has an underlying (one might say 'supernatural') plan."

Roger Penrose (mathematician and author): "I would say the universe has a purpose. It's not there just somehow by chance."

Tony Rothman (physicist): *"When confronted with the order and beauty of the universe and the strange coincidences of nature, it's very tempting to take the leap of faith from science into religion. I am sure many physicists want to. I only wish they would admit it."*

Vera Kistiakowsky (MIT physicist): *"The exquisite order displayed by our scientific understanding of the physical world calls for the divine."*

Robert Jastrow (self-proclaimed agnostic): *"For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries."*

Stephen Hawking (British astrophysicist): *"Then we shall be able to take part in the discussion of the question of why it is that we and the universe exist. If we find the answer to that, it would be the ultimate triumph of human reason - for then we would know the mind of God."*

Frank Tipler (Professor of Mathematical Physics): *"When I began my career as a cosmologist some twenty years ago, I was a convinced atheist. I never in my wildest dreams imagined that one day I would be writing a book purporting to show that the central claims of Judeo-Christian theology are in fact true, that these claims are straightforward deductions of the laws of physics as we now understand them. I have been forced into these conclusions by the inexorable logic of my own special branch of physics." Note: Tipler since has actually converted to Christianity, hence his latest book, *The Physics of Christianity*.*

Alexander Polyakov (Soviet mathematician): *"We know that nature is described by the best of all possible mathematics because God created it."*

Ed Harrison (cosmologist): *"Here is the cosmological proof of the existence of God the design argument of Paley updated and refurbished. The fine tuning of the universe provides prima facie evidence of deistic design. Take your choice: blind chance that requires multitudes of universes or design that requires only one.... Many scientists, when they admit their views, incline toward the teleological or design argument."*

Edward Milne (British cosmologist): *"As to the cause of the Universe, in context of expansion, that is left for the reader to insert, but our picture is incomplete without Him [God]."*

Barry Parker (cosmologist): *"Who created these laws? There is no question but that a God will always be needed."*

Drs. Zehavi, and Dekel (cosmologists): *"This type of universe, however, seems to require a degree of fine tuning of the initial conditions that is in apparent conflict with 'common wisdom'."*

Arthur L. Schawlow (Professor of Physics at Stanford University, 1981 Nobel Prize in physics): *"It seems to me that when confronted with the marvels of life and the universe, one must ask why and not just how. The only possible answers are religious. . . I find a need for God in the universe and in my own life."*

Henry "Fritz" Schaefer (Graham Perdue Professor of Chemistry and director of the Center for Computational Quantum Chemistry at the University of Georgia): *"The significance and joy in my science comes in those occasional moments of discovering something new and saying to myself, 'So that's how God did it.' My goal is to understand a little corner of God's plan."*

Wernher von Braun (Pioneer rocket engineer) *"I find it as difficult to understand a scientist who does not acknowledge the presence of a superior rationality behind the existence of the universe as it is to comprehend a theologian who would deny the advances of science."*

Antony Flew (Professor of Philosophy, former atheist, author, and debater) *"It now seems to me that the findings of more than fifty years of Deoxyribonucleic acid: the chemical inside the nucleus of a cell that carries the genetic instructions for making living organisms. DNA research have provided materials for a new and enormously powerful argument to design."*

Frank Tipler (Professor of Mathematical Physics): *"From the perspective of the latest physical theories, Christianity is not a mere religion, but an experimentally testable science."*