

Outside the Classroom Facts

Radiometric Dating

The concept of radiometric dating is dependent upon the fact that there are many things that change character under different circumstances. Iron rusts and becomes iron oxide, fruit ripens and becomes edible and delicious, wood rots and becomes unusable in its final state, etc. Along this same line of thinking many elements and compounds change into different elements and compounds. For instance; some forms of potassium change into ordinary calcium plus argon gas, several forms of uranium decay down into helium, electrons and lead, etc. There are more than 1200 elements and compounds that do this. The logical question is, "How can this fact be used?" The answer is that if some of these elements and/or compounds can be found in the rocks found on and in the earth then perhaps the age of the earth can be determined. This has been discovered to be true but it turns out that volcanic lavas are the only rocks that DO have any elements that can be used for dating. This process is called Radiometric Dating. Layered rocks, such as those left by flood waters and are so evident in the Grand Canyon, do not contain any decay elements so are dated by determining their relationship to volcanic lavas. This is called Relative Dating.

It should be apparent that some assumptions must be made in order to do Radiometric Dating since the lavas do not have built in clocks that reveal time directly. Four assumptions must be made. They are:

- (1) The number of atoms of the original radioactive material (the parent) is known;
- (2) The number of atoms of the resulting element or compound is known (the daughter). No daughter atoms must be assumed present in the original sample since there is no known way to accurately guess this quantity if it exists;
- (3) Nothing has happened in the past to change this number artificially such as by leaching or adding atoms;
- (4) The rate at which the parent changes into the daughter (this is defined as the half-life) is known and been constant. Ten times the half-life gives the approximate maximum age the particular element can be used to measure except for C14. Recent improvements in the C14 measurement techniques have extended this number to about 16 times the half life.

It should be noted that the techniques for measuring these quantities are highly developed and accurate so that any errors occur because of the assumptions. The most commonly used elements are:

Parent	changes into	Daughter	Approx. Max. Age Determination
Carbon14		Nitrogen 14 (Carbon 12 is natural carbon.)	90,000 years
Potassium 40		Argon40 and common Calcium	8.4 billion years
Samarium 62		Neodymium 60	14.8 billion years
Rubidium 87		Strontium 87	10.6 billion years
Uranium 238		Lead 206 plus Helium and electrons in 14 steps	45.0 billion years
Uranium 235		Lead 207 plus Helium and electrons in 11 steps	7.0 billion years
Thorium 232		Lead 208 plus Helium and electrons in 12 steps	14.1 billion years

The following two radiometric elements are not used for practical reasons but are included to point out that some elements change in very short times.

Radium 226	Radon 222 plus Helium	3 ½ minutes
Polonium 214	Lead 210 plus Helium	.0015 seconds

Particularly note that Carbon 14 dating can only measure things that are very young compared to the other dating methods.

The final decision as to the accuracy and feasibility of a measurement technique is determined by the results or, in other words, do they make sense. It was stated earlier that only volcanic lavas have any of the elements used for Radiometric Dating. There are at least two ways to determine the validity of this method of dating. One is to find a rock sample that contains several different types of radiometric elements and compare the results; and second, get samples from active volcanoes where the age of the rock is known and determine how closely this method agrees.

For the first test two examples come to mind, both from the Grand Canyon. Example one is from a volcano on the north rim of the canyon that has the lava running over the side of the canyon. Five different types of radiometric material were detected in this lava. The results are as follows:

Potassium- Argon dating said it was	841 Million years old
Rubidium-Strontium dating said it was	1,060 Million years old
Samarium-Neodymium dating said it was	1,379 Million years old
Uranium-Lead dating said it was	1,250 Million years old
Thorium-lead dating said it was	1,250 Million years old

These disturbing results indicate an age discrepancy of 538 Million years. What is the true age of this volcanic eruption? Perhaps the second example will yield better results. This second example is from the Cardenas basalt (a lava intrusion at the bottom of the canyon). The result is as follows:

Potassium-Argon dating gave an age of	516 Million years
Rubidium-Strontium dating gave an age of	1,111 Million years
Samarium-Neodymium dating gave an age of	1,588 Million years

This sample gave an even worse discrepancy in that it was 1,072 Million years. Based upon these results there is an obvious problem. Perhaps the second suggested test method will do better.

For this test lava was taken from active volcanoes where the exact time of the eruption is known and therefore the age of the rock. Obviously the lava was allowed to cool before sampling so the different elements in the sample could be considered constant. Ten examples are given.

Location	Lava age at time taken	Dating method	Results
Hualalai volcano, Hawaii	163 years	K-Ar	160 million to 3 billion years
Kilauea volcano, Hawaii	164 years	K-Ar	22 million years
C.S.Noble & J.J. Naughton, "Deep Ocean Basalts: Inert Gas Content and Uncertainties in Age Dating." Science, Vol. 162, p265			
Mt. Ngauruhoe, New Zealand	42 years	K-Ar	less than 279,000 years (sample A1)
	42 years	K-Ar	1 million to 1.6 million years (A2)
	42 years	K-Ar	3.7 million to 3.3 million years (B1)

42 years	K-Ar	.6 million to 1 million years (B2)
42 years	K-Ar	1 million to 1.4 million years (C)
21 years	K-Ar	800,000 to 1.2 million years (A)
21 years	K-Ar	less than 270,000 years (B)

Andrew Snelling, *Radioactive Dating Failure*. Creation Ex Nihilo, 22(1): 18-21, Dec. 1999

Mt. St. Helens, Oregon 16 years K-Ar 350,000 to 2,800,000 years (5 samples)

Steve A. Austin, "Excess Argon Within Mineral Concentrates from the New Dactite Lava Dome at Mt. St. Helens Volcano". Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal, Vol. 10, No. 3 (1996), pp.335-344.

These results reveal that radiometric dating techniques of fresh lavas are useless and brings some incredible observations. For instance, it seems reasonable to assume that the correction factor for the lava samples that give the age as 270,000 years is = 21/270,000. But this indicates that the earth is only (21/270,000) X 4.5 billion years = 350,000 years old. Using this same approach the Mt. St. Helens data reveals the earth to be between 25,700 and 205,700 years old and using the Kilauea volcano example the earth is only 33,500 years old. Is it logical to maintain that the age of an unknown rock can be accurately determined when it cannot be done for a rock of known age?

The obvious next question is, "Are there any other indicators of the earth's age that indicate it may be young rather than old?" Believe it or not the answer is a loud "YES." **There are presently over 120 known indicators of the earth's age but only 10% indicate an old earth and therefore 90% indicate a young earth.** My first reaction is why is the emphasis on 10% of the data rather than 90%? How can this be justified as good honest science? A few of these young earth indicators are given below.

1. The Helium content of the earth's atmosphere due to radiometric decay would have accumulated in less then 15,000 years at the present generation rate.

2. It is known that the earth's magnetic field is quickly decaying. Calculations reveal that the earth's age is somewhere between 6 and 10 thousand years old. Fifteen thousand years ago calculations, based upon the present rate of decay, estimate the field would have been equal to that of a sunspot. It is inconceivable that any kind of life could have existed under those conditions for very long.

3. All of the sediments found in the ocean could have accumulated from rivers in 14 million years at the present flow rate of 20 billion tons per year.

4. Present calculations show that the sediments in the ocean are equivalent to about the present land mass. At the present sedimentation rate of the rivers, 14 million years ago the land mass would have had to to be double what it is now. There is no indication of this.

5. There are many different elements carried into the ocean by the rivers. Based upon this the oceans have to be :

For nickel	only 18,000 years old
For copper	50,000 years old
For Uranium	10 to 100 thousand years old
For gold	500,000 years old
For silicon	8,000 years old
For salt	62 million years old (Recognize that even if this were the age of the earth it would not be long enough for the theory of evolution to be valid.)

6. The earth is slowing down in its spin rate which means it was spinning faster in the past. The day-night cycle would have been only 23 hours long about 1.5 million years ago. The earth would have

been destroyed long before then by centrifugal force. The earth bulges at the equator now because of centrifugal force.. The moon also affects this bulge.

7. Using present population growth rates of 1.73% and a life span of 43 years the population of the earth should have been 9.9 billion people just 8,000 years ago. The present population is 5.3 billion people with an increase of 93 million people per year. It should be recognized that the earth must be young because it cannot support this many people even now with our highly developed agricultural practices..

8. About 25 years ago some scientists, in spite of conventional thinking, decided to use Carbon 14 dating on dinosaur bones to determine their age. Remember that Carbon 14 dating can only measure ages less than about 90,000 years. They collected dinosaur bones from 10 different sites across the US. The bones were dated between 9,900 and 23,000 years old.

9. In the March, 2005 issue of Science it was reported that soft tissue and blood were discovered from a Tyrannosaurus Rex. DNA experts maintain that DNA cannot exist more than 10,000 years in a natural environment. The proteins in living organisms are chiral (left and right handed) in nature and consist of only left handed molecules. Equal numbers of these two molecules exist in nature. When an organism dies the molecules start changing to this equilibrium state. This means dinosaurs were on the earth very recently. There is other evidence supporting this idea that dinosaurs existed upon the earth very recently. They lived with man.

As just noted, this is not an isolated instance. There is a list of 41 other examples published on the web site <www.icr.org/soft-tissue-list/> The author, Brian Thomas, researched the scientific literature and has written an article "Published Reports of Original Soft Tissue Fossils" and it was posted on the ICR web site on July 21, 2011. The article quotes only non-secular sources. The evolutionary age of the samples varied from 10 to 360 million years old. Doesn't this reveal that the dates assigned to the geologic column need serious re-examining because they are much too high.

10. Rather than continuing to give more examples (there are many) some recent discoveries will settle the issue. The Institute for Creation Research gathered a group of PhD scientists, which they called the RATE Commission) to carefully examine existing radiometric dating techniques. They came up with some rather interesting results which confirmed that the earth's strata are indeed young. The reason behind the dating discrepancies seems to be that the rate of decay varied in the past rather widely.

Remember back on page 3 that Uranium and Thorium decayed down into Lead plus Helium. An investigation was conducted to determine if any Helium could be detected in the rocks. It was known that Helium readily diffuses (leaks out) of diamonds and zircons and should NOT be present if the rocks were as old as the Uranium-Lead dating indicated. The results were startling. Abundant Helium was found indicating the rocks were very young. The only reason for such data was and is that the decay rate mentioned on page 3 and assumed constant was not constant. This raised the question as to whether Carbon 14 dating could be used effectively on materials that were assumed to be too old to be dated using this method. They were able to detect Carbon 14 and unexpectedly, Helium, in diamonds, zircons and coal. Conventional thinking says that diamonds and zircons are assumed to have formed about 1 to 3 billion years ago and coal about 100 to 400 million years ago. **Remember that the presence of the Carbon 14 indicates the samples could not be more than 90,000 years old.** It

is recognized that the earth must be billions of years old for molecules to man evolution to take place.

Using the data from Carbon 14 dating and the diffusion rate of helium the diamonds, zircons and coal were calculated to be in the order of 6,000 years old.

At this particular writing these results have been investigated but not refuted.

We have been so saturated with the idea that the earth's strata took millions of years to be laid down it is hard to conceive of them as being young in spite of the evidence. The eruption of Mt. St. Helens in September, 1980 has revealed that this can be a reality. A canyon that is one fortieth the size of the Grand Canyon was cut overnight. This implies that the Grand Canyon could have been cut in weeks rather than millions of years. Remember that there is much at stake in keeping the age of the earth's strata old if macro-evolution is assumed true.

The Age of the Universe Problem

At this point you probably agree that the earth's strata deposition may have occurred recently and so are young but what about the heavens. Don't they negate all of the above information? Unfortunately, there is not the overwhelming evidence just quoted about the age of the earth but there is enough conflicting evidence regarding the age of the universe to indicate something is wrong with the present ideas of determining the age of the universe. Consider the following facts.

1. Studies of the spirals of galaxies and logic indicate that the closer you get to the center of the spiral the faster the stars are moving around the center of the galaxy. The speed at which they are traveling has been determined and indicates that the spirals should be a blur or should barely exist, if at all, if the universe is 10 billion years old. The sharp images observed indicate that even a few hundred million years should produce the blurring effect.

2. Comets are supposed to be 4.5 billion years old but every time they come close to the sun they lose some of their material. Observations are that the loss is so much that they cannot survive much longer than about 100,000 years. Many observed comets are thought to be less than 10,000 years old. In an attempt to explain this, the Oort cloud and Kuiper belt have been proposed. There is no evidence supporting either of these assumptions.

3. There are too few supernova remnants (an exploding star) in the heavens. A supernova remnant forms about every 25 years. There are only 270 visible which implies that the universe is the very young age of only 6750 years ($270 \times 25 = 6750$). If the heavens are 100,000 years old there should be at least 4,000 visible.

4. Dr. Pence of Johns Hopkins University reports that the team leader of a project to determine the age of the universe using the Hubble telescope said, "We expected the image (outer limits of space) to be covered wall to wall by faint red stars. There was just a handful there. This was a disaster for the whole way that astronomers are developing the idea of an old universe." Doesn't this confirm not only that the universe must be much younger than previously thought and also that there still are problems in determining the age of the universe.

5. The magnetic fields of planets and moons in our solar system are much too strong to be consistent with an age of billions of years. They should all be close to or zero by now.

6. Jupiter and Neptune have been found to radiate twice as much energy as they receive from the sun. If the planets are assumed to be billions of years old they should be cold by now. An age of thousands of years agrees with the observed condition which means the universe is young.

7. The moon is presently moving away from the earth at about 1.5 inches per year and was thought to have been faster in the past. Approximately a billion years ago the moon would have been so close to the earth that the gravitational pull of the moon on the earth would have caused such high tides that the earth was probably not habitable. It is reasonable to assume the moon formed much less than 1 million years ago rather than the reported age of approximately 4 billion years old.

Conclusion

The main point is that there are facts that make the assumption that the universe is 11 billion years old very questionable. It is not logical to assume an old universe until the above discrepancies have been clearly explained by facts and not unsubstantiated theories. Because of brainwashing from our childhood it is admittedly difficult to gaze into the heavens and not assume that they are old. This same problem exists relative to the age of the earth where there is factual evidence that the earth is young – so young that molecules to man evolution is not a reasonable explanation of what we observe on the earth. How old is the universe? Could it be the same age as the earth?

Relative Dating

Relative dating is the logical outgrowth of radiometric dating. Any ride through the countryside in a hilly region reveals that there are different rock and/or soil layers (strata) that are obviously not due to volcanic activity. The process of determining the age of these layers is called “relative dating.” If a rock layer is over a layer of lava obviously the rock layer is younger than the lava layer. By determining the fossils in this rock layer it is assumed that if a rock layer at another site has the same fossils they are the same age. This process was carried out on a worldwide basis. Note that the age of the fossils is determined by the age of the rocks and that the age of the rocks is determined by the fossils it contains. This circular reasoning is acknowledged by geologists. J. E. O’Rourke says, “*The rocks do date the fossils, but the fossils date the rocks more accurately. Stratigraphy cannot avoid this kind of reasoning, if it insists on using only temporal concepts, because circularity is inherent in the derivation of time scales.*”¹ David Raup concurs when he said, “*The charge that the construction of the geologic scale involves circularity has a certain amount of validity.*”²

Relative dating is based upon macro-evolutionary assumptions and not on the fossil evidence. This should be apparent because of the great number of strata that are out of order. By what criteria are the strata said to be out of order? They are said to be out of order because they have the wrong kind of fossils in them. The 145 million year gap in the strata at the Grand Canyon (evolutionary dating) are said to be missing because no fossils from those supposed periods are found in the strata. The physical evidence does not agree with this assumption. The evidence says that the layers were never there because the contact line between the strata indicates no gullying or washing occurred over the supposed millions of years that it took to deposit these strata? Is it reasonable to assume that absolutely no gullying or washing of any kind occurred for the entire length of the canyon (approximately 277 miles) during the 145 million years while these strata were being built up?

1. O'Rourke, J. E., *Pragmatism Versus Materialism in Stratigraphy*. American Journal of Science, Vol. 276 (January 1976), p. 53.
2. Raup, David M., *Geology and Creationism*. Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin, Vol. 54 (March 1983), p. 23.

Dating Conclusions

it should be obvious by now that there is very sound evidence that both the earth and the heavens are young.

Geologic Column (Fossils and Ancient Life)

Most textbooks say something similar to, "***The fossil record reveals a remarkable fact: Fossils occur in a particular order.***" These statements refer to the geologic column. What must be recognized is that the geologic column is based upon macro-evolutionary thinking and exists only in textbooks.

The Geologic Column and Time Scale was essentially in its present form by 1840. This was long before much was known about world geology and Charles Darwin wrote his famous hypothesis. If macro-evolution is accurate then the order presented by geology and many biology books is what would be expected in the fossil record. However, there are facts that tend to nullify this assumption. Some of them are:

1. The complete geologic column and fossil order does not appear anywhere in the world although most of the geologic column appears in west Nepal, west Bolivia, and central Poland. At least one strata is missing in 99.6% of the earth's surface. One of the largest exposed cross-sections of the earth is the Grand Canyon. It contains only 4 of the 12 geologic time periods.¹ Additionally, the four are not consecutive because the Ordovician, Silurian and Devonian are missing. There is no hint that these strata were ever there. Where did the 145 million years of missing sediment go without leaving a trace? Geologist John Woodmorappe states "***Eighty to eighty-five percent of the Earth's land surface does not have even three geologic periods appearing in correct consecutive order.***"² Is it reasonable to neglect most of the information? Have the facts been made to fit the hypothesis of the hypothesis to fit the facts?

2. Woodmorappe also states that "***Some percentage of every geologic period rests directly upon Precambrian basement strata.***"³ This means that there are many geologic strata, and therefore fossils, that are out of order compared to the geologic column. How is this explained?

3. Derek Ager, the past president of the British Geological Society agrees with this idea when he said, "***Nowhere in the world is the record, or even part of it, anywhere near complete.***"⁴

4. The radiometric dating discrepancies and therefore relative dating discrepancies make the time scale on the geologic column meaningless.

5. Don't the great discrepancies in the fossil record mentioned in parts 2 and 3 make the order of the geologic column meaningless?

6. The Encyclopedia Britannica, 1985, p.779 had this to say about the process of assembling this column, "***The end product of correlation is a mental abstraction called the geologic column.***" The author of that edition certainly thought the geologic column lacked creditability.

7. Living fossils demonstrate the extreme stability of species and a problem in the fossil record.

Presently Living Organism

Years Present in Fossil Record

COELACANTH FISH	350 to 70 MY
4 FOOT LONG WORM	600 to 70 MY
HORSESHOE CRAB	424 to 50 MY
LINGULA (A shell type of organism)	510 to 430 MY
NEOPLINA (Resembles a clam)	600 to 385 MY

8. Many gaps exist in the fossil record. Are these gaps real? Darwin was aware of this problem when he wrote, "***Why then is not every geologic formation and stratum full of such intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic change, and this is perhaps the most obvious and serious objection which can be urged against the theory [of macro-evolution].***"⁵

Professor Stephen J. Gould of Harvard University confirmed Darwin's doubts are still valid when he stated, "***All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains little in the way of intermediate forms; transitions between major groups.***"⁶ Isn't this a good example of what happens when a hypothesis is formed before the scientific evidence is determined? The evidence is made to fit the hypothesis.

9. Just because a canyon exposes numerous strata does not mean it took millions of years to carve it. Two canyons that graphically illustrate this are the Burlingame Canyon near Walla Walla, Washington which is 120 feet wide and 120 feet deep and was cut in a week by flood waters and the Mt. Helens canyon which was cut overnight and is 125 feet wide and 140 feet deep and cut by a mud slide. These two canyons are approximately one fortieth the size of the Grand Canyon. Doesn't this indicate the Grand Canyon could have been cut in much less than a year?

Think Critically: In view of the facts just quoted is the fossil record and geologic column positive proof of macro-evolution?

1. Strahler, Arthur N. *Principles of Geology*. Harper & Row, New York, 1977, p.102.

2 Woodmorappe, John, *The Essential Non-Existence of the Evolutionary Uniformitarian Geologic Column: A Quantative Analysis*, Creation Research Quarterly, Vol. 18, No.1, June, 1981, p. 46.

3. *ibid.* number 2, p. 67.

4. Ager, Derek v., *The New Catastrophism*. Cambridge University Press, 1993, p.14.

5. Darwin, Charles R, *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection*, first edition reprint, Avenel Books, New York, 1979, p.292.

6. Gould, Stephen J., *The Return of the Hopeful Monsters*, Natural History, Vo1.86, No.6, June-July 1977, p.24.

How Fossils Form

Since much of the evolutionary information is based upon the fossilization process it is important to understand exactly what it is. Many authors present a very misleading and inaccurate concept of how fossilization occurs and how long it takes. In your experience, if an animal or other fleshy organism dies over land does a fossil form? Why not? It does not form because the organism will decay before it gets buried in such a way as to form a fossil. A basic rule of fossilization is that the rate at which an organism decays must be much longer than the rate at which it fossilizes. If an animal is run over and is immediately buried there will be no fossil remains within a year unless the burial is in a desert where it will not decay but it will not become a fossil either. The key to fossilization is to not only bury the organism very quickly but it must also be in an area that rich in the minerals necessary for fossilization and the organism must be isolated from normal decay mechanisms. Ordinary flood waters do not do this. There were thousands of buffalo killed in the west but there are no fossils. Why not?

Rapid burial requires violence beyond what we normally observe today and accounts for the fact that we seldom see a fossil being formed today. Does a flood like we so often experience produce fossils? The answer is no! Think about what is necessary to make a fish fossil. If a fish dies, it normally will float to the top of the water within a few hours and will not be in a position to be buried. How does it get back on the bottom so that it can be buried? Within a few days at the most the fish will have been either eaten or decayed sufficiently that fossilization is impossible. The same will be true for any animal that dies in the water. Consider the problem of burying a dinosaur or elephant so that the fossilization conditions are met. As catastrophic as they are, flood waters do not produce fish, bird or animal type fossils. There must be a sudden surge of water that is full of a lot of sediment of the right composition. A tsunami or hurricane tidal surge hitting land is not violent enough to accomplish this. Compared to some geologic formations the layers are so small in their total effect that it is inconceivable that the billions of fossils that are distributed everywhere on the earth can be considered to be caused by these catastrophes. There are many huge formations in the world. One of these is the Morrison Formation that covers 576,000 square miles in the western United States and includes Dinosaur National Park and many other dinosaur fossils throughout its area.¹ Even though this area was supposed to have been a shallow sea at one time what could have happened to fossilize so many dinosaurs in the same strata over such a large area? Burying a large dinosaur is not something that can happen in a normal flood. Today's sedimentation rates are much too slow to bury and fossilize an animal the size of an elephant or whale.

1. Illinois State Geological Survey, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
<http://www.isgs.uiuc.edu/dinos/de_4/5ca00c3.htm>

Intelligent Design

The concept of Intelligent Design has been known for several centuries. Even Charles Darwin in a sense acknowledged the presence of the basic idea when he said in Chapter 6, Modes of Transition, of his "Origin of Species" "If it could be demonstrated that any complex organ existed which could not possibly have been formed by numerous successive slight modifications, my theory would absolutely break down." In other words if some particular aspect of an organism or the organism itself is so complex that it cannot be logically accomplished by single random mutation processes then it must have been designed. The very idea of design is, of course, completely out of even being considered since it implies a designer which then nullifies macroevolution as being true. The fundamental question is whether or not meaningful information can be obtained by random chance happenings. Many scientists believe and recognize that our environment clearly indicates that meaningful information does not come from random chance happenings. The "Setti Project" (Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence) is based upon this. Many millions of dollars have been spent and are being spent trying to determine or locate extraterrestrial intelligence using this fact.

Regardless of the facts any design process that does not involve humans is forbidden in today's classroom since it can be used to infer that the intent of the teacher is to introduce religion into the thinking of the student. The modern day advocates of Intelligent Design have been doing a reasonably good job of quantifying the concept so that it can be more easily classified as scientific. Advocates are adamant that religion is not a part of the consideration. They use mathematics as their proof tool. Michael Behe, one of the advocates, sums up the idea by stating that I.D. is true if the object meets the

following two criteria: (A) the system is so complex that design seems to be the logical origin and (B) it has irreducibility or it loses its function if even a single part is missing. Some of the examples that fit these criteria are: the flagella motor, the bombardier beetle, the immune system, the eye, the ear, the Apheloria millipede, etc. An excellent video presentation on the flagella motor can be seen at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ey7Emmddf7Y&feature=youtube_gdata_player

How We Got To This Point of Classroom Censorship?

In simple words this censorship of facts in the classroom has arisen because of religious convictions. It is mandatory for all forms of the atheistic religions that macro-evolution be true. If macro-evolution is true then (1) the earth must be old and (2) information must come about through random chance happenings. This is in contrast to the Judeo-Christian religions who recognize and believe that neither of these requirements is true. The conflict is between atheism and theism.

The many atheistic organizations have found a clever and unique legal way to maintain their fundamental religious belief in macro-evolution by insisting that only facts supporting it be taught in the school system. They have been able to bring in the doctrine of separation of church and state to do this. This doctrine has modified the clear intent of the US Supreme Court, Congress and Louisiana and caused me to exclude the information included above on the topics Fossil Formation, the Fossil Record, the Geologic Column, Relative Dating and Radio-metric dating and Intelligent Design. It is apparent that additional information, beyond what is in the textbooks, may reflect upon the accuracy of the age of the earth.

Believe it or not everything just stated is openly stated on the web site for the American Humanistic Association (AHA), one of the leaders of this movement.

<http://www.americanhumanist.org/What_We_Do/Education_Center/Teacher_Corps> This web site states in the opening paragraph under the heading "Who We Are/About the AHA."

"We strive to bring about a progressive society where being good without gods is an accepted way to live life. We are accomplishing this through our defense of civil liberties and secular governance, by our outreach to the growing number of people without traditional religious faith, and through a continued refinement and advancement of the humanist worldview."

The fact that the AHA represents a religion is born out by their second paragraph of this web site under "Who We Are/About the AHA." It says, **"Humanism encompasses a variety of non-theistic views (atheism, agnosticism, rationalism, naturalism, secularism, and so forth) while adding the important element of a comprehensive worldview and set of ethical values---values that are grounded in the philosophy of the Enlightenment, informed by scientific knowledge, and driven by a desire to meet the needs of people in the here and now."**

[The dictionary definition of a religion is "(a) any specific system of belief, worship, conduct, etc., often involving a code of ethics and a philosophy. (b) any system of beliefs, conduct, etc. resembling, suggestive of, or likened to such a system."]

Furthermore the fourth paragraph under "What We Do/Overview"

"Our adjunct organizations defend the Jeffersonian wall of separation between church and state (AHLIC), advance humanist thought in the realm of education (KHEC), delve into the ethical and moral challenges brought about by advances in biotechnology (ABC), provide aid to those most in need (HC), and apply humanism to daily life (HS)."

You might wonder what all of this has to do with what is being taught in the schools. This

organization answered by recently establishing an educational group whose sole purpose is to interact with school personnel and boards on both the local and state level to accomplish their stated goals. The quote from their web site, given below, makes it very clear that they intend to alter curriculum, textbooks or other supplemental material and interact with the public whenever possible. **“It is in this spirit that the Kochhar Humanist Education Center is establishing the Humanist Teacher Corps. Our intent is to identify and mobilize a cadre of American Humanist Association members and other supporters of humanism to engage in action individually or in teams on one or more of the following activities:**

- 1. To develop curriculum resources on humanist issues.**
- 2. To provide presentations at community forums to inform the public about humanist principles and values.**
- 3. To serve as watchdogs and advocate for more humanistic curricula and textbooks in public schools and assess state standards for their historical accuracy”**

To make things even worse the ACLU is looking for an excuse to interact legally to accomplish this same goal. For this reason the material given in this paper should not be covered in the classroom except as presented in the state approved textbooks.

The presentation of nothing but soundly established and reasonable facts is not allowed because an old earth age is an essential part of humanistic thinking. The bottom line is not about what is factual and best for the student but about what can be taught and not affect the foundational belief of the humanist. The “macro-evolution (molecules to man evolution) – creation conflict” is religious and not scientific. The humanistic adherents are afraid they may not be able to meet the challenge of a presentation of all of the facts regarding macro-evolution so aggressively fight against any effort to introduce contradicting thought to the Darwinian concept.