Cse Seminar 7(2003) Questions and Answers

by Kent Hovind

Kent Hovind's seminar addresses the conflict between creationism and evolution, emphasizing the importance of understanding and defending biblical truths in the face of opposition.

Duration: 2:28:52
Scripture: Genesis 1:1, Psalm 14:1, Proverbs 3:5-6, Romans 1:22, 1 Corinthians 1:20, Colossians 2:8, 1 Timothy 6:20
Topics: "Creation Science", "Evolution Debate"

Description

This sermon by Kent Hovind delves into the topics of creation, evolution, and dinosaurs, emphasizing the belief that the Bible is scientifically accurate and evolution is a flawed religion. The seminar includes a question and answer session where various scientific and philosophical perspectives on evolution are discussed, challenging the conventional narrative taught in schools. The speaker highlights the views of renowned scientists and philosophers who question the validity of evolution as a scientific theory, presenting evidence that challenges mainstream scientific beliefs.

Transcript

Thank you for joining us. My name is Kent Hovind. I taught high school science for 15 years, and this is going to be seminar part seven, question answer time.

If you've gotten this far, hopefully you've seen the first six, because we'll be covering new information. I taught science 15 years, and I cover information on the subject of creation, evolution, and dinosaurs. I take the position that the Bible is literally true, scientifically accurate in all details, and the evolution theory being taught in our schools is the dumbest and most dangerous religion in the history of planet Earth.

We're going to be covering a wide variety of questions that I get during my Q&A time. Everywhere I go, I try to teach for an hour or so, and then have question answer time. And I've heard most of the questions that come up in the last 17 years that I've been doing this.

We'll be covering a wide range of things, like how do we see stars billions of light years away? Have there any fresh dinosaur bones been found, not even fossilized yet? Why are there so few human bones found? What about the Bible codes? Why do you use the King James Version? Are there contradictions in the Bible? What about other religions? Could they be right? What about global warming? Where do the races come from? A whole bunch of stuff we're going to be covering as quickly as we can. There is much more information about all of these topics on our college class. We taught college classes, CSE 101, the 100

series.

101, 2, 3, and 4, you can take those, and where we have time to go into a lot more detail. And then the 200 series is even more depth than that. So if you don't get enough information, or if I don't answer one of your questions, you can call into our daily radio program.

Every day, 4.30 to 6.00, currently, we may change the time someday, but currently, 4.30 to 6.00, central time, Monday through Friday, when I'm not traveling, I'm live on the internet, drdino.com or truthradio.com. And you can take our college classes and ask questions there. We cover just a whole lot more material. All of the slides that I use in my seminar, and it's close to 7,000 now, are available to download off my website, drdino.com. Or you can just order the DVDs or CDs of all of the slides.

And a lot of slides, you'll see, they've got a little asterisk near the end. That indicates there's something in the notes section of the slide. And there's a lot of things I have to skip just for sake of time, but hopefully we can answer some questions for you here.

The Bible says in Ecclesiastes, I applied mine heart to know and search and to seek out wisdom and the reason of things. I think it's wise for Christians, especially, to do that. Try to be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason.

And I think we can be more effective soul winners and more effective for God's kingdom if we knew more and could give an answer. That's the goal of all this of seminars that we produce is to equip people that can give an answer to know the truth. First Peter chapter three says, sanctify the Lord God in your hearts and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you the reason of the hope that's in you.

And we hope that this training you'll get here will give you the answers you need. First Timothy two says, study to show yourself approved unto God. We should study and learn, not just so we can give an answer to others, but so God is pleased with us.

That's the goal of study. God, are you happy? One of the questions I often get as I speak at universities is, hey, Hovind, are you the only one that believes in creation? Don't all scientists believe in evolution? Absolutely not. I don't know how that question even comes up.

Not all scientists do not believe in evolution, number one. Okay, thousands and thousands and thousands of them are creation scientists. For instance, Dr. Russell Humphreys worked for years at the Sandia National Laboratories.

There's a good article about him on the Answers in Genesis website. They've got a whole list of 180 some or 200 scientists today who are young earth Bible believing six day creationists. Dr. Humphreys said, using a simple statistical approach, I would conservatively estimate that in the United States alone, there are around 10,000 practicing professional scientists who openly believe in six day recent creation.

So first it's not true that all scientists believe in evolution. Secondly, even if they did, that's not how you establish truth. It doesn't matter what the majority believe.

The majority has a long history of being wrong, okay? They used to teach, you know, all the planets go around the earth. The majority was wrong, okay? Though believe it or not, there still are some scientists who are geocentrists who teach the earth is in the center and everything goes around the earth. And there's, I've got the books in the library.

You can read those if you wanna take that. I've looked at the subject. I just, I can't buy it yet.

I think they're wrong. I think the sun is in the center. There are the time when they used to teach that big rocks fall faster than little rocks.

That was taught for 2000 years. And it's wrong. So the majority can be wrong.

They used to teach the doctrine of humors. You know, if you're sick, you have bad blood. Take out your blood and you get better.

That's how George Washington died. They were wrong. And in that case, they were dead wrong, okay? In John chapter seven, many of the people, therefore, when they heard this said, of a truth, this is the prophet.

Others said, this is the Christ. But some said, shall Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the scripture said that Christ cometh of the seed of David out of the house town of Bethlehem? Notice what happened here in John chapter seven. The people were arguing about, was Jesus really the Christ? And some of them said, wait, wait, wait.

Christ doesn't come out of Galilee and Jesus came from Galilee. The problem is they had a misconception. They thought Jesus came from Galilee.

Where was Jesus actually born? Bethlehem. So they had the whole wrong problem. They're arguing about the wrong subject.

So in John 3, 43, it says, so there was a division among the people because of him. And some of them would have taken him. They would have tried to kill the messenger because they had a wrong impression.

They're going after this. We got to shut this guy up. This Jesus is out there preaching.

We got to shut him up. They got the wrong impression to start with. And that's what happens.

People get the wrong idea. They think creationists like me are doing damage to education system. No, we're the right people.

We're trying to fix the problem, okay? We're trying to resolve it. Verse 45 says, then came the officers, the chief priests and Pharisees. And they said unto him, why have you not brought him? Now this is classic.

Notice the chief priests sent their hoodlums to go get Jesus. Jesus answered their questions. They came back and said, wow, never man spake like this man.

And then the Pharisees said, well, you should have asked him this. I get this every time, including three days ago in Michigan at the university up there. There's always some professor that says, they advertise that Hovind's coming to the university to speak, Northern Michigan University.

Or the week before it was in Wisconsin, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A hundred professors in Milwaukee refused to debate me. 80 professors at Northern Michigan University refused to debate me.

I've had close to 4,000 now, professors that have refused to debate on the subject. And they don't even come when I speak. They send their students and say, here, ask him this, ask him this, ask him this.

The student comes back and says, teacher, he answered all my questions. And then the teacher says, you idiot. You should have asked him this and this and this.

Well, teacher, you coward. Why didn't you come, okay? Why didn't you ask the question? And professors do the same thing, just like the Pharisees did. The professors send their students to try to trap the creation, as they won't come themselves, okay? And then when that doesn't work, they try to use the law to silence them.

Let's just pass a law that says you can't teach creation. Or if anybody does try to teach creation, we're gonna get them fired, send them out of here. Then verse 47, then answered them the Pharisees, are ye also deceived? Hovind translation, are you stupid? Has this guy deceived you? This is the classic one they always use.

Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? Translation, none of the other scientists believe this creation stuff, therefore evolution must be true. Now think about that logic. The majority believes this, therefore it's true.

I mean, that's silly. First place, it's not true the majority believe it. Secondly, that's not how you tell.

And then they said, but this people who knoweth not the law are cursed. Hovind translation, we have knowledge, you don't. We have a degree, you don't.

We don't approve of your degrees from a non-accredited Christian school, therefore we're smart, you're dumb. That's a common tactic used by the professors today. And the 99 professors I've debated, it happens all the time.

And in one of the guys, Nicodemus very wisely said, doth our law judge any man before it hearing? Nicodemus at least had the common sense to say, hey, before we judge this guy, Jesus, and say he's wrong, he's stupid, et cetera, let's listen to what he's saying. And I would encourage college students and professors and anybody, listen to the creation side. Just listen, really honestly listen and hear it, and then make your decision.

When I spoke in Soviet Union a couple of years ago, I was at a university over there in, I don't know, Pavel, if you remember what city I was in, it's in Ukraine, your home state. But one of the cities had a university, they shut down the university and sent 30 professors to have me speak for two hours, because on creation. I was a big celebrity, Dr. Hovind from all the way from Florida.

The further I travel, the more famous I am. When I'm right here in town, it's not famous at all, they shut down the university and 30 professors came. After about an hour of speaking on creation, one of the professors was crying.

And I asked the translator, this girl named Olga, I said, what's he crying about? And she said, he's never heard the creation story. He didn't know there was one. And I think there's a lot of people in America, a lot of students that I see in America have never really honestly heard the creation story.

So if somebody says, everybody else believes in evolution, therefore you should too, number one, that's not a good argument, and it's not true, okay? And listen to the creation side, understand it. Because when I get done talking a lot of times, like in the airplane, I sat by somebody who believed in evolution just last week. I said, well, let me just explain the creation side.

Took three minutes, explain the creation view very simply. And they said, wow, that makes a lot of sense. Well, yeah, just listen, okay, to what they got to say.

Okay, they started with the false assumption that Jesus was from Galilee. He wasn't, okay, he was actually born in Bethlehem. Some of the Pharisees had not believed him, so therefore that's proof that he's not right.

You get the same thing today. Some scientists don't believe in creation, therefore creation's not true. That is absolutely stupid logic, okay? And they'll say, has he published in science journals? As if, well, you don't see creation articles in National Geographic, therefore that proves it's not right.

Well, you didn't see many capitalist articles in communist journals 10 years ago either, by the way. It doesn't prove anything's right or wrong. The majority can be wrong.

The majority followed Aaron into rebellion. The majority voted not to go into the promised land in Numbers chapter 32. The majority followed false gods many times in the Old Testament.

The majority of the leaders hated Jesus. The majority of the world hates Christians. The majority voted in Bill Clinton twice, for heaven's sake.

I mean, the majority can be wrong, all right, can be dead wrong. But it's not true that all scientists believe in creation. There's a book here by Robert Gentry.

Robert Gentry is a good friend of mine from Tennessee. He is a very famous scientist who did work on the disposal of radioactive waste, nuclear waste. What do you do with this waste product? He would do research on the granites around the world.

He discovered that as you look at granites under a microscope, you find they got little tiny halos in them, radio polonium halos. We'll get into more of that later. But as soon as they found out that his research was proving evolution is not true, because he really proves the earth was never a hot molten mass.

He never mentioned creation, never mentioned God, just purely scientific research. They published him in all the major journals until somebody said, wow, guys, Gentry's work is proving the Big Bang Theory wrong. They took away his funding and shut him off like a spigot.

They persecuted somebody just because his work was not supporting the sacred cow, i.e. evolution. Roger DeHart was a science teacher at Burlington Edson High School near Seattle. He was told, they brought him into the office and said, you cannot tell your students about errors in the textbooks.

All he was doing was bringing in current science journals. Here's a textbook that says the baby has gill slits like we covered on video four. DeHart would bring in a science journal, says, guys, I'm sorry, it says in the textbook on page 220 that the baby has gills.

That's not true. Here's a current science journal. See, here's the evidence.

He never mentioned God, never mentioned the Bible, never mentioned creation. He just said this textbook's not accurate. And they told him he couldn't do that.

You can't inform your students that the book is out of date. That's the kind of persecution Christians get, or anybody gets when they try to go against this evolution theory. Evolution is a carefully protected state

religion.

Just like communism was a carefully protected state religion when you grew up over there. You don't dare question it. Kevin Haley was a biology teacher in Oregon.

He lost his job simply because he exposed errors in the textbooks. He told him, hey, this book's not right. There's a mistake here.

He said, you're fired. Can't teach if you say there's errors in our books. Baylor University in Waco, Texas, fired William Dembski in April 2000 simply because he told his students there might be an intelligent designer.

He said, oh, you're not allowed to say that. So they fired him. This is Baylor, what used to be a Christian college.

Forrest Mims was a science writer for years. He wrote for many major journals, National Geographic, Science Digest, American Journal of Physics. He wrote for all kinds of articles for magazines.

But then when he applied for a job at Scientific American, he was denied. They said, you can't work here because you are a creationist. Even though what he was writing on has nothing whatsoever to do with the subject of creation or evolution.

They said, we don't want you on our staff because it would look bad if we hired a creationist. That's the type of persecution you get. Rob LeVake was told, he told his students, I kind of doubt this Darwin theory's true.

So they took him away from teaching biology and gave him another job. They said, we don't want you teaching biology because you might make our students doubt Darwin's theory. That's how it's protected.

It's a religion. There's a teacher in Indiana, Dan Clark. His principal called him in, Ed Eller, the superintendent, and said he could not introduce creation to his class.

Now there's no law against teaching creation at all. There are no court cases that says you can't teach creation. They just said you can't be mandatory.

But teachers always have the right to teach creation. But here's the problem. The law says you can teach it, the court says you can teach it, but your boss now says you can't.

So he quit his job finally over that. He stood firm and said, look, I'm not gonna bow to this one. He quit his job.

Dean Kenyon wrote the book, Pandas and People. He was a science teacher at San Francisco State University. He wrote this book and says, it's a biology textbook basically, a science textbook, that says, hey, you know, there must have been some kind of designer.

This is so complicated, this is amazing. There must have been a designer. It doesn't try to get him saved or converted to be a Baptist or a Buddhist or a Catholic.

It just says, look, there must be a designer. He was a tenured biology professor, San Francisco State University. He had written all kinds of books about evolution when he believed in it.

Then he got converted and said, you know, I really doubt that theory is true. It just doesn't work. And so they fired him, but he was tenured.

So he sued them and got his job back and they put him in as a lab assistant, washing test tubes, stuff that, you know, the students do. They had to sue him again to get his real job back, just because he said, I think there might be a creator to this universe. That's the type of persecution you get.

When I spoke in Lubbock, Texas several years ago, they had a professor there named Dr. Dini, D-I-N-I, who teaches biology. He told his students, if you don't believe in evolution, don't come ask me for a recommendation to go off to medical school, because I won't give you one. He said, it was on his website for years.

He said, if you don't believe in evolution, you'll never get a recommendation from me. Well, when I went to speak there in Lubbock, Texas, the students offered Dr. Dini $1,000 if he would debate me for two hours, and he refused. 1,000 bucks for two hours, that's pretty good money, Leah.

Why'd you like to make $1,000 for two hours? I mean, he said, no, he won't do it. This persecution that happens against Christians and against creationists in the secular school system is mind-boggling. What are they afraid of? So I say, well, it's not true that all scientists believe in creation, but many scientists that do believe in creation are afraid to say anything, because they know the kind of persecution you're gonna get.

How many teachers were there in Ukraine that did not believe in communism but didn't dare say anything about it? Anybody even, if you don't even smile right at Stalin, he'd kill you, you'd end up in the gulag someplace. That's the kind of things happen in America, believe it or not. If a person doesn't support the evolution theory vocally and actively, they'll be banished to academic Siberia.

They lose their grant money, they will lose their job. That's sad. And Patrick Henry College was told back in November of 2002, I believe, that they weren't gonna get accreditation because they didn't teach enough evolution in their college.

There's an article in Agape Press here, a university professor said she was asked to resign for introducing elite students to flaws in Darwinian thought at the Mississippi University for Women. I spoke just north of there a few weeks after this happened. I talked to some of the people involved.

This lady was told she had to resign her job because her teaching might make students doubt Darwinism. What are they going to school for, an education or indoctrination? Yeah, you're going to get an education, I thought. And it used to be that way, but it's just not anymore.

It's pretty sad. And this lady said that this professor that wanted to fire her hadn't even heard her speech. But she was raising doubts about Darwinism.

All kinds of scientists down through history, I mean, like thousands of them, all the branches of science were started by creationists. There's a list, there's a good list on Answers in Genesis. Just go to answersingenesis.org website and type in scientists who believe creation.

And it'll bring up all kinds of articles and you can read about all these scientists down through history who have been creationists, very famous scientists. I've often asked evolutionists, I say, guys, can you name me one advancement in modern science we've had because of the evolution theory? Is that why we have

computers? Is that why we have telephones, radios? Is that why we went to the moon? What advancements can get named because of this evolution theory? They've never given an answer. There is nothing, the theory is useless.

But all major science, all the whole branches of science in the last 400 years were started by creationists. Now they weren't all young earth creationists like me and they certainly weren't all independent, temperamental, fundamental, right-wing, radical Baptists like me. But they were creationists.

Wernher von Braun, the head of our space program was a creationist. A.E. Wildersmith, William Ramsey, the Wright brothers, they studied birds. They said, we wanna see how the designer, the creator, how God made the birds and we'll learn how to make an airplane by studying airplanes.

The guy who invented the MRI, Magnetic Resonance Imaging Machine, is a young earth creationist. There are creationists today. There are a couple of good books we have in our library or for sale on our website.

In Six Days is one and On the Seventh Day. This is 50 scientists who believe in creation. Here's 40 more scientists who believe in creation.

You can get these. There are thousands of scientists who do believe in creation, do not believe in evolution. Karl Popper, a famous leading philosopher of science, he said, evolution is not a fact.

Evolution doesn't even qualify as a theory or hypothesis. It's a metaphysical research program. It's not really testable science.

Evolution is a religion. And they get so angry when I tell them that, which is probably why I tell them that every few minutes because I enjoy pushing the right buttons. Julian Huxley, his grandfather, Thomas Huxley, was the guy who really pushed Darwin when Darwin's book came out.

Julian Huxley said, I suppose the reason we leapt at origin of species was the idea of God interfered with our sexual mores. We don't want God telling us what to do. That's why they've accepted evolution.

Michael Ruse said, evolution is promulgated, promoted by its practitioners as more than a mere science. Evolution is promulgated as an ideology of secular religion, a full-fledged alternative to Christianity with meaning and morality. He said, I am an ardent evolutionist and an ex-Christian.

But I must admit that in this one complaint and Mr. Gish is one of many to make it, the literalists are right. Evolution is a religion. This was true of evolution in the beginning and it's true of evolution still today.

Evolution is a religion in every sense of the word. Evolution is a fairy tale for grownups. The theory has helped nothing in the progress of science.

It's useless. So it's not true, they all believe it. Nearly all branches of science were started by creationists.

Evolution theories added nothing to science. When students or professors fear expressing their real honest thoughts, they're not getting educated, they're getting indoctrinated. Students get flunked for not supporting the evolution theory.

Every week when I go out and speak, somebody will come to me and say, when I was in biology class, I wrote a paper and the teacher gave me an F because it didn't support evolution or because I dared to go

against the evolution theory. I get calls like that. Diane, you take some of the calls and transfer them over to me.

Students saying, hey, what do I do? My teacher gave me an F because my paper went against evolution. It's sad. I mean, it's discrimination.

All the advancements in modern technology have nothing to do with evolution. Evolution is a hindrance to science, not a help at all. Okay, next question.

What about separation of church and state? Well, there's no such phrase in the Constitution. You can get the entire Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence for $1. This little book, Citizen's Rule book, excellent book.

Everybody ought to read this one. It's got a great story in here about the jurors. It's amazing the power that jurors have.

One juror can decide he doesn't like the law. And if a person's, if they pass a law in your city that says, you know, you can't spit on the sidewalk and somebody spits on the sidewalk and they videotape him, they got the whole thing, he broke the law. I mean, take him to court, it's proven he broke the law.

But you as a juror say, I don't like that law. I don't think it's fair to say you can't spit on the sidewalk. The judge is gonna threaten all the jurors and say, no, you have to rule according to the law.

You gotta listen to my instruction. You don't have to listen to anything that judge says. He's blowing smoke, okay? Smile, nod your head.

When you get in that jury room, you vote not guilty. And the rest of the jurors are gonna think you're nuts. What do you mean not guilty? You saw the tape, you saw, yes, I know.

But the law's no good. Jury nullification, powerful, powerful story here. Anyway, the Constitution does not mention separation of church and state.

You should get the Federalist Papers. Those are all the papers that the founding fathers wrote as they were developing this Constitution. And you can see their thinking process.

The same day they voted for the First Amendment, which people often say separation of church and state, which is not what it says. It says the government shall not make a religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof. But that same day, Congress voted to send $25,000 to help a Catholic missionary start a mission to help the Indians in St. Louis.

They were not trying to separate church from state. They wanted to keep the state out of the church but not keep the church out of the government. No phrase in the Constitution about separation of church and state.

And it's perfectly fine for Christian teachers to do all kinds of Christian things in their school. My brother taught 34 years public school, had a picture of Jesus right by his desk all 34 years. Many teachers keep a Bible right on their desk.

Now, if they give you a hard time, the principal might say you can't do that. I'm not saying you won't get persecution. But as far as legally, you can.

There's lc.org, libertycouncil.org, Matt Staver's organization. He handles cases like that. David Gibbs, they do stuff like that.

David Gibbs, it's his organization, Orlando, Florida. So yes, if you have trouble, see one of those folks. But what happened? Thomas Jefferson wrote a letter to some Baptist pastors.

And he's the one that mentioned the phrase in the letter, separation of church and state. And now the atheists are using that to say, oh, you can't have Christian things in government. What a dumb idea.

Our country was founded to be a Christian country. They all said that. Go to wallbuilders.com, David Barton's great website.

He's got lots of stuff on, there's no such thing as separation of church and state. So don't fall for that. And we can cover more on that in our college class.

Here's what's happened though. The Constitution of the United States, Article I, Section 10 says, you have the right to make a contract. Let's suppose Adam says, Brother Hovind, I'm gonna pay you $10 an hour the rest of my life.

Okay, and he signs a contract. And then he does not fulfill the contract. Well, then I can sue him.

And he could say, I've got a constitutional right to keep my money. Yes, you do. But you also have a constitutional right to make a contract and you made a contract.

So the judge is just gonna uphold contract law. Okay, a question that I very frequently get asked, I would say every single week I go speak, which is 52 weeks a year now for 16 years. Every single week, somebody will say, now, Hovind, how do we see stars billions of light years away? You say the earth is only 6,000 years old.

How do we see the stars? Yesterday on the radio program on the website, Dr. Dino, some guy called in and said, now, Hovind, I did some studies and in a 6,000 year light year radius, we'd only have so many cubic miles and all the stars wouldn't fit. I said, wait, wait, wait. Who said anything about a 6,000 mile radius? He said, well, you're the one that said the universe is only 6,000 years old.

Yes, I did. But I did not say all the stars are within a 6,000 light year radius. Never said that, that would be ludicrous.

But how do we see the stars billions of light years away if the universe is only 6,000 years old? And I believe the Bible clearly teaches it's only 6,000 years old and God made everything. Actually, he made the earth first in Genesis one and then verse 14, he made the stars also. Evolution says he made the stars evolve first and then the earth.

Well, there's certainly a lot of stars out there. Nehemiah chapter nine says, thou, even thou art Lord alone. Thou has made the heaven, the heaven of heavens.

God is claiming that he made them. So either he did or he didn't. But what about the stars? How do they fit in? Astronomers can see a star blow up about every 30 years.

It's not like it's on a timetable. It might be every five years, it might be every 50 years, but on an average, every 30 years, a star explodes. And they're looking out there with their telescope and say, oh, wow,

there's a new one, a star exploded.

It's called a nova. Or if it's a big one, they call it a supernova. Nova in Spanish means no go.

By the way, the Chevy Nova did not sell very well in Mexico for that reason. Hey, do you wanna buy a nova? No, why would I do that? It won't go. But stars blow up every 30 years.

Well, they've searched the heavens with these telescopes looking for how many supernova rings are there. They call it a dead star. They can find less than 300.

Now, wait a minute. If there are less than 300 supernova rings and one happens every 30 years, you can do the math. I mean, that's about 9,000 years.

If the universe is billions of years old, there ought to be a whole lot more supernova rings out there. Why are there less than 300 supernova rings? Because it's less than 10,000 years old? Boy, they don't like that answer at all. But that's the logical conclusion.

Anyway, if stars are blowing up every 30 years, we would have to have at least one star born every 30 years just to keep the balance. I mean, countries that have a population problem because they're getting less births and deaths, you know, like Germany, more people are dying than being born. Oh, well, eventually that's gonna create a problem, okay? Stars should have to be born.

Nobody's ever seen one star form, not one. We see them blow up all the time. They've never seen a star form, and I'll cover that in a second.

It's last estimate by Hubble Telescope was that there are 76 trillion stars. 76 trillion. They say the universe is 20 billion years old, but you can do the math.

That means 6 1⁄2 million stars would have to form every minute. We'd have to have 6 1⁄2 million stars forming every minute for 20 billion years to make the stars that we know about. That doesn't count the ones we don't know about because we can't see them yet.

Who knows how many stars are out there? Sometimes the textbooks will say, well, there are new stars being constantly born in clouds of gas and dust. This is so stupid. How a physics textbook can teach this, I don't know.

Anybody that knows freshman physics knows when you try to squeeze gases together, it pressure builds up, temperature builds up, and it drives them back apart. It's called Boyle's gas law. Nobody has ever seen dust collapsing into a solid.

It would take such incredible pressure to do that. I was in a debate one time, and this professor, I asked him, I said, how can you get dust to collapse into a solid? Explain that to me. He said, well, we calculated that if 20 stars explode near each other, it'll produce enough pressure to make a brand new star.

I said, no, that's brilliant. You gotta lose 20 to gain one. I said, you ought to run for Congress.

You could help those guys borrow their way out of debt. It's not gonna get a universe full of stars if you gotta lose 20 to gain one. And even that is only theoretical.

It's never been observed. I was in Alamogordo, New Mexico, and they've got a science center down there, and they showed these pictures of star babies. They said, oh, this is a new star forming.

No, sir, it's a bright spot. One guy in Science Magazine admitted, the silent embarrassment of modern astrophysics is we do not know how even a single one of these stars manage to form. Nobody knows how stars can form from dust clouds.

No one has unambiguously observed material falling into an embryonic star, which should be happening if the star is truly still forming. And no one has caught a molecular cloud in the act of collapsing. Precisely how a section of interstellar cloud collapses gravitationally into a star, a double or multiple star, or a solar system, is still a challenging theoretical problem.

Astronomers have yet to find an interstellar cloud in the actual process of collapse. The origin of stars represents one of the most fundamental unsolved problems of contemporary physics. This guy said, no one really understands how star formation proceeds.

It's really remarkable. Nobody knows how this happens. So if they tell you new stars are forming, you tell them, Kent Hovind said, they're confused or they're lying.

Because nobody knows how it happens. There's not even a good theory how you can squeeze dust into a star, and there's certainly no evidence. But here's what happened.

They see bright spots appear in the clouds. Not in the clouds, in the dust clouds in space. They look at this crab nebula or eagle nebula, and they're staring at it, and all of a sudden one day a spot gets a little brighter.

Oh wow, a star's being born. That's immediately their conclusion, that a star's being born. They say, wait, wait, wait.

Maybe the dust in front of it is clearing and the star was already there. Maybe it's a star blowing up. Maybe it's another supernova.

Because that's what happens when stars supernova, they get really bright. They don't know that a star is forming. So don't let them tell you that we've seen stars form.

Nobody has seen such a thing. All we do is we see them blow up, which is the opposite of what evolutionists need. Oh, the Bible says in Genesis chapter one, let them be for signs and seasons and for days and years.

And he made the stars also. Here God is claiming he made the stars. And it says in Psalm, he counts the number of the stars.

Not only how many there are total, but each one has its own number. So God will say, oh, this is star number 42 trillion, you know, 718 billion. He knows the number of each one.

And says, praise him, he waters that be above the heavens in Psalm 148. This is the only verse that says anything like this. Waters that be above the heavens.

Now in Genesis one, it talks about verse six and seven, water that be above the heavens. I believe when God first made the world, it was very, very different than what we see. Mostly land instead of the huge

oceans that we now have.

Most of that water was in the crust of the earth. We cover that in video two. But there was earth and there was heaven singular.

King James is the only Bible I'm aware of that gets it right in Genesis one, one, where it says in the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth. All the rest of them say heavens. Okay, that's a mistake.

There was heaven, which means expanded place. There was earth and then from here on out. Then he divides it up into three slices.

First heaven, second heaven, third heaven. The first heaven is where the birds fly. Genesis one talks about that.

Verse 20 and 21. Then there was water above the firmament. Now some creationists do not believe in the canopy theory.

I understand. I've read their stuff. I think they're wrong.

I still believe even, and some accuse me, well, you know, you don't agree with us. Therefore, you know, you're not a good creation scientist. You know, to keep up on your research.

I keep very much up on the research and I disagree. It's not that I haven't read it. It's that I have read it and disagree, okay? But I believe there was a layer of air for Adam to breathe, layer of water above to protect him, and then a layer of stars and then more water.

The only verse I have to back it up is right here. Psalm 148, praise him ye waters that be above the heavens. That's present tense.

Is there still water above the heavens? Psalm 104 says, who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters, who maketh the clouds his chariot, who walketh upon the wings of the wind. Could it be that there is another layer of water beyond all of outer space? Maybe everything that we see as this universe, which looks like huge, maybe everything we see is inside water, a crystal, and God is outside of that. The third heaven, 2 Corinthians chapter 12.

Could there be a third layer where God lives? Of course, God doesn't need a place to live. He just is, you know? Psalm 20, 29 says the voice of the Lord is upon the waters. The Lord is upon many waters.

Maybe everything that we see when we step out at night and say, wow, look at all these stars. Maybe the whole thing is a little snow globe on God's dresser, you know, that he picks up and shakes once in a while. How you doing in there? I don't know.

I like to think that way. But the Psalm 148, the waters that be above the heavens, you know, people have often asked, hey, where's the last star? And once we find it, what's on the other side? I don't know the answers to those, but just a possibility is that there, according to the Bible, may still be water above the heavens. But there's a lot of stars out there.

Hubble estimate was 11 trillion stars per person. That is 76 trillion divided by six billion people. Every one of you gets 70, it's 11 trillion stars.

What happened, they told the Hubble telescope to focus in on a dot. They found a dot above the Big Dipper. You can see the picture of it there.

It is about the size of a grain of sand held at arm's length, and it was black. They said, we don't think there's any stars there. Let's focus in on that spot and see what we can find.

They took pictures for 10 days straight, focusing in on that dot. After 10 days, there were more stars in that dot than they could count. These were brand new stars, never been seen before.

Called it Hubble Deep Field. Looking up there saying, man, that's stuff we didn't know about. Assumption would be that it's that way all through space.

Truly, the stars cannot be numbered, which is what the Bible says, they cannot be numbered. But how do you tell the distance to the stars, and how can the Earth be 6,000 years old, and the stars be so far away? Fair question. Stephen Hawking said, stars are so far away, they appear to be just pinpoints of light.

We cannot see their size or shape. How do we tell different types of stars apart? For the vast majority, there's only one thing we can see, and that is the color of their light. If you get the biggest telescope on Earth, this is not it, by the way, spotting scope.

But if you get the largest telescope on Earth, and look at the closest star, which is Alpha Centauri, four and a half light years away, all you're gonna see is a dot. If I focus this in on the sun, it'll start to get bigger and bigger, and you can actually see flames leaping off, and see the spicules, and you can see color changes, and you can actually see features of the sun. When you look at a star, you never get to see that.

Nobody has ever seen a star as far as any of the features of it. You get the biggest telescope on Earth, it's gonna be nothing but a dot in your scope. All you can tell is, I said, that's a red one, that's a yellow one, that's a blue one, that's all you can see.

So anything we do, we have to do based on assumptions, just from the color. But how do you tell the distance to the star? Well, I taught high school trig for years, and if you guys had trig, you know how it works. If you have two observation points, you can calculate the third distance.

You have to know it, it's solving a triangle. Trigonometry deals with triangles, so you sine, cosine, tangent. If you know one distance and two angles, or two distances and one angle, you can calculate the rest of the triangle, using sine, cosine, tangent.

Here's the problem. Earth is only 8,000 miles in diameter, which, compared to star distances, is zero, it's nothing. So if I'm looking at a star, and somebody over in China's looking at a star, we are 8,000 miles away from each other, straight line through the Earth.

That would be nothing. What they've done to enlarge the distance to look at a star, instead of just being opposite sides of the Earth, the Earth is also going around the Sun in this great big huge circle. We're going 66,000 miles an hour, and it takes us a year to go around.

Great big racetrack. Well, the distance from the Earth to the Sun is about 93 million miles, average. And that's a lot, but at the speed of light, it's not much.

At the speed of light, it's eight minutes away. It takes the sunlight eight minutes to get to the Earth. So if we're eight light minutes from the Sun, the diameter of our orbit going around is 16 light minutes.

So what we're gonna do is we're gonna look at a star in January, and then we're gonna look at a star in June, and we have now gone halfway around this monster circle. And we're gonna get two observation points to try to enlarge the base of our triangle. And it sounds huge.

Man, that's 186 million miles. Well, it's still not much. A year has 525,000 minutes in a year.

If this picture here, showing the little yellow dot, was the scale, if that yellow dot represented Earth's orbit, not the Earth's diameter, the orbit of the Earth, it's way too big for the picture. What we're gonna do is try to get to show you the math involved here. If I had two surveyors setting up with their transits or telescopes, and they are 16 inches away from each other, and they're both looking at a dot 525,000 inches away, which is eight and a third miles, would you agree that would make a rather skinny triangle? Let's go out in the parking lot and draw a triangle with point A and point B 16 inches apart, and point C eight and a third miles away.

It's gonna make a real skinny triangle. That is exactly the triangle you get when two people on opposite sides of Earth's orbit try to measure one light year. One.

Now, and I'm not sure you can tell exactly where you were six months ago. I think that would be a little stretch of the imagination to say, oh yeah, six months ago in January we were, where were we? I'll give them that. I won't even argue that.

I just would bring that up for appeal, Your Honor, in case we need to. You can't know exactly where you were six months ago. But the angle you get with that is 0.017 degrees.

Now, let's imagine this. I want you to get two guys to set up their surveying transits. They're 16 inches apart, and I'm gonna go put a dot eight and a third miles away, but they don't know how far away it is.

They're both focusing in on the dot, and they see this dot out there. Here's the only information they have, the measurement between themselves, 16 inches, and the angle out of parallel. I say, guys, I want you to calculate how far away that dot is based on that little angle change you get.

I think that would be difficult to measure. One light year. You'd certainly be, there'd be some guesswork involved, okay? Now, if you wanna measure 100 light years, you got a much worse problem.

Now you gotta move your dot 830 miles away. If we had two guys on the roof of this building here in Pensacola, Florida, 16 inches apart, and they're both focusing on a dot in Chicago, which is 830 miles away, but they don't know how far away it is. They're going to tell me how far away it is based only on their angle of the telescope out of parallel.

I would say that's impossible, impossible. To measure 15 billion, no question, that's impossible. I don't think you can measure 100 light years, not with real numbers, not with real measurements, but this textbook says they can measure, parallax trigonometry can measure up to 100 light years.

Okay, I doubt it, but I'll give them 100. I'll give them 1,000 if they quit crying, okay? The fact is you can't measure a billion, simple fact. So here's some things to consider about starlight.

They said in 2004 that the new SIM technology, Space Interferometry Mission, they hope to get where they can improve the distance of measuring to stars. And they say this accuracy will enable SIM to determine stellar distances to 10% accuracy out to a distance of 482,000 million, million miles. That's

82,000 light years.

And then it says, this is an improvement of several hundred times over what is possible today. Well now, wait a minute. If they're going to improve it several hundred times and it ends up being 82,000, what's 82,000 divided by several hundred comes out to be several hundred.

Apparently they're admitting they can only measure several hundred light years, which I would agree. I mean, I would say that's even a stretch, but I'll give them several hundred. They can't measure billions is the point.

So when your students in school get taught, oh, that star is, you know, 14.629 billion light years away. So I don't believe you. I don't believe you at all.

It might be, but you can't prove that. They're making up a story. With SIM technology, they hope to finally be able to get out to where they can measure most of the way across our galaxy and we're in it.

We can't even measure across our own galaxy, let alone these distances to other galaxies. So I think we should look at the stars and say, wow, what a mighty God we serve. Instead of going out there and say, well, we know how far that way, we know what evolved.

I mean, it's just that egotistical attitude. Some of these atheists get, makes you want to slap them in the face. Like, man, why don't you serve God? Look what he made, you know.

Here's the things to consider concerning starlight. Then we'll take a break. Number one, we cannot measure these great distances.

It just cannot be done. Number two, nobody knows what light is. Is it, they call it a wave or a photon or a particle? You know, we know what it does, we use it all the time, but actually give me a jar of it and paint it red.

Nobody knows the substance of it. What is light? And we sure don't know that it always travels the same speed all through time or space. The entire theory behind a black hole is that light can be attracted by gravity.

Well, if light can be attracted by gravity, then you cannot say the speed of light is a constant, okay? At Harvard University back in 99, they slowed light down to 38 miles an hour. The next year, they slowed it down to one mile an hour. And the next year brought it to a dead stop.

Light goes, you know, pretty quick, 186,000 miles a second. They slowed it down. It was done at Harvard.

It was done at Smithsonian. It was done at Cambridge University. A repeatable, demonstrable experiment.

Now that is science. If you do an experiment, get a result, somebody else follows your data, does the same experiment, gets the same result, that's science. They slowed light down.

This article came out on Fox News Channel. They said, we've succeeded in holding a light pulse still. They brought the speed of light to zero, brought it to a dead stop.

Meanwhile, back in 2000 at Princeton University, they speeded light up to 300 times the speed of light. So when somebody says that star's 10 billion light years away, which I doubt they can measure, therefore that

we can prove the universe is 10 billion years old, they got several problems in their logic right away that they probably don't see, which is why we do these seminars so we can help people understand. It's 300 times the speed of light.

Astronomer Barry Sutterfield, an Australian government astronomer, said during the last 300 years, 164 measurements of the speed of light have been published using 16 different measurement techniques. The speed of light has apparently decreased so rapidly, experimental error cannot explain it. This is a chart showing the decline in the speed of light from the published numbers in the last 150 years.

You notice the decline in the chart. The speed of light's getting slower until about 1960. For the last 40 years, anybody that's measured the speed of light gets the same number, 186,282.4, I think, miles per second.

Who cares? Well, it could be that it leveled off in 1960 for two possible reasons, three possible reasons. Our way of measuring is getting better. Instruments are getting better.

We're smarter. You know, everybody in the past was dumb. We're smart.

We got it right. Could be. That's what they'll tell you.

Second option, though, is we're at the tail end of a logarithmic curve, and you're much less likely to see any decline. As you get further out on the logarithmic curve, it pretty much levels out. But a third reason is, 1956 is when they invented the atomic clock.

And they started using that as their clock to measure the speed of light. Well, now, wait, wait, wait. The atomic clock is based on the wavelength of a cesium-133 atom.

So the clock is based on the speed of light. Now, if you have a clock based on the speed of light and you're measuring the speed of light with it, if the speed of light changes, you're never gonna catch it with that clock. It's like watching two twins grow next to each other.

Well, neither one's growing. Well, duh. You got a rubber ruler problem here.

Clear back in 87, they said, the speed of light was 10 billion times faster at time zero. There must've been a faster speed of light. There've been articles from the 80s, 90s, 2000s, saying, look, the speed of light is not a constant.

They said, no physical law prevents anything from exceeding the speed of light. In two published experiments, the speed of light was apparently exceeded by as much as a factor of 100. The Big Bang Theory requires a much faster speed of light.

Dr. Magluccio, however you pronounce his name here, I got his book on the table. He says, the shocking possibility is the speed of light might change in time during the life of the universe. Could it be the speed of light was faster? There's an article in the newspaper, said speed of light may have changed over history, study says.

Winnipeg Free Press, nothing's reliable, not even the speed of light. We have shown that a time varying speed of light could provide a resolution to well-known cosmological puzzles. One of the mysteries of a decaying speed of light seems to be able to explain why opposite extremes of the cosmos that are too far apart to have been in contact with each other appear to obey the same rules of physics and even about

the same temperatures.

It would only be possible for light to cross from one side to the other if it traveled much faster than today, moments after the universe was created. Is the speed of light really a constant? There are articles here in Reuters News Service, the speed of light may not be a constant. I have dozens of articles like this in the last 15 years, and this will be much more detail in our college class about the speed of light.

So don't let somebody tell you the speed of light is a constant, we don't know that. Big article came out in Discover Magazine, says was Einstein wrong about the speed of light back in 2000? I said, yeah, Einstein was wrong. The speed of light is not a constant.

There's the book by the Italian scientist, I'm assuming he's Italian. Says, look, the speed of light is not a constant. And there've been many articles published about this, you can read them for yourself.

I'll flash through them quickly here and you can get the details. So the third thing to consider, the creation was finished when God made it. Not only can we not measure those distances, not only is the speed of light not necessarily a constant, the creation was done.

See, Jesus made wine out of grapes that never existed. He missed all that time. Instead of going from the water in the ground through the plant into the grape, squeeze it, make the wine, now drink it.

No, Jesus turned the water straight to wine. What happened to all the intermediate steps? God can bypass all that, he doesn't need any of that. I ask people the question, how old was Adam on day six? Anybody know how old was Adam on day six? Zero.

Did he look zero? No, he looked 52, 53 next month. But he looked perfect physical condition. God didn't make two babies and put them in the garden of Eden and hand them a package of seeds and say, here, plant these quick, you're gonna need supper.

It has to be a full grown man, full grown woman, full grown garden. They gotta have supper like tonight. Better be something hanging on the tree ready to eat.

Even if you plant a tree, you're gonna take four or five years to get fruit off it. So the creation had to be mature. A fourth thing to consider about the speed of light question.

A light year is a distance, it's not a time. It's a distance. And since the speed of light is not proven to be consistent, why would star distance have anything to do with the age of the universe? Now, I am not saying and have never said all of the stars are inside of a 6,000 mile radius of the earth.

That is not what I say. I don't know any creationist that teaches that. So when they say that, they're setting up a straw man, you know, knocking it down.

They're lying, basically. The stars probably are billions of light years away. They probably are.

We just can't measure them, that's all. I like this article on the Discover. It said, how do scientists measure the age of stars? They said, well, we can find the absolute ages by comparing a star's color and brightness with those in stellar evolution models.

What? We can tell how old it is by how old we think it is. That's exactly what they're saying right there. That's dumb, okay? Now, I think everybody's asking the totally wrong question.

Everybody's saying, how did the light get from the star to the earth? They're asking the wrong question. 17 times in the Bible, it says God stretched out to heavens. Well, if he stretched out to heavens, you're asking the wrong question.

It's not how did the light get from the star to here, but how did the star get from here to there? That's the question we need to be asking. Bible says pretty clearly God made the earth first, and then he made the stars also. And he stretched, suppose he made the earth, and then he stretched out the stars from here.

Adam would see the stars on day six, and day seven, and day eight. As the star is being stretched out into place, it's gonna leave behind a trail of light. So the stars could be billions of light years away today, and still have been created in the six days, 6,000 years ago.

Russell Humphreys has a book which I read, and I just have to say, I didn't understand it, all of it, really, really smart, but it's a good one on starlight and time if you wanna get more on that. I don't know that I agree with his premise. I think he starts with the assumption the speed of light is a constant.

Now, how do we explain that? And they get into this warped space and bent space stuff. I think it's much simpler. The speed of light's not a constant, and God made things and stretched them out into place.

So if that stretching took place, maybe that explains why we have a red shift. And we'll cover the red shift question in just a minute after the break. Okay, let's go on to the question we often get, well, what about the red shift? Doesn't that prove the universe is expanding? Or doesn't that prove the universe is billions of years old? Let me explain what they're talking about.

If light shines through a prism, it breaks it up into the rainbow colors, red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet, okay? Well, if you take starlight and shine it through a prism by putting a prism on the back of your telescope, you look at the star, the light comes through, and it gets broken up into the same red, orange, yellow, green, blue, indigo, violet. And you can kind of tell what's burning because different things burn different colors, like copper burns green. And each element produces a distinctive color.

And so they can kind of tell what's in the star and how it's burning by what color of light it produces. So you can learn a lot about the star from the light. However, as they look at the spectroscope, the colors it produces, there's little black lines in starlight indicating something's burning, a particular element's burning, but they're shifted toward the red.

If you notice the center picture up there, its black lines are shifted over toward the red side, and that's called the red shift. So the question is, what would be causing this? Why would some of these stars have the black line shifted over toward the red? Well, there are several theories about what's causing it. The most commonly accepted theory, and probably the only one that students are ever taught in school, is that the red shift is caused by what's called the Doppler effect.

If you've ever been waiting at the train tracks when a train is coming, as the train's coming toward you, it is squeezing the sound waves, and so the pitch goes up. And when the train leaves you, it is stretching the sound waves, and so the pitch drops, and it goes, as it goes by. That's called the Doppler effect.

Who cares? Well, this happens, okay? Whether the sound is moving past you, or you moving past the sound, it doesn't matter. You still get this Doppler effect, the change in pitch. Well, the theory is that if a star was moving toward us, it would squeeze the light waves, giving it a blue shift, and if it is leaving us, it would give us a red shift, because it would stretch the light out.

That's the theory, okay? What really causes it? I don't think anybody knows for sure. This guy said there was an early sign that red shifts reliably indicate the distance to quasars. For quasars, however, the diagram shows a wide scatter in apparent brightness at every red shift.

In fact, there is little correlation of brightness to red shift at all. Either quasars come in an extremely wide range of intrinsic luminosities, or, as most people believe, or their red shifts do not indicate distance. I don't think anybody knows for sure what's causing the red shift, but you certainly can't tell the distance to a star based on the red shift, and that's exactly what they try to do.

They look at stars and say, oh, that one's red shifted more. That must be 10 1⁄2 billion light years away, instead of 10.2 or something. They make up an awful lot of imagination stuff over just a real little bit of science, in my opinion.

This fellow said in Sky and Telescope Magazine, thus, for us, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that at least some quasars are relatively nearby, and a large fraction of their red shift is due to something other than expansion of the universe. Basically, he's saying we're not sure exactly what's causing the red shift. It might be that they're nearby.

There's a good book you can get, I highly recommend this one, called The Evolution Cruncher. It's a 900-page book, and it's like five bucks. He's got a whole section in here, on page 52, about the evolution, about the red shift and the Doppler effect and what causes it.

Got some really good stuff, and these you can give out to every high school kid you know. But there's a good section in there about the red shift, what's causing it. This article says, quasars with enormous red shift was found embedded in a nearby spiral galaxy with a far lower red shift.

Now, how can one star be inside of another star, and they're giving you two different red shifts if this indicates distance? If they're the same, if a quasar is inside a galaxy, they should both give you the same red shift, both the same distance away. But they admitted, they found this quasar inside of a galaxy that had different red shifts, but yet they're obviously the same distance away. So they said, according to the standard Big Bang view of the universe, the objects we call quasars are generally supposed to be at the very edge of the visible universe.

They're supposed to be superluminous black holes with a million or a hundred million times more mass than our sun, surrounded by a disk of matter, or material. Some of the material falls into the black hole, causing the emission of huge amounts of energy. There was a big article when they discovered this, a cosmic discovery, discovery poses cosmic puzzle.

Can a distant quasar live within a nearby galaxy? This really created a problem. How on earth can we have these two objects that are different distances at the same location? Well, it's not a problem if you realize that you can't trust the redshift to measure the distance, but they're so anxious to say the universe is billions of light years across, and it probably is, and then use that as evidence to say, therefore it's billions of years old. And that's why this all becomes a problem for them.

If they would just accept the Bible, it wouldn't be a problem at all. This article said, quasar with enormous redshift found embedded in nearby spiral galaxy with far lower redshift, unsolvable riddle for Big Bang astronomy. I agree.

If you believe the Big Bang theory, that is an unsolvable problem. Science News ran an article, said another set of observations indicates that the universe appears to be 8.4 to 10.6 billion years old. The new work relied on Hubble Space Telescope to obtain distance to faraway galaxies.

The team led by Tanver, the University of Cambridge in England used a two-step method to estimate the Hubble constant. Now stop and think about that. How many of you have had algebra before? You had algebra? You have variables in your equation, okay? Well, if one variable times a constant, if one constant changes, that's gonna change your whole answer.

So most of this distance stuff they're doing with stars is based on what they call the Hubble constant. But they don't even know what that is. The Hubble constant is estimated.

That's gonna radically affect your outcome of your equation. So is the universe 8.4 billion years old, or is it 10.6? When I debated Hugh Ross at Reasons to Believe, he said it's 17.42 billion years old. 17.42, how do you know that? Some textbooks say 18, some say 20, some say 12.

The numbers range all over the scale. The fact is they don't know. They're making up numbers, purely making them up.

Article goes on to say, you have to be very careful about drawing conclusions because of the Hubble constant. Measurements have huge systematic errors. I like this article, it came out in Discover Magazine a couple years ago.

Astronomers believed the veil, one of the best studied supernova remnants, was 2,500 light years away and 18,000 years old. They were quite wrong. In fact, the veil is only 1,500 light years away and 5,000 years old.

So here just four years ago, they're discovering they got radically wrong numbers. How do you know any of the numbers they're telling us are right? I think we should say, look, until somebody's proven the Bible wrong, I'm gonna believe it. Instead of saying, well, scientists are saying it's wrong, so therefore we must believe the scientists.

Don't go along with that. Even the nearest Cephids, a Cephid variable, are so remote, it's difficult to determine their absolute distance with any great accuracy. All large distances in astronomical literature are subject to an error of perhaps 10% from this cause alone.

There are lots of different things that can cause errors in these measurements. We've talked about the triangulation, measuring with trigonometry. You got incredible errors built into that.

The numbers are just so big. The distances are so large, you can't do it. They say we know that faintness, that's how bright the star is, arises from two causes, distance and absorbing matter in space.

This is what's happening. They look at a star and say, wow, we know that one is 4 billion light years away. And look at that one over there.

That one's only half as bright. So it must be 8 billion light years away. These are the inverse square law.

And that's all logical if there's nothing in between absorbing the light or scattering the light. Just because a star is dimmer doesn't necessarily mean it's farther. It might be something's in between, a dust cloud.

Outer space is full of all kinds of stuff. Anyway, the guy admits it's not generally possible to apportion it between the two. There's more about Halton Harp and what happened to him, the persecution that happened to him because he dared to question the redshift.

All he did was expose the problems with it. Said, guys, that redshift has problems. Well, then you're fired and you get out of here and don't you ever come back, you know, till you repent.

Because you just don't question some things, they're sacred. The Bible says in the book of Isaiah chapter 42 that God stretched out the heavens. Isaiah 45, he stretched out the heavens.

Jeremiah, he stretched out the heavens. 17 times in the Bible, it says God stretched out the heavens. Now, what does that mean? Well, I would guess it means he stretched out the heavens.

I don't know that anybody knows, but here's a couple of options of what may be causing this redshift. Keep in mind, the redshift is probably the only bit of scientific data that is used to support the Big Bang theory. They look at the stars and say, wow, redshift, redshift, redshift, all these stars are moving away.

What does that mean? Oh, that means they used to be all in one spot. So the evidence for the Big Bang is the redshift. And the Big Bang's gotta be one of the dumbest theories in the history of humanity.

Here's some things that might be causing the redshift. It could be the stretching from the creation. If the stars are moving away because they're being stretched out or were stretched out, that would cause a redshift.

It could be the light's getting tired. I get tired. I don't know if light does or not.

We know that light going through a prism bends because different wavelengths are different energy levels. That's why it makes the rainbow. Maybe it's just the effects of traveling through space.

Is space really nothing or is there something in space? Is light going through anything when it goes through space? I don't know. That's just one thought. Maybe it is the Doppler effect.

Could be. Maybe it's light being slowed down or speeded up by a black hole. Robert Gentry's got a great article in his website, halos.com. If you wanna read more about the redshift and the problems with it, get all the technical stuff.

But when you talk about the stars, there's a good book here by Brian Young called The Stars, God's Word in the Sky. You can get it from our ministry, 10 bucks. Great book on the stars.

Christians shouldn't be afraid of astronomy. Now, astrology is different, but not astronomy. God created everything.

Here's a book, Astronomy and the Bible. I don't know if this one's available from our website or not, but we can get it, Donald DeYoung. It is, Jonathan? Yeah, it's on our website.

Awesome book, Astronomy and the Bible, if you wanna read more. Because I think we should study astronomy, study what God has made. This book is a little controversial.

D. James Kennedy, Coral Ridge Ministries, Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. He says the real meaning of the zodiac, he goes through the 12 zodiac symbols and says probably these

originally had a gospel story to them, which has now been perverted into the horoscope. So get coralridge.org if you want to get the book.

It's like six or eight bucks. But the Bible does talk about the constellations. It talks about Pleiades and Orion in the book of Job chapter 38, or Maseroth and Arcturus in Job 38.

There are constellations mentioned in the Bible. Now, what does this mean? Well, I don't know, and I don't know anybody who knows for sure, but here's what some Christians think, that when God originally made the world, Adam did not have a Bible. Hadn't been written yet.

So God gave Adam the gospel story in the stars. The 12 different constellations told the story of the redemption, the coming of Christ. And maybe the Sphinx was built, this is one theory, the Sphinx by the pyramid, you know, in Egypt.

They say, well, the Sphinx was built to tell us how to read the zodiac because it starts with the face of a woman and ends with the body of a lion. So you start reading the zodiac. Instead of starting in January, like we do, you start with Virgo, the virgin, and you go through the 12 constellations and end with Leo, the lion.

I don't know. I know that today the horoscopes all perverted and Satan always takes what God does and twists it and perverts it and change it. But if you wanna study that, that's fine.

There appears to be something to that though, that maybe there really is something to this gospel in the stars. And Carl Baugh's got a good theory that each of the constellations is producing different radio waves. Stars produce radio waves.

He thinks the canopy of ice that used to be above the earth could actually change those radio frequencies into audible waves like a crystal radio does. It would actually vibrate. And Adam and Eve would be able to hear the music of the stars mentioned in Job chapter 38.

Whether that's true or not, I don't know, but it sure preaches good that the whole gospel story was being sung to them continually as they traveled around every year. Who knows? Anyway, second question, is the sun shrinking? There has been some controversy among creationist groups in the last 10 years over this question. The sun is shrinking.

There's not much question about that, but does that prove it's not billions of years old? Well, I think so. The sun is burning, obviously. You can step outside and look at it.

It's losing about 5 million tons every second. Quite a weight loss program. Well, that means, of course, it used to be bigger.

You don't need to be too much of a genius to figure that out. Bulletin of American Astronomical Society ran an article back in 79, which some people have argued about the legitimacy of this, but they said, since 1836, more than 100 different observers at the Royal Greenwich Observatory, that's in England, and the U.S. Naval Observatory have made direct visual measurements that suggest the sun's diameter is shrinking at a rate of a 10th of a percent each century, or about five feet an hour. Let's assume that is correct for the moment.

If the sun is burning and it's losing five feet an hour, that would be the diameter. So the radius, it'll only be 2 1⁄2 feet of radius. It's 93 million miles to the Earth.

You divide that by 2 1⁄2 feet per hour, you're gonna find out it cannot possibly be billions of years old. That, of course, would assume several things. Has the rate always been the same? Has the rate of burn always been the same, et cetera, et cetera? I know, there's a lot of assumptions built in, but I think we could all agree the sun is burning.

I think we could all agree it's getting smaller. Several indirect techniques also confirm the sun is shrinking, although these inferred about 1■ as much from Science Magazine. Here's a chart showing the graph of what has been observed, written down.

I mean, they look at the sun, they measure the diameter using trigonometry, and it's close enough to work that way, that they measure the numbers and say, wow, the sun's diameter, polar and equatorial, is shrinking. Now, I know the sun oscillates. It swells and contracts and swells.

You know, it's burning, like a marshmallow, you know. But generally, you can see from the graph, it is losing diameter, losing size. Well, if you go back billions of years, you would assume this would make a problem.

If the sun were bigger, it would pretty soon absorb Mercury and then Venus and then Earth. I don't know how far back it'd have to go. And I think Christians would be wise to not put a number on it.

Don't say, well, you know, 18.6 million years ago, this would happen, because what happens, the atheists then argue about the number, and they miss the whole point. They miss the concept. The fact is, guys, it's burning.

It used to be bigger. This creates a problem for your theory. The bigger problem, though, than just the size of the sun is the mass.

Gravity is directly proportional to how heavy the objects are, the mass of the object. If the sun were more massive, gravity would be stronger, and that's gonna start sucking planets in, drawing them out of their orbit. So yes, the sun is shrinking, and I think it creates a problem for those who want to believe the universe is billions of years old.

I wouldn't put a number on it, but it certainly makes a problem somewhere. Now, Danny Faulkner is an astronomer at University of South Carolina. He's a good friend of mine, been down here to do some taping with us when I debated Hugh Ross.

He's got a great article, it's kind of long on his website, but he says, The Young Faint Sun Paradox and the Age of the Solar System by Danny Faulkner. You can go to his website and read about that, but he says, because the sun, if you go back in time, would have been dimmer, this creates a problem. How can plants have survived with the changing brightness of the sun also? Evolutionists maintain that life appeared on the Earth about 3.8 billion years ago.

Since then, the sun would have brightened 25%. Well, if the sun is 25% brighter now than it was then, how could plants have evolved? It goes through some good legitimate points here. The Faint Young Sun Paradox is a problem for those who believe in evolution.

He says the logical conclusion he comes to is, it's not billions of years old. Of course, the other astronomers, oh, that's not possible. Of course, it's billions of years old, of course it is.

They don't like that idea. Okay, what about carbon dating? I get asked this question all the time. Jonathan spent $70 to get this book, all right? And the new one's out and it's $80 now? $80, okay.

Radioisotopes and the Age of the Earth, the RATE Project, R-A-T-E. I am sure not, I'm not the world's expert on carbon dating, but I think I can explain things. I'm a teacher, I can explain it as best I can.

That's what a teacher's supposed to do, take the complex and explain it where the average person can get it. Since I operate about fourth grade level, I gotta understand it myself first so I can explain it. Let me explain how carbon dating is supposed to work and then tell you the serious problems with it.

Carbon dating was not invented until 1949 in the last 60 years. So when they started telling the kids the Earth is billions of years old back in 1830, they didn't tell them because of carbon dating. They never thought of carbon dating, never been heard of, okay? Why were they teaching the Earth is billions of years old 160 years ago? Well, because they needed billions of years to make their theory look good, that's why.

If I told you a frog could turn into a prince if you kiss it, you'd all say, well, it's a fairy tale. But if I told you, hey kids, the frog can turn into the prince if you wait billions of years, oh, maybe so. Now it becomes believable.

No, it's still a fairy tale, it's a stupid idea. But the geologic column is where it all started. We covered that on video four and some more on video six about the geologic column.

The Earth was divided up into layers, Cenozoic, Mesozoic, Paleozoic, Archeozoic. Each layer was assigned a name, an age, and an index fossil. We covered that on video four.

Then they said, now we have to prove these layers are old. So they picked the numbers out of the clear blue sky and any dating technique that comes along like carbon dating or any other has to match the geologic column or it's rejected. Only because the geologic column's been taught for 180 years now.

So surely it's true. No, just because it's been taught 180 years doesn't make it true. But that's the logic those scientists will have.

Well, we know the geologic column is established. Therefore, any carbon dates we get should match that. If they don't, we'll throw them out and we'll keep testing till we do.

They might have to test a sample five or six times till they get the number they want. Well, how do you know any of them are right then? If you're getting a different number every time, how would you know any of them are right? Radiometric dating would not have been feasible if the geologic column had not been erected first. Ever since William Smith at the beginning of the 19th century, fossils have been and still are the best and most accurate method of dating and correlating the rocks in which they occur.

Apart from very modern examples, which really are archeology, I can think of no cases of radioactive decay used to date fossils. They don't date fossils by carbon dating. They date them by their geologic position.

That's how it's done. But here's what happens. Earth's atmosphere is about 100 miles thick.

Space shuttle, in order to get free from friction, has to get up about 100 miles to be able to outside the air. And straight up, 100 miles is not that far from here to halfway to Tallahassee. But if you look at the atmosphere, it has very distinct layers to it, which is kind of interesting.

It has a heat sink where it gets very, very cold up about seven or eight miles up, like 80 or 90 or 100 below zero. But the Earth's atmosphere contains mostly nitrogen, 78% nitrogen, 20%, 21% oxygen, a little bit of CO2 for plants to breathe. Well, these don't breathe, they're fake, but plants breathe in carbon dioxide.

And there's a very tiny little bit of radioactive carbon-14, 0.0000765%. This radioactive carbon-14 is different than regular carbon. It's produced by radiation striking the atmosphere. Sunlight strikes the atmosphere, slaps the nitrogen around, and turns it into carbon-14.

So it all starts by the sunlight hitting the atmosphere. Just to give you the procedure here, about 21 pounds of carbon-14 is produced every year, and that is spread out all over the world. If I told you there's 21 pounds of gold, but it's spread out equally all over the world, forget it, I'm not even gonna go look for it, okay? So you're not gonna find it, real tiny amounts.

If you look at a periodic table, carbon and nitrogen are right next to each other. Nitrogen has an atomic weight of 14, carbon has an atomic weight of 12. But if the sunlight slaps the nitrogen around, it'll knock a few things off of it, and it becomes carbon-14.

So it still weighs as much as the nitrogen, but now it's considered a carbon. It's called radioactive, which does not mean it listens to the radio. It's just, it's unstable, and it's gonna break apart.

It's like three guys dating the same girl. That relationship's not gonna last, okay, forever. Something will go wrong, right? Find the one you want, Jonathan, and just marry her and be happy the rest of your life, right? Carbon-14 is unstable.

It does not like being carbon-14. It wants to get out of this situation, so it breaks down. About half of it will break down on a statistical average.

About half of it is gonna fall apart every 5,700 years. Now, it is doing this on a purely random procedure. I mean, you got a pile of molecules.

You never know which one's gonna fall apart. But statistics tell us about half of them will fall apart every 5,700 years, roughly. Now, while it is carbon-14, it's floating around in the atmosphere, like the rest of the carbon, and it lashes onto oxygen, like carbon often does, and becomes carbon dioxide.

And they hook up, and they're happily floating around the atmosphere. And the plants are breathing in CO2. Animals come along and eat the plants.

So the only way carbon-14 gets into the living world is from the atmosphere. It's produced by the sun striking the atmosphere. Plants breathe it in.

Animals eat the plants. Probably during your lifetime, you've either eaten plants, or you've eaten animals that have eaten plants. How many have ever done that before? Like today for lunch, right? Everything we do is from one of those two sources.

It's plants, or it's animals that ate plants. Well, the plants are absorbing CO2. Some of it is radioactive.

So if the atmosphere contains 0.0000765%, it is assumed that the plants also have 0.0000765%. Probably a reasonable assumption, and I don't argue with them. I just point out this is one of dozens of assumptions that can enter in to really mess up things like carbon dating. So probably you have 0.0000765% carbon in you, because you've been eating these plants, or you've been eating the animals that have been eating the plants.

So probably it's all balanced in nature. When the plant or animal dies, it stops eating, stops taking in more C14, it stops breathing, okay? Now, whatever it had is gonna decay. It was decaying while it was alive, but now there's nothing to replace it.

So what they do is they compare the amount of C14 in the fossil with the amount in the atmosphere, and say, wow, this fossil's only got half as much. Therefore, it's been dead for one half-life, 5,700 years. Because it continues to decay after it died, but now it can't be replaced.

So while it was alive, it should have had about 0.0000765%. If it's only got 0.00003825%, it's been dead for one half-life, or two half-lives, or three half-lives, et cetera. In theory, it never goes to zero. But for practical purposes, you can't measure beyond a certain amount.

You know, you're gonna run out of stuff to measure. It goes from a half, to a fourth, to an eighth, to a 16th, to not enough to measure. Great article came out from Institute for Creation Research.

They're the ones that did the rate project, icr.org. They said, with their short 5,700-year half-life, no carbon-14 atom should exist in any carbon older than quarter-million years. It should all be gone. Yet it's proven impossible to find any natural source of carbon below the ice age that does not contain significant amounts of carbon-14.

Even though such strata are supposed to be millions or billions of years old, conventional carbon-14 laboratories have been aware of this anomaly since early 80s, and have striven to eliminate it, and are unable to account for it. Lately, the world's best-searched laboratory, which has learned during two decades of low C14 measurements, how not to contaminate specimens externally. Under contract to creationists, they confirmed such observations for coal samples, and even for a dozen diamonds.

I think what that means. The textbooks will tell you coal formed 250 million years ago, in the Carboniferous era. And yet when they test coal, it still has carbon-14.

How is that possible? If all the carbon-14 atoms would have disappeared in say 30, 40, 50,000 years, why would there still be carbon-14 atoms in coal? I got an idea. It's not quarter-million years old. Ooh, boy, they don't like that answer.

They'll keep searching until they find another answer, because they don't like that one for sure. And diamonds, which they say, form millions and millions of years ago, they still have carbon-14 in them. And it's not possible to contaminate one of those things.

I mean, it's the hardest substance we have. So how do you get carbon-14 in diamonds? And when did diamonds form? Well, I'm not sure when they formed. I know Superman makes them in a few minutes.

You know, take a piece of coal, squeeze it, he's got a diamond to give to, what's their name, you know? But olive oil. So, and they've learned today, just in the last 20 years, I guess, how to make diamonds that are just indistinguishable from natural diamonds. High pressure, they've been doing it for years, making

artificial diamonds, but they can't get them very big.

Now just, I think in 2005, they were able to get big diamonds with a synthetic process. Take your pet, that's right, burn the body, cremate it, just pressure it into a diamond. And you can wear your dog the rest of your life, you know? Or your ex-wife, you know, or whatever.

I don't think I'd wanna do that. We were talking about that on the radio yesterday. Anyway, the guy said, these diamonds even have carbon-14.

It says, this cannot be contaminated. Those constitute very strong evidence the earth is only thousands, not billions of years old. Now the Rate Project book is difficult reading, heavy reading.

Jonathan, you're awful smart. How far did you make it through the book? About halfway, and it's taken almost a year. Yeah, it's heavy reading.

If you want the simplified, you know, don't go down quite so deep version, this one is excellent by Donald DeYoung, Thousands Not Billions. He kind of summarizes in real English what they said. Different ways to show it.

Look, it's not billions of years old. But the carbon dating assumptions need to be pointed out. They'll say, well, we know carbon decays at a certain rate.

And so we know if it's only got half as much, it's half as old. There's some assumptions that mess up everything. I'll show you how it works.

If I said, we're gonna fill a barrel with water. So I hand Leah the hose. Here, Leah, fill this barrel with water.

But what you don't know is I have drilled holes in the barrel. While you're putting it in, the water is leaking out. It's kind of like your checkbook.

You know, you keep putting it in and it keeps leaking out someplace, right? How many discovered that as you live along? Got the ring, Jonathan, you're discovering now, right? Well, the Earth's atmosphere is kind of like this barrel. It's always getting brand new carbon 14, 21 pounds every year being put in. And it's always leaking out through decay.

So the question would be, how long would it take to reach a stage called equilibrium? Now with a barrel, you can actually do the math and calculate if I'm gonna put in, you know, a certain amount of water per minute and a certain amount per minute leaks out, when will I reach equilibrium and where? That can all be calculated, you know, with a little bit of math. And with the atmosphere, they said, well, when would the atmosphere reach equilibrium? So the guys who invented carbon dating in the late 40s said, I wonder about this Earth's atmosphere reaching equilibrium. They did a bunch of studies on that and said, now, if we took a brand new planet Earth created it from scratch, poof, got it going around the sun, how long would it take to reach this equilibrium point in the atmosphere where the production rate and the destruction rate is the same? And they determined it would take about 30,000 years to reach equilibrium.

I'm not sure how they did all that. You could probably see some of the rate scientists and figured it out. But then they made two mistakes in my totally unbiased opinion.

They said, number one, we know the Earth is millions of years old. Mistake number one. Number two, they said, we can ignore the equilibrium problem because we would have passed that point 30,000 years ago.

You know, they've discovered the Earth has still not reached equilibrium. Radiocarbon is still forming 30 to 40% faster than it's decaying. Now think about that.

If radiocarbon is still forming faster than it's decaying, that means the Earth is less than 30,000 years old, number one. And number two, you can't carbon date anything because you'd have to know when it lived so that you could calculate when it lived. You would have to already know when it lived to figure out how much carbon-14 was it breathing at that time.

It doesn't work. There's a website, www.archy.org. He's got more stuff on the Earth has not reached equilibrium if you want some articles there by Ron Cooper. But this is a calibration curve.

If an animal is still alive, it should give you about 16 clicks on your Geiger counter per minute per gram. If you're only getting eight, you say it's been through one half-life or four clicks, or it's been through two half-lives or three half-lives, et cetera. This is called a calibration curve.

In theory, it sounds like it should work, but there are several real obvious assumptions and I don't know how they don't see it. Suppose you walked into a room and I said, I want you to tell me, here's this candle burning on a table. When was it lit? Find out it's seven inches tall.

You say, well, that won't tell me anything. Now we've got to measure how fast it's burning. We measure the candle for a while.

We get an Olympic stopwatch and we get it down to the nearest 40 bazillionths of a second, okay? And we all agree the candle is burning an inch an hour. Here's our two facts. Seven inches tall, burning an inch an hour.

When was it lit? Mary, can't figure it out? Nobody can figure it out. Unless you make some assumptions. Assumption number one, how tall was the candle? And assumption number two, has it always burned at the same rate? Neither of those can be known.

If you find a fossil in the dirt, the amount of carbon can be measured. The rate of decay can be determined. I don't argue with either of those.

How much was in it when it lived? I don't know. Has it always decayed at the same rate? I don't know. Has it been contaminated, sitting there in the ground for all these millions of years? There's no way to know those things.

If the earth had a canopy of water above the atmosphere or a canopy of ice, as we cover on seminar two, that would have blocked out a lot of the water and blocked out a lot of radiation from the sun, which would have prevented most of the carbon-14 from even forming. So animals that lived before the flood would have lived in a world with much less carbon-14 to begin with, maybe none, but certainly less. And when we dig up the fossil that's been buried for 4,400 years, let's say it started with four, where today we start with 16.

We dig it up 4,400 years after the flood and say, wow, here's a mammoth that got buried and it's carbon dated. Well, we're assuming it started at 16. When we test it and find it's got two, we're gonna say, oh, it's been through four half-lives, when it's actually only been through one half-life, which is why it never works.

When they first invented carbon dating, 1949, Willard Libby, they did some testing and they said the lower leg of a mammoth was 15,000 years old, but the skin was 21,000. How can two parts of the same animal be different ages? Quite obviously, we know one of the numbers is wrong. So how would you know either of them are right? And if either one's right, how would you know which one? I see no way to tell.

Well, let's see if it's getting better. 14 years later, they tested a living mollusk, a clam, and it was 2,300 years old, still alive. In 1970, at the Nobel Symposium, they said, if a carbon date supports our theories, we put it in the main text.

If it does not entirely contradict them, we put it in a footnote. If it's completely out of date, we just drop it. You mean they can pick and choose any numbers they want? Exactly correct.

If the number doesn't fit what they expected, they throw the number out. 1971, freshly killed seal was 1,300 years old when they carbon dated it. Troubles with carbon dating are undeniably deep and serious.

Despite 35 years of technological refinement and better understanding, the underlying assumptions have been strongly challenged and warnings are out that radiocarbon dating may soon find itself in a crisis situation. Continuing use of the method depends on a fix-it-as-we-go approach, allowing for contamination here, fractionation there, and calibration wherever possible. It should be no surprise then that fully half the dates are rejected.

Did you follow that? Out of thousands of carbon dates that have been carbon dating times that they've done it, half of the numbers are thrown out. How do they know they're wrong? And also, how would you know the other half is right? If half your test results have to be thrown out, it ought to raise red flags in somebody's brain. Wait a minute.

This is stupid. What are we doing? We're wasting our time here. And the article goes on to say, the wonder is, surely, that the remaining half have come to be accepted.

No matter how useful it is, the radiocarbon method is still not capable of yielding accurate and reliable results. There are gross discrepancies, the chronology is uneven and relative, and the accepted dates are actually selected dates. This whole blessed thing is nothing but 13th century alchemy.

And I agree. That's 1981. I've got all these in chronological order.

It never gets better. 1984, living snails, carbon dated 27,000 years old. 1992, two mammoths found side by side.

They carbon date them. One is 22,000, the other is 16,000. Which one's right? Or are both of them wrong? Or are both of them right? There is no possible way to tell.

In 1996, Carl Swisher, at Berkeley University, used the most advanced techniques to date human fossils. Says last spring he was reevaluating Homo erectus skulls found in Java in the 1930s. He was testing the sediment found with them.

The species was supposed to be extinct for a quarter million years. Swisher used two different dating methods. He kept making the same startling find.

The bones are 53,000 years at most, and possibly no more than 27,000. I'd like to point out two things here. He's looking for a quarter million as his answer.

But he keeps getting 53 to 27,000, okay? Which is only one fourth of what he wants. One fifth of what he wants, okay? But he's still getting a 96% error. I mean, is it 27,000 or 53,000? This is not an exact science.

So when they publish an article in the paper and say, we found a dinosaur bone or a mammoth bone, and it was, you know, 17,221 years old in six months and three days. Right, come on. You don't know that.

They're making up this stuff. Just absolutely making it up. Professor Reiner Protsch von Zeiten, earlier the February night of 2005, was resigned from the professor because he'd been lying about carbon dating for years.

His frauds were exposed in February of 2005. He had dated the Bischoff spire skeleton at 21,300 years old. But when they tested him at Oxford, they said it's only 3,300 years old.

700% error. He had said, Professor Protsch had said he had found the oldest German, the first German to ever move to Germany, 27,400 years old. They tested it at Oxford and said, this is an old man that died in 1750.

He's 250 years old. The professor had been lying about this stuff for decades. And so he finally resigned in disgrace.

Well, he should, right? One part of a mammoth dated 29,000 years old. Another part was 44,000. You talk about a slow birth.

That would be it, okay? I like this article from Rand McNally. The last two years, an absolute date was obtained for the Gandong beds above the Trenel beds. That's in Indonesia.

It has the interesting value of 300,000 years, plus or minus 300,000 years. Boy, they nailed that one right on the head, didn't they? Plus or minus, you know, 300% error. In the geological survey professional paper 862, and I get some flack over this, but I've got the paper in the library somewhere.

We couldn't find it here. There's all kinds of articles about carbon dating things in Alaska. I just wanna show you a few things here.

They carbon dated sample number SI 454. See that on the map there, on the chart there. And said it was 17,210 years, plus or minus 500.

Then they tested sample SI 455, and said it's 24,140 years old. Well, 17,000, 24,000, say, wow, that's working good, until you find out that's the same sample as 454. Very same sample.

Test it again. So is it 17,000 or 24,000? Sample number 299 was less than 20,000 years old. That little caret means less than.

Sample number L137X is greater than 28,000. We say, well, see, it's working good. This sample is less than 20,000.

This other sample is greater than 28, until you find out it's the same sample as 299. How can a sample be less than 20 and greater than 28 at the same time? I taught algebra for a long time. I don't think you can do such a thing.

That's not too good. Living penguins were dated at 8,000 years old. Materials from layers where dinosaur bones were found are carbonated 34,000 years old.

I was in a debate one time, and this professor was getting so upset. Finally, he said, how can you use Reader's Digest as a resource? I said, sir, I use Reader's Digest as a resource for the picture of the dinosaur bone, okay? It's not the resource for the fact, okay? That's where I got the picture from. Oh, okay, okay.

So we went on to the debate. But yes, dinosaurs ought to date 70 million years old. A Russian scientist dated dinosaur bones at less than 30,000 years old.

Hugh Miller from Columbus, Ohio took in four dinosaur bone samples and said, would you carbon date these? And they charge like 600 bucks to carbon date something. They carbon dated them and said they're less than 20,000 years old. He said, oh, by the way, these are dinosaur bones.

They said, oh, well, then they're not 20,000. We gotta test them again. Why can't they be 20,000? They said, well, we know dinosaurs lived 70 million years ago.

So if you had told us that, we never would have carbon dated them. One friend of mine died here several years ago, but he was digging, doing a lot of archeological work. And he dug down in this well and he found layers of burned wood, which is good to carbon date because obviously, you know, it had carbon in.

And he put them in a baggie, sample number A from such and such a layer. How many feet down? He labeled it A. Dug down 10 more feet, hit another layer of burned wood. The city had been destroyed, or 20 feet, whatever it was.

He labeled it sample B. He took them in to have them carbon dated. Paid them the 600 bucks. They said sample A is, I forget, 3,000 years old and this one's 4,000 years old.

He waited six months, switched the labels, took them back in, same laboratory, said, I want you to carbon date these samples. Now, sample B, the lower one, is in a top bag. He just switched the labels and they give him the same results, 3,000 and 4,000.

It doesn't work. It's never worked. Here's things to consider about carbon dating.

When you date a sample of known age, it doesn't work. If you date a sample of unknown age, it is assumed to work. That's not science, okay? As things decay, they produce helium.

This helium, the amount of helium in the atmosphere, is only enough to account for a few thousand, a few million years, not billions of years. There's a book called The Mythology of Modern Dating Methods by ICR, if you wanna read stuff on that. They do a lot of testing on this.

They're probably the experts in the creation community. This guy said, the rocks do date the fossils, but the fossils date the rocks more accurately. That's ludicrous, okay? And it all based on circular reasoning.

They've known that for centuries. We'll cover more on that on video four. I talked to James P. Dawson.

He's gonna be on our radio program tonight, actually, Jonathan, he's supposed to call in. James Dawson was one of the guys working on dating the moon rocks. They brought back moon rocks, gave them to his laboratory, and said, how old is the moon rock? He took specimen number 10017, divided it into six

pieces, and tested it many, many times.

How old is it? They got numbers ranging from two and a half billion to 4.6 billion. It's a 500% error, or 100% error. I talked to him back in 99, and he's in Oklahoma, there's his phone number.

He was chief of engineering and operations for the Lunar and Earth Science Division of the Mann Spacecraft Center in NASA in Houston. He worked on lunar samples, including the Genesis rock. He told me they found ages from 10,000 years to several billion in the same rock.

His website, jpdawson.com. How can one rock be 10,000 years old and several billion years old at the same time? Something is wrong, okay? The book Bones of Contention has a great chapter at the end called The Dating Game, showing how that they will just change the dates whenever necessary. If it doesn't fit the theory, oh, let's test it again until it fits the theory. See, the theory is important.

The facts are not. Evolution, as I've said many times, is a carefully protected state religion, and that's all it is. What about potassium-argon dating? Does that work? Actually, the numbers are bigger, but the problems and assumptions are exactly the same, and you can demonstrate it doesn't work.

Potassium decays very slowly. This chart shows the different elements in their half-life. Carbon has a half-life around 5,700 years, but potassium, it takes 1.3 billion years with a B for half of that to disappear.

Very slowly decays. By the way, I would like to point out, Your Honor, just for, you know, appeal, that all of the dating methods are based on the decay of an element. Uranium decays to lead.

Potassium decays to argon. They're all moving down the periodic table, not up. All going down.

Just point out, keep that in mind in case we need to appeal this case, all right? 80% of the potassium in a small sample of iron meteorite can be removed by distilled water in 4 1⁄2 hours. Well, if you can take out 80% of it in 4 1⁄2 hours, how can you trust any dates you're gonna obtain by that? Canadian Journal of Earth Science ran an article and said, in conventional interpretation of potassium-argon age, it's common to discard ages which are substantially too high or too low compared to the rest of the group, or with other available data, such as the geologic time scale. There it is.

If you test a sample and its number's too high or too low or it doesn't match the geologic column, it gets thrown out. Well, then why are you wasting your time and money testing it? You already know how old you'd like it to be. Give it a number.

Pick a number. It's dumb. The KBS tuff.

A tuff is a layer of ash or lava, or generally ash that has been packed and turned into rock. It's called tuff, T-U-F-F. K. Brinzenmeier had been dating these samples with potassium-argon dating because... Here's the theory.

When a volcano erupts, the rocks and stuff coming out is really hot, and any gases in it should be able to escape. Well, potassium slowly turns into argon, and argon is a gas. They use it for welding over at the shop.

Argon welding, you know? Argon's a gas. So since potassium turns to argon, when the rock gets melted and shot out of a volcano, all the gas escapes, and so the theory says this new layer should have been... The clock is now reset. It is zero years old.

Even though when it was in the earth, it's, you know, four billion years old, now all the argon's gone because it accumulated this argon for millions of years, but now, poof, it melted and the gas is gone. So we can potassium-argon date this lava or ash or any volcanic material. Well, they had been dating this layer of ash named after K. Brinzenmeier because she did research on it.

They said it's 212 to 230 million years old. All the scientists agreed that layer of ash is around 200 million years old. Until Richard Leakey came along in 1972, and he's digging around under the KBS tuff, and he finds a perfectly normal human skull.

Everybody panicked. They said, wow, how can you have a normal human skull under 200 million-year-old rock when man didn't even evolve till like 3 million years ago? That's not possible. And so they looked for things.

Was this a burial? Did somebody dig through the rock and bury this person down here? You know, was there an earthquake? Is there a fault line near here someplace? Nope. All we can conclude is there's a normal human skull under 200 million-year-old rock. So what do you conclude? Well, one group studied this and said, well, that proves aliens came here 200 million years ago.

Would you just consider that maybe the rock's not 200 million years old? After they found out it could not be an intrusion or a burial or anything else, it had to be legitimately placed there. I mean, the person was buried under this ash layer. They took 10 more samples of the KBS tuff and dated them again.

Keep in mind they'd already dated them a bunch of times, and everybody agreed it's 212 million years old. But now they take 10 more samples and check them again and say, oh no, it's only 0.5 to 2.6 million. Well, that's way down from 212.

They dropped the number way down, but they're still getting a 500% error from 0.5 to 2.6. This is not an exact science. See, back in 1770, they taught the kids the Earth is 70,000 years old. In 1905, they said it's 2 billion years old.

By 1969, when I was a kid and they went to the moon, they brought back moon rocks and said, oh wow, they're 3.5 billion years old. That was the official age, 3.5 billion. By the way, they did it with potassium argon dating.

You can see the article there from the newspaper. Today they tell the kids it's 4.6 billion years old. Do you realize the Earth is getting older at the rate of 21 million years per year? That's 40 years per minute.

While dates are always obtained with carbon dating or potassium argon dating, dates that don't fit the theory are rejected. Only the correct dates ever get published. Well then why are you wasting anybody's time? It's not science.

The original content cannot possibly be known. You can't know there's been no contamination. You can't know that the decay rates always remain the same.

You can't know those things, okay? Give you a couple examples of potassium argon problems and then we'll take a little break. Basalt from Mount Etna in Sicily. By the way, I climbed on Mount Etna when I was over there in Sicily.

They knew it erupted in 122 BC. They knew it erupted 122 BC. They were written records.

Well, the potassium argon data said it's two and a quarter million years old. Excuse me? It should be like 2000. When they tested lava from a Hawaiian volcano, they knew it erupted in 1801.

The people watched it happen. That's the lava flow that covered our village, you know, 1801. It gave an age of 1.6 million years old.

That's in 1968. Let's see if it gets better. Basalt from a volcano in Hawaii erupted in 1959.

When they tested it, it gave an age of eight and a half million years old. Another volcano in Mount Etna from the 1964 eruption gave an age of 700,000. The 72 eruption gave an age of 350,000.

It was erupting when I was over there in 2002, I believe. I don't remember. Lava from Mount St. Helens was tested, which my sister lives just 60 miles from there.

They tested the lava from Mount St. Helens, brand new lava coming out of the volcano. Grab a sample. How old is it? They tested it five different ways and got five different numbers.

All the way from 350,000 to 2.8 billion. Notice all five numbers are different, number one, and all five numbers are wrong, number two. They're wrong.

It doesn't work. So again, when you test a sample of known age, it's assumed to work. And if you test a sample of unknown age, it is, you know, we know it doesn't work when you know the age, but when you don't know the age, well, then they say it works.

So it just doesn't work. And I'm tired of them using our tax dollars to call that science. That is not science.

That's pure imagination. There's a whole bunch more in the book, Evolution Cruncher, if you want more on that, or in the RATE project book, Radioactive Isotopes and the Age of the Earth, if you want more. Or there's a whole lot of good stuff in Walt Brown's book, In the Beginning.

He's a PhD in physics, an Air Force Academy professor for years in Colorado. Got great stuff in here. I differ with him on a couple of little things.

Of course, I differ with probably everybody on a couple of things. The only one right on everything, of course, is me. But we're trying to get them all converted.

Take a five-minute break, and we'll come back and talk about have fresh dinosaur bones been found? Next question we often get asked is, hey, if dinosaurs drowned in the flood, have we found fresh dinosaur bones? Or if they're all fossilized, take millions of years, doesn't it? Well, first, it does not take millions of years for things to fossilize. We covered that on video number six. But yes, some fresh dinosaur bones have been found.

There's a great book out called The Great Alaskan Dinosaur Adventure about some guys that went up to northern Alaska and in the riverbanks up there, in the Colville River on the north slope of Alaska, found frozen dinosaur bones. I talked to Les Zerbe, my friend up there who's been a missionary for years in Africa, I mean, in Alaska. I was just up there a few months ago with him.

He said he was there. He could drive his plane right to the spot, land there, and dig out some fresh, frozen dinosaur bones if we'd like. But yes, they have been found.

In Journal Science magazine in December of 93, they said, report an amazing preservation of the bones of a young duck-billed dinosaur found in Montana. Under a microscope, the fine structure of the bones was seen to have been preserved to such an extent that cell characteristics could be compared to cells of chicken bone. Anybody who teaches dinosaurs died millions of years ago has not studied the real evidence, okay? In northwestern Alaska, in 1961, a geologist found a bed of dinosaur bones in unpermineralized, that's unfossilized condition.

This is possibly the same bed that Les Zerbe goes to. He offered to take me last time I was there, but the weather wouldn't permit it. We were gonna fly up there for a couple hours and see this stuff.

I'll go next time I get up there. In Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, which is way on the north slope near Barrow, Alaska, they found frozen dinosaur bones. They're as light as balsa wood and look as fresh as yesterday's dog bones.

The structure was porous and the fossils were not mineralized, not fossilized. A Canadian Indian, Eskimo, in 1987 on Bylot Island up in northern Canada, found part of a lower jaw of a duck-billed dinosaur. It was in fresh condition.

Joe Taylor, our friend from Crosbyton, Texas, has a website, mountblanco.com. He has dug up dinosaur bones before that are not fossilized. He's dug up dinosaurs all over the world. But in the summer of 2005, they found dinosaur tissue inside a T-Rex leg bone and the dinosaur tissue was still soft.

Now the scientists are trying to figure out, like John Horner from Montana is trying to figure out how could fossils, how could they stay soft for 70 million years? The thought will never cross his mind that maybe they're not 70 million years old. He's already committed to that. And to say maybe they're only 6,000 years old or 4,400 years old from the flood would absolutely be anathema to them.

They'll never consider that. So now they're gonna probably get a government grant and try to figure out how could they stay soft for 70 million years? They're totally asking the wrong question. The question is when they formed, not how they formed.

Here's a picture from a magazine showing they found a fossilized dinosaur, still had what they thought, I believe was confirmed, was the heart, soft tissue fossilized in a dinosaur. Up in Alaska, they frequently find dinosaurs. Well, Alaska's cold.

Reptiles don't do well in cold weather. But dinosaurs in Alaska? Not many, but a few have been found. And yes, it's true.

Some have been found that are not fossilized. You can do more research on that on your own. We'll cover more on our college class when we get to that.

If there really was a flood, I often get the question, well, where's all the humans? Why aren't there more human bones? There should be bazillions of human bones buried. I mean, we find lots of clams, find lots of other animals. And it's true, of all the fossils formed, Jonathan, I don't know if you know the percentage.

It's like 90% of all the fossils formed are marine organisms. Have you read something like that? 90 or 98. 90 or 98, animals that live in the water, okay? Very few mammal fossils are found and very few human fossils are found.

Marvin Lubenow, in his book, Bones of Contention, it's the best one I'm aware of on the topic. He's a creationist, but he spent years and years and years, like 25 years, studying all the human remains. He says there are about 4,000 human remains have been found.

Now, compared to clams, we find billions of those, or fish, we find billions of those. Why only 4,000? Well, there's a couple of things to consider. Why so few human bones are found? And by the way, they're all 100% human.

Actually, the Neanderthals had thicker bones than we have. They were in much better condition. They were like, they say the average Neanderthal could pick up a football player and fling him over the goalpost.

I mean, they were just in incredible condition. The muscular structure must have been great. But when God made the world 6,000 years ago, there were two people, but it was full of plants and full of animals.

4,400 years later, it was still full of plants and full of animals and still not full of people. I have no idea what the population was at the time of the flood. This is just a pure guess, whether there were probably a billion people.

If you figure they're living 900 years and having 70 or 80 kids per family, you know, that's what you need, Tanya, about 70 kids. It would be a large population in a hurry, but let's just pick a number and say there was a billion. Why are so few found as fossils? Well, the purpose of the flood, according to Genesis, was to destroy man off the earth.

That's why God did the flood. Bible says there were giants in the earth in those days and there were mighty men of old. So I don't know for sure what that means, but I suspect that might mean that people were actually bigger before the flood came.

We've covered on video two about some of the giant fossil skeletons that have been found. People nine feet tall, 10 feet tall, 12 feet tall. I don't know if everybody was that big or not, but certainly it appears some of them were.

So there are several theories of why so few human bones have been found. Number one, there were less people to be killed. There aren't as many people available.

So you're not gonna find as many bones of them. You're gonna find more animals and more fish and clams and stuff like that. Secondly, people are smarter than animals.

Well, some people. And they would tend to avoid drowning until the last possible minute. Whereas animals would get surprised and covered up and buried, the humans would figure out some way to avoid this.

Plus, it probably took about six months to kill everybody. I mean, the flood covered the world, but it doesn't mean it covered the whole world instantly. It rained 40 days and 40 nights.

And probably what we see today, the continental shapes and everything, obviously is a pure coincidence based on the water level. And everything was flexing up and down during the flood. We covered on video six.

So if the earth was totally different, different configurations, unrecognizable by today's globe, but as the crust of the earth is flexing up and down, the water slowly coming up from the fountains of the deep that

are broken open. The rain was 40 days, but the water kept coming up for 150 days. So if we start with the assumption that during the flood, there were high ground above water may have lasted for six months.

The high ground getting smaller and smaller, and people would run to high ground. And they also have the tide. The moon is causing the tide.

The moon doesn't know or care that there's a flood on the earth. It's just pulling the water up. So the tide may go up, cover an area, and then go down, and people and animals would run to the newly exposed island.

You know, ah, here's high ground, get over there. So we'd find footprints in these mud layers that then would get covered up with the next tide. I mean, every six and a half hours, the tide changes.

High tide to low tide, six hours and 25 minutes average. So as these mud layers are full of footprints, they bake in the sun just for a couple hours, enough to get a skin on them. And then a new mud layer washes in on top from the next tide.

It is highly probable that during this flood, during these first few months of the flood, you would get thousands of layers deposited for multiple reasons we cover on video six. And you may have footprints within each of these layers. Had a guy called into the radio program yesterday, the guy from Sweden that calls in once in a while, you know, to our radio program, evolutionist.

He says, well, we find layers of rock and footprints between the layers. He said, that proves each layer was exposed for thousands of years. No, that proves it was exposed for maybe 30 minutes.

Not proof, it doesn't prove it's exposed for thousands of years. So yes, it's possible to get footprints. And especially if you look at all the, nearly all the footprints are running the same direction.

What would that mean? They're trying to avoid something. They're all going the same way, probably avoiding the flood water. And in Psalm 104, it says the mountains arose, the valley sank down.

So during the flood, the crust of the earth was all broken up into plates and they're much more flexible and movable than they are today. Today, they're kind of locked into position as most of the water is gone that was underneath, that was lubricating this movement. So they get run of high ground.

And then of course, a couple of days later, that may not be high ground. Something else becomes high ground as the plates twist around. So second reason though, people are smarter and probably would avoid drowning.

If they end up on top, they don't rot. I mean, they rot, they don't fossilize. How many buffalo got killed out West in the last 200 years? Like millions, none of them fossilized.

See, things only fossilize if they're buried. So you could have a lot of humans get killed toward the end of the flood or toward the middle of the flood, I guess, and not be fossilized at all. Thirdly, if humans were bigger, they would not be recognized as human.

I mean, if you find a five foot thigh bone, you're not gonna recognize it as a human. And so it must be from a dinosaur cave bay or something. So those are the reasons why so few human fossils have been found.

Fourthly, I'm not sure who's doing the counting. When they say 4,000 have been found, who's counting all these? Marvin Lubinow says that's what he can find in the published record. But how many things have been found that are human fossilized in certain layers, but it doesn't match the established scientific paradigm of the day? And so they say, we better not even report this because you're not allowed to find humans with dinosaurs or else, man, you're gonna lose your job.

You can't go against the evolution theory. It's a carefully protected state religion. I point out no human and chicken bones have been found fossilized together in the same rock strata anywhere in the world.

So that proves humans and chickens did not live at the same time. You know, that's not good logic, okay? We don't have to find the bones together to prove they live together. We don't have to find the footprints together to prove anything either.

No human and chicken footprints have ever been found together. No coelacanth fossils were found for 65 million years of their geologic column. They've got their geologic column and they say, oh, coelacanths lived 65 million years ago.

How do you know? Well, that's the last fossil we found of them. And then they find them still alive. What does that prove? For 65 million years, by their thinking, no coelacanths lived or no coelacanths fossilized.

Obviously, they would say it just happened that none fossilized. Well, it could be that none of the humans fossilized either that were buried or weren't buried deep enough or they haven't been found yet and all kinds of reasons for that. I was in a debate with a former preacher turned atheist one time, the debate over Noah's Ark.

One of his arguments was that Noah could not have built the Ark like the Bible says because the Bible says Noah covered the Ark with pitch. And he said, Hovind, don't you know pitch is made from oil? And oil is a post flood product. According to your theory, the flood buried this world, all these animals got buried and squished and turned to oil.

So if oil came as a result of the flood, then how could Noah have pitch to cover the Ark? Well, that's based on a common misunderstanding. In Genesis six, it says Noah covered the Ark with pitch within and without. Make it with pitch, Exodus two.

Noah or Moses was put in a little basket covered with pitch. So what is pitch? Bible says in Isaiah chapter 34, the streams thereof shall be turned to pitch. The dust to brimstone and the land shall become burning pitch.

It shall not be quenched. The smoke thereof shall go up forever. Pitch, according to the 1828 Robster's Dictionary, which is in the library there, pitch is made from tree sap.

There used to be huge industries taking pine trees, baking them down, getting the sap out and making pitch just for waterproofing ships. Kind of like varnish today or spar varnish or linseed oil. There are many oils and things made that don't have to rely on something from a flood.

It doesn't have to be something that was destroyed in the flood. Pitch, according to the dictionary, the resin of pine or turpentine. And there were giant factories all over America producing barrels and barrels of pitch to sell to ships in the 1800s, 1700s, 1800s.

You bring a few extra barrels of pitch with you, if you get a leak in your ship, you tar it. So it does not have to be from flood-related deposits. I'm holding in my hand, I don't know if you guys can focus in on that or not.

This is a piece of slate or shale, I mean. There are probably 60 layers to it, real thin layers, and you can see oil oozing out the side. But right there on the surface is an exact, it's a fish.

It's true that animals under pressure turn to oil, it's a fact. This fish was squeezed between these layers, and you can see the actual impression of the fish. There's no question that at least some of the oil in the ground comes from organisms, living organisms, fish, you know, people, whatever, that are squeezed.

But that doesn't mean Noah had to have this kind of oil to waterproof the ark. This is on our Creation Evidence Museum if you wanna come down to dinosaur adventure land and take a look at that. Next question.

I often get asked the question, is modern man smart and ancient man stupid? You know, was he stupid or was ancient man really smart? There's a good book called The Puzzle of Ancient Man by Don Chittick. Excellent book. I believe they've had a hard time keeping it in print.

We sell a lot of them, I know, it's really, really good. Going through all kinds of interesting artifacts that are found about humans, made by humans, amazing machines and stuff that would have to be really, really old. Well, the Bible teaches before the flood came, the people lived to be 900 years old.

Adam came pre-programmed straight from the hand of God. He could walk, talk, name the animals and get married first day. He probably knew incredible amounts of information that was pre-programmed in or after spending 100 years walking and talking with God, he just knew a lot of stuff that God told him.

God would say, Adam, you see this tree right here? Watch this, you pull off the bark, scrape the inside and chew on that. Oh wow, yeah, it's got vitamins, you need that, Adam. Probably a lot of the ancient medicines that cultures have are remnants of things left over from knowledge passed down by the ancients.

Like how did the first guy know you can take a willow tree and scrape the bark off and make vitamin C out of the tea? I mean, how did they know that? Who's the first guy to start chewing on a tree? I mean, you gotta wonder, somebody must've told him. So if they're living 900 years and having huge families and learning an incredible amount, I don't know how far advanced they got before the flood came. But I suspect possibly even more advanced than we are today.

And some people say, well, why don't we dig up their cities? Well, the problem is we're looking at things that we need today and assuming that they needed them before the flood. Suppose they lived in a world with perfect weather. You don't need a house, just go sleep on the grass.

Suppose you lived in a world where none of the animals would harm you, all the animals were friendly. Everything's vegetarian, Genesis 1.29. Again, you don't need a house. And why don't we find their cars? Well, man, if you're nine or 10 or 12 feet tall and can run 50 miles an hour and everything's growing in your yard, you don't need to go anywhere anyway.

Why do you need a highway system? Why do you need a car? You don't need airplanes, you don't need trains. So if you can think garden of Eden conditions, the things that they needed would not be the same

things that we need. After the flood, the people were still living to be 400 years old.

So a lot of this knowledge would be retained. Now today, about the time you know everything, you're 80 years old and you die. Now you can't pass it on to anybody else.

But if you could live to be four or 500, you could pass on your knowledge to your great, great, great, great, great, great grandchild. So it'd just be a real, real different world back then. So a lot of this knowledge, I think, went to the grave.

But in the old days, you could go talk to your great, great, great, great grandfather and get advice. And he'd give you some really cool advice on how to do certain things. Many civilizations after the flood would arise very quickly.

If you got a bunch of smart people, Noah's sons, having 15, 20 kids per family or whatever, and they're gonna go off into this area and they're gonna build their own civilization. Well, it wouldn't take them long as long as they've got high IQ. They might not have all the technology.

They might have to make stone tools at first, until they can dig a hole to find the iron to melt it down to make the steel tools. They would know how to do it. It's kind of a Gilligan's Island situation.

But within 50 years, you could build a civilization. Look at Robinson Crusoe, lands on an island. So after 20 years, he's got a whole, got a farm, got a house, got a fort, did it all himself.

So yeah, it doesn't, especially you get smart people in situations like that, you can build a civilization in a hurry. It's interesting, if you study history, all of the ancient civilizations, the Babylonians, the Sumerians, the Greeks, they all are the Chinese. They just arose out of nowhere.

Poof, there's a civilization. There's no evidence of this stuff they teach in school, of them going from hunters and gatherers and grunts and groans, caveman stuff, becoming civilized and building cities. There's no evidence of that.

It's farther back you go, it's all of a sudden, poof, there's the beginning of the Egyptian civilization, the beginning of the Chinese civilization, just like they moved in and built it in less than 100 years. So some strange things have been found in the fossils, as in the ground, that would indicate man used to be really smart. This little airplane, for instance, is in the Smithsonian, I believe.

Right, yeah, in Smithsonian. It was found in a grave in Columbia. It's about 1,000 years old.

But it's an airplane, quite obviously, with all the features of an airplane. But it can't be an airplane, according to the evolutionist, so therefore they have it labeled in the Smithsonian as a stylized insect. Now tell me, does that look like a stylized insect to you? See, they can't admit that ancient man knew about airplanes because that would go against the theory.

The theory says modern man is smart, ancient man was stupid, he was a chimpanzee walking on Thor most of the time, slowly came up, and here we are today, the gods of the universe. That's the thinking in their mind. Actually, the evidence shows the opposite of that.

Here's an airplane, again, found in an Egyptian tomb, this time, 2,100 years old, pre-Christ. How did they know about airplanes? A little model airplane, they knew about flight. This iron pot, we've got a model of it here, was found inside a lump of coal.

This is a replica, you can get a replica from Carl Ball. They're breaking open a lump of coal and there's an iron pot inside. They examine the coal that comes out and it's molded right to the pot on both sides.

I mean, the coal formed around the iron pot. What would you conclude? That a coal miner dropped it? No, because then the coal won't be conformed to the pot. I would conclude that they had iron and were making iron vessels before the flood.

During the flood, they got buried in a forest of trees and squished and turned to coal, and of course, it's not gonna affect the iron any. How do you get an iron pot and lump of coal? Ancient man must have been smart, not primitive. In Peru, they've got giant stone walls like the one in the picture here.

These stone walls are phenomenal. Some of the rocks in there are so huge, we can't even move them today. There's more in the Puzzle of Ancient Man about that topic if you wanna read more, but one of the stones down in Peru weighs 20,000 tons.

Now to give you an idea how big that is, the largest crane on earth today can lift 3,000 tons. I think they just built one in Japan, if I recall, for unloading ships. I just heard about it in 2003 or four that can lift 6,000 tons.

There's something like that, that may be the new, somebody's gonna say, oh, Hovind, you're wrong, it's more, 3,000's wrong, you're lying. I'm not lying, I just don't know. I think it's 6,000 tons now, okay? But still, they've got stones up here that weigh 20,000 tons.

How did they move that? Who did it and how did they do it? I don't think it's logical to say ancient man was primitive. They must have known something we don't know today. Like this guy said, what is truly impossible about the block is that it's the size of a five-story house and weighs 20,000 tons.

We have no combination of machinery today that could dislodge such a weight, let alone move it. We can't even break it loose from the ground, let alone move it, we can't do it. This bell was found inside a lump of coal in West Virginia.

The guy who had it on his desk for years later moved to Central Florida and I've not been able to, he's an old man now, I've not been able to get ahold of him lately, so if you get his address, let me know because I think he needs to have that on display at a creation museum in Pensacola, Florida, that's what I think. This thing was analyzed and they said, this is some kind of strange old, like a Buddhist type god on top of here. But how could you find a brass bell inside coal? Ancient man knew how to work with all the metals.

Bible says Tubalcain was an artificer in brass and iron. That's Adam's grandson. They were already working with brass and iron.

This is a little zinc and silver vessel, was found inside rock, supposed to be 600 million years old. Well, I disagree with the 600 million year part, but they knew about things. There's a great article in the Puzzle of Ancient Man about the little device found in a ship that was sunk in 100 BC in the Aegean Sea, which is right next to Greece, okay? It's got an analog computer on board.

How on earth did they know about analog computers in 100 BC? It's called the Antikythera device, Antikythera mechanism. The History Channel in March of 2005 was amazing. It had a whole hour-long message about this Antikythera device found in Greece.

They actually built a working model of it and said this thing, by turning the crank, would be able to predict where the planets would be or the sun would be. It'd be like an amazing computer for ships navigating. 100 BC.

No, ancient man was not primitive. You can get copies of this hammer from our museum. This, Dr. Baugh has the original in his museum.

He lets us make replicas of it. This was found in 1934 in Texas, New London, Texas. When they first found the hammer, the handle was petrified, what was left of it, and they looked at the hammer and said, man, it was in solid rock.

Said, what on earth? How can a hammer be in rock? And the rock was supposed to be 400 million years old. So, of course, guys who believe in evolution would say, well, that just proves aliens visited the planet 400 million years ago and one of them dropped his hammer. I mean, that's the kind of logic they use.

Instead of thinking, you know, maybe our whole time scale's wrong. They will never consider that. They cut a little notch in the hammer with a file in 1934 to see what kind of metal it was.

It is still not rusted, the notch. It's a type of a stainless steel. Battelle Laboratory analyzed it and said it's 96% iron, 2.6% chlorine, and 3.25% sulfur.

And then they said, you know, we don't think you can get those elements to combine unless you do it under a much stronger magnetic field. Probably the pre-flood earth had a magnetic field eight or 10 times stronger than what we have today. This was found in Iraq, this little battery.

Quite a few of these were found. They knew about electricity 2,000 years ago. The Egyptians apparently knew about electricity.

Here's a hieroglyphic showing snakes in some kind of chamber hook with a wire going to a little generator of some kind. We don't know. There are two theories.

One is they are using electricity to mummify the snake or do something, or they're using electric eels to produce electricity. I don't know which way the electricity's going, or even if it's electricity. But I think we've got the wrong idea to say modern man is smart and ancient man was stupid.

I think ancient man knew a lot. They knew about brain surgery. Quite a few skulls are found like this, this process is called treponing.

They would actually cut into somebody's head, and many are found with the hole healed over, which indicates the patient lived. I mean, cutting a hole in the head is no big deal. But some of the ica stones from Peru show what appears to be brain surgery.

Dr. Dennis Swift, who spoke at our boot camp in 2004, has some of the instruments, the hardened copper instruments that they would use for brain surgery or for surgery period. Ancient man knew how to do all kinds of things with people's heads, besides cut them open and let them heal. They did make strange shapes to the heads.

They apparently did heart surgery from some of the ica stones anyway. It appears that they're doing open heart surgery. Here's a guy with an artificial limb attached.

So they knew about that. That would have been 2,000 years ago. This little machine appears to be some kind of steam engine.

They might have known about some kind of power like that 2,000 years ago. They certainly knew about the wheel. This little cat was found on wheels to move around a little kid's toy, apparently, in some of the inca Indian tombs.

They knew certainly were smart as far as biology goes. This little spider is one of the little nothing. It's 150 feet tall.

It's one of the Nazca line images. We cover some of that on video too. But they knew that to make this spider with no eyes, because it's blind, these little spiders are extremely rare.

It's only an eighth of an inch long and it lives in caves, in the dark, in the Amazon, 1,000 miles away from where the drawing is. So they really knew about their biology. And they knew to make the one leg longer and it's the correct leg too.

Third leg down on the right, on the right side. That leg, during mating season for 15 seconds, that one leg grows longer and exchanges DNA off the tip of that leg. And they knew that.

So they were not ancient, not stupid. They were ancient, but they're not stupid. This Piraeus map of 1513 shows Antarctica with no ice on it.

How did they know to, first of all, how did they find Antarctica? How did they know to map it with no ice? Something was different, okay? This metallic sphere was found in South Africa. It has three parallel grooves around the equator, but it was found in what they said was pre-Cambrian material, 2.8 billion years old. Well, of course, I disagree with the 2.8 billion years.

It's a human artifact, quite obviously, found in rock, supposed to be 2.8 billion years old. But see, rather than question, you know, maybe it's not 2 billion years old. Guys like Michael Cremo, who wrote the great book on stuff like this, they're called OOPART, Out of Place Artifacts, O-O-P-A-R-T.

He said he studies all kinds of these things. Now he's a Hindu. Michael Cremo has the book, Hidden History of the Human Race.

He says this proves aliens came and visited the earth 2.8 billion years ago. Rather than question, maybe the whole geologic column is wrong. They just, I don't know why, they're not allowed to question that.

His book's called The Hidden History of the Human Race. It's in our library if you wanna read that. Here's a mortar and pestle, you know, to grind wheat or grind flour with, grind corn.

The problem is, it's in rock, supposed to be 33 to 55 million years old, way before man got here. So what do you conclude? Well, again, aliens came, visited the planet. These little spirals were found.

The thing that's amazing about these little spirals, they're made of tungsten, very difficult metal to work with, very difficult to refine. And these things are three 10,000ths of an inch, three 10,000ths of a millimeter in diameter. And it follows the perfect golden mean ratio.

Same thing used in the Fibonacci sequence, one to 1.618. How do they know about that? A lot of these are found in Russia. Probably if you get over there, bring me some of these, I want some of these for the

museum. These little amazing little spirals.

There's all kinds of stuff on the internet about that if you wanna read it. Well, what about the pyramid? Who built the Great Pyramid? If we think an ancient man is dumb, how did they build the Big Pyramid? There are 66 copies of the original, apparently. There appear to be 67 of these giant stone pyramids found around the world.

Who built them and why? Well, there's not much question on the 66 copies. Who built them? It was the Egyptians or the South American, Mayan Indians or something. Who built that original one? The original pyramid is often called the Great Pyramid.

It is by far the largest of the pyramids and it's very different in that there are no inscriptions found in it other than a few marks the builders apparently made. You know, put this rock on top of this one. But all the rest of the pyramids in Egypt have all kinds of hieroglyphics.

You know, this is King Herman, the greatest guy that ever lived, blah, blah, blah. Not this one. The greatest pyramid, the biggest building on earth by far, has no inscriptions.

Who built it? Why was it built? Well, there are four theories about the Great Pyramid and they fall into two general categories. One theory says it was built before the flood by some godly people, i.e., Adam, Enoch, maybe, I don't know. And the purpose of it was to preserve some ancient knowledge because there are some amazing mathematical formulas in the pyramid.

Like, you know, twice the height divided by the base is the value of pi, 3.14159. I forget. There's all kinds of amazing mathematics in the Great Pyramid. So one theory says it was built by godly people before the flood.

Second theory says it's built by heathen before the flood. It's just a heathen structure, some kind of temple worship or something. The third theory says it's built by godly people after the flood.

And the fourth one says it's built by heathen after the flood. Probably it was not built during the flood. I think we could probably all agree on that, okay? Not a good time to build a pyramid.

I kind of lean toward number one, but I wouldn't prove that. I couldn't prove it and wouldn't be dogmatic about it. I think some godly people, probably Enoch, built this pyramid to preserve the gospel story.

One of the theories on all this is, of course, Adam, Adam did not have a Bible. So God gave him the gospel story in the stars. This is what many people think, and I kind of lean that way, but I'm willing to discuss it.

Noah did not have a Bible. And if the canopy was gone that used to protect him and probably amplified the light so they could see the stars better before the flood, you know, 20 inches or 30 inches of ice, compacted, super frozen, like we talked about on video two, that canopy before the flood would have actually made it easier to see the stars and they could actually hear the music of the stars, the Zodiac, that's one of the theories. But Noah didn't have a Bible.

He had a couple chapters because Adam actually wrote part of Genesis. Okay, we cover that in the Teledos coming up here soon. But, so God gave them the gospel in stone.

This is how the, it preaches good, whether it's true or not, I don't know. But basically there used to be the gospel in stars. Then there was a gospel in stone.

And today we have the gospel in scripture, the three different way. Now let's assume that there may be some truth to that and go from there. If there isn't, it's not a big deal.

I won't lose any sleep over it. But the Great Pyramid is an amazing structure. By far the largest building on the planet today.

Still largest building in the world, built bigger than anything ever built by man since. Some people think the Isaiah 1919 passage is referring to the pyramid. It says, in that day there should be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt and a border, a pillar at the border thereof.

And it should be for a sign and a witness. There are quite a few folks who think that the pyramid is this, this is it. Because that there's, the teaching goes that Egypt split into two kingdoms, Northern and Southern Kingdom.

And they were fighting in a civil war kind of stuff. And this pyramid is right on the border. And then when they united, it's now in the midst thereof.

So it is both at the border and in the midst. Otherwise, how could a building be that way? Now, of course, the Jehovah's Witnesses have gone crazy with the pyramid. There are all kinds of books by Jehovah's Witnesses thinking, oh, this prophesies everything and proves Jehovah's Witnesses are right, you know.

And they kind of take it to real wild extremes. And there are many books available on the pyramid, some of which are absolutely loony. But it's very interesting reading.

The pyramid is a huge building. It goes up four sides to the top and the top stone was never installed. If you look at the diagram here, there's only one door into the pyramid.

Nobody could find the door until 800 AD. That pyramid sat there for thousands of years and nobody could find their way in. Finally, in 800 AD, some Arabs got a hammer and chisel and just started pounding a hole, chiseled their way into the pyramid.

They chiseled and chiseled for months. And the guy kept telling his workers, oh, there's gonna be lots of gold in here. You're all gonna be rich, you know, blah, blah, blah.

Well, finally, after months and months of chiseling, everybody's getting tired of going in, you know, digging a hole in the rock, okay? Because it was solid rock. Finally, they were close to giving up and they heard a noise of a rock falling. And he said, oh, it came from over that way.

Let's chisel there. They chiseled over and they hit one of the passages in the middle and they had to work their way backwards to find the door. Had they known where it was, they could have walked up and just pushed it right open.

But nobody could find this door for centuries. Well, once they found the pyramid and mapped it out, you see it's got an entrance where the A is. The entrance, only one entrance in.

It immediately takes you on the broad road down to the pit, letter C. Or you can take a choice to make a turn and go up channel E there, up the narrow road that goes to the king's chamber. So your choice is the

broad way that leads to the pit or the narrow way that leads to the king's chamber. Now that'll preach.

It sounds like there's a little gospel in there somewhere, right? If you get to the king's chamber, you find yourself in an empty tomb where nobody ever rotted. No body's decomposed in there. And it's on the 50th row of stones.

What's that all mean? I don't know. There's a grand gallery that some people think has marks along the way that in those marks, if they go by pyramid inches, which is a little bigger than our inch, the pyramid inch, they say each one marks a year and they say on this grand gallery that it's got marked off where World War I is, World War II, major events through world history are supposedly marked off in the grand gallery. That's some of the stuff you read in these books when you read about the pyramid.

It's the largest building by far. It contains enough stone to build a 10 foot high brick wall all the way around Texas or France. They're about the same size.

10 foot high brick wall around Texas. The top of the pyramid is 455 feet high. The 50th row of stones, which is interesting, the 50th year of Jubilee, the 50th row of stones is where the king's chamber is.

And those who teach that the pyramid has Christian symbolism, of course, will jump on this type of thing. The broad way, the narrow way, the king's chamber, et cetera. Or you go down to the pit.

In the king's chamber is an empty tomb. I was told, I didn't check it out, maybe it's not correct, but it has the same volume, this empty tomb, as the Ark of the Covenant. Take the length times the width times the height, that equals the volume of the Ark of the Covenant.

Maybe somebody can check it out and let me know if that's correct. But originally, the pyramid was covered by 144,000 smooth, polished casing stones. Each one weighed about, I believe they said 10 tons were the casing stones.

They fit together so tightly, in many cases, you couldn't even find the seam. And in all cases, I was told, you can't even get a piece of paper between them. Imagine a 10-ton stone fitting together with the next one so tightly, you can't even get paper between it.

No mortar. I mean, today, we build brick walls and put mortar in there and you can look at the brick on the house here. Some of them are straight and some of them are not too straight.

Brick layers get in a little bit of a hurry. These stones are massive and they didn't even use mortar and they fit together flawlessly. And the top stone was never installed.

And those who teach it's a Christian building or Christian principles in there say 144,000, Revelation chapter seven, 144,000. Bible talks about the whole body fitly joined together. And they'll say, see, this is evidence that it has some Christian symbolism.

Well, maybe it does. I don't know. Ephesians chapter four, the whole body fitly joined together.

Matthew 21 talks about the stone that the builders rejected. Now the great pyramid never did have a chief cornerstone. Imagine the largest, neatest building on the planet, no cornerstone.

Why would they stop one rock short? Why didn't they finish the job? Well, I don't know. There are a couple of theories about that. But in Mark 12, it talks about the scripture.

Scripture says, the stone that the builders rejected. Luke 20, the stone that the builders rejected, the same has become the head of the corner. This is obviously referring to Jesus Christ.

And Daniel tells about the stone that was cut out of the mountain without hands and smote the image on the feet in the book of Daniel. Could this stone be Jesus Christ? Who's gonna make his own kingdom on the world? Revelation 21 talks about the new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven. There are those who teach that the new Jerusalem, the city, and the Bible tells us the great city, the holy Jerusalem descending out of heaven will be clear as crystal, four square, and 12,000 furlongs, that's 1,379 miles.

So there's gonna be a city in Revelation 21 that is 1,300 or 1,400 miles by 1,400 miles by 1,400 miles. And everybody assumes it's going to be a cube. Maybe so, I don't know.

But maybe it's a pyramid, because that's a structure that could also have those dimensions and it would lie four square. And if it's a pyramid, pyramids only have one cornerstone, right on top, whereas other buildings would have four. So there are those who teach that the great pyramid, the new Jerusalem's going to be in the shape of a great pyramid, and Jesus Christ is the chief cornerstone, and he is the light of the world.

And if the whole thing's clear as crystal, then the light just kind of translucent, the light goes right through. So he is the light. The first 13 verses in the Bible starts off with this, the world has light, but it has no sun.

The last 26 verses of the Bible, the world has light, but it has no sun. He is the light thereof. And so maybe the pyramid is symbolic of that, I don't know, I just got a good book on that if you wanna read it.

And of course, if any of this is true, it's obvious Satan would use this as a perverted for his use, and the great pyramid on the back of your dollar bill is a Masonic Lodge symbol, which has 13 rows of stones representing the 13 degrees in the blue lodge. The chief cornerstone is not yet in place, and many people say this represents Lucifer, and he's gonna come down and establish his kingdom, when actually, God's gonna establish his kingdom toward the end. But which one's right, I don't know.

I kind of lead toward number one, but I wouldn't be dogmatic, the Bible isn't clear. Next question, the textbooks often teach the earth was a hot molten mass. This earth science book says, as the earth formed, it was hot, and there were large pools of bubbling lava.

Well, now the Bible says in Genesis chapter one, that the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. So, was the earth a hot molten mass, and it slowly cooled down over billions of years, or was it created under water, which means, of course, it has to be less than 212 degrees. It's not a hot molten mass.

Somebody's wrong. Either the Bible is wrong, or the textbooks are wrong about the earth being a hot molten mass. So, what is the evidence, what's the truth about this? One of the neatest books on this topic is this one we referred to earlier by Robert Gentry, called Creation's Tiny Mystery.

He spent years studying radio polonium halos, which are little tiny rings that are only visible with a microscope, and they're found in granites. Every type of granite all over the world contains these little radio polonium halos, little tiny circles in the rock. Well, what are they? Well, polonium is one of the many elements on the periodic table.

As polonium decays, it's radioactive, it's dropping to another level, it sends off little fragments, kind of like a hand grenade. The problem is polonium has a really, really short half-life, like 164 thousandths of a

second. So, if this was taking place in hot molten rock, it would decay, the polonium would decay, poof, make its little halo, and the rock is liquid, so it would disappear, it would flow away.

Just like the fireworks from the 4th of July, don't stay there in the sky all year. It goes up, poof, makes a little ring, and then falls down. But if you could explode a hand grenade in a giant block of jello, the fragments would go out, and stick, and be preserved.

The only way you could preserve a ring, a halo, would be to do it in something that is, you know, like a giant block of jello, or in something already solid. The way to get these little polonium halos preserved, which are found all over the world, is to do it while the rock is already solid. Robert Gentry was writing all kinds of articles about this, radio polonium halos, saying, look, you know, this indicates the earth was never a hot molten rock.

And granite is an interesting rock. I don't think anybody knows for sure how granite formed. If you melt granite, and then let it cool down, it does not turn back to granite.

It turns to rhyolite. You see a picture of rhyolite here. So, all the granites have these polonium halos.

What does that mean? Apparently, granite was the original created foundation stone. That was the original created rock. It's the only way to get these little halos in there that I know.

You can talk to Robert Gentry. His website is halos.com, and get much more of the technical information on this. So, I think the evidence would point to the fact the earth was never a hot molten rock.

And then, NOVA TV program, they ran an article in the summer of 05. They said, oxygen 18 found in 4.4 billion year old zircons show it had contact with large quantities of water. Why don't they get it? If these little zircon crystals, which are extremely tiny, have evidence show us that they had contact with large quantities of water, 4.4 billion years old.

I don't buy that, of course, for a second. But their own evidence ought to show them the earth was never a hot molten mass. Never.

Often in seminars, I get asked the question, what about global warming? Is the earth really getting hotter? Well, I don't know. I've lived on it for 53 years now, but to me it seems about the same as it's always been. Of course, that's a short time frame compared to the big picture.

According to the first Corinthians, it says the earth is the Lord's, God owns the world. Psalmist said, Psalm 8, when I consider the heavens, God made the heavens, and he made man to have dominion over them. Our job is to be the tenant.

God's the owner, he's the landlord, we're the tenant. Our job is to take care of his earth. It doesn't belong to us, but we're supposed to take care of it.

Belongs to him. Now Karl Marx in his communist manifesto gave 10 ways to destroy a capitalist country and turn it into a communist country. Number one was abolish private property.

That was essential to destroy capitalism. Nobody's allowed to have private property. Well, if you read through the Bible in Leviticus 25, it talks about in the 50th year, they have the year of Jubilee.

You proclaim liberty throughout the land and everybody returns to his possession. There's a good link here between liberty and having your own possessions. See, if you own it, you control it.

So if God created the world, he owns it. He controls it and he's let man use it for his glory. And there are those who don't like that idea.

Guys like Karl Marx and communists, they think, no, the world belongs to us, you know, and we control it, there is no God. But in first Kings, it talks about having your own vine, your own fig tree, drink water out of your own cistern, running waters out of your own well. Private property is essential to liberty.

And Peter Burrell said, we reject the idea of private property. Kids in school today are having pledges like this. Talk about stupid.

This kind of stuff's on the walls of many public schools. I pledge allegiance to the earth, which I do love and depend on, and to all life on land, air and sea, which is as much a part of earth as me. This one says, I pledge allegiance to the world, to care for earth, sea and air, to honor every living thing with peace and justice everywhere.

Jacob Bredstead told me a couple of years ago, he said when he was in third grade in elementary school in Minnesota, his teacher, Ms. Klopocki, took down the American flag and had the third graders pledge to the earth instead. Can you imagine? Boys and girls, we're gonna pledge to the world today. We're starting these kids in third grade.

Half the cartoons on Saturday morning TV now are that kind of way, you know, destroy the mean old capitalists, you know, that are destroying the world and save the planet, you know, Captain Planet. There's all kinds of cartoons designed to get the kids thinking that, you know, we gotta save the earth. Well, I am against pollution and I'm against destroying things unnecessarily, okay? But the real purpose of this environmental movement and the big scare about global warming is not to save the earth.

The purpose is to establish communist plank number one, abolish private property. They want you to have to get a permit to cut down a tree on your own property. One guy in California had this tree was growing, obviously, into his house.

And it was crushing the front porch. The house was 100 and some years old and had been planted and the tree was growing and was caving in the front porch. So he went to get a permit to cut down the tree.

And they said, you can't cut down the tree because, you know, the trees are protected. He said, well, then I need to get a permit to remodel my porch. They said, no, that's a house is 100 years old.

That's a historic building. You can't remodel the porch. Talk about stupid.

Why go ask for a permit at all? Well, that's what starts the problem. But see, once people sign a contract to become a servant of whoever, now you're under contractual law. You know, if you sign a contract to become 501c3, well, then you better do everything they tell you to do.

Okay? So don't sign the contract. Don't get yourself tangled up in those things. And that gets difficult to do.

But there's a good book on the global warming question if you want to read more. It's called Facts, Not Fear. I'm sure it's available lots of places, but Marilyn Quayle, Dan Quayle's wife, former vice president, wrote the forward to it.

What is the real evidence about global warming? And you can take a look through that if you'd like. It's in our library or order your own if you'd like. They said in a magazine that man-made rainforest baffles scientists.

They said, a man-made rainforest that should have taken millennia to evolve has baffled scientists by springing up in just 150 years. This business of us destroying the planet and destroying these ancient rainforests and, you know, oh, we're gonna ruin the world and the sky is falling is, I think, baloney. And there are a lot of environmentalists that are probably very sincere, very intelligent, and very wrong.

And they're fighting the wrong battle. Now, it's true, people abuse the environment. And when somebody's dumping chemicals upstream from my house, you know, I'm gonna sue them and say, don't dump that in my water supply, okay? That's fine.

But if there's an environmental problem, is the government the one to fix it? Show me anything they fixed. If they fix it, it'll cost 10 times more than it should and probably still won't be right. I do believe in global warming, though.

The Bible says in Revelation 16, the fourth angel poured out his vial upon the sun and the power was given to him to scorch men with fire. There's gonna be global warming. Hasn't happened yet.

Coming soon to a city near you.