Creation or Evolution

Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.

Date: 20 May 2015

Preacher: Andy McIntosh

[0:00] what happened there oh i see okay okay um well it's really good to be here thank you pastor peter for your kind welcome sorry i was just in the little room when you started but uh you'll have seen that little clip that was just a little taster of some of the things that we've been saying um i hope you've grasped that really the major issue is what those of you who are here for the first night what we were considering in the scriptures if you aren't a christian tonight then maybe some of the things that i'm going to share tonight will be of some help to you in seeing that there is a coherent christian position concerning origins and concerning the bible i want you just to if you've got a bible just turn with me if you would to 2 peter chapter 3 i'd just like to introduce what i'm going to say by a reference to the scriptures and rather than read the old testament where you know that there is three chapters um six seven eight and nine actually four chapters on the flood um in genesis i thought i'd just read a summary verse in 2 peter 3 which i've already referred to in the earlier nights but if you just look with me at 2 peter 3 you'll see a very serious description of the events which led to the flood or after before the flood and afterwards this second epistle said it says i'm going to read a verse in the first day of the holy prophets and this is the first that you may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets and of the commandment of us the apostles of the lord and savior knowing this first that there shall come in the last day's scoffers walking after their own lusts and saying where is the promise of his coming for since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation for this they are willingly are ignorant of that by the word of god the heavens were of old so that's the first reference to the word and the earth standing out of the water and in the water then it says whereby the world that then was being overflowed with water perished what's the whereby referring to when you think about it it's referring to the word of god do you understand me even though it doesn't actually say just at that point the word of god the whereby is referring to that which is performing the action first of all of creation and now it's saying whereby the world that then was with being overflowed with water perished then it says verse seven but the heavens and the earth which are now by the same word that's the third reference to the word explicitly again the same word are kept in store reserved under fire against the day of judgment and perdition that means being lost of ungodly men but be loved be not ignorant of this one thing that one day is with the lord as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day many people of course try to take that last verse to say oh well a day in creation is a thousand years that's not what paul peter is saying there peter is simply saying that god is outside time and he knows what is happening and he knows the trials of the time when peter was writing when nero was actually literally burning christians at one point in his own garden and he was burning them

in the coliseum and having them thrown to the lions and he was saying hold on you christians god sees the end from the beginning that's really what is being meant here that god has a plan of history and it says in verse nine the lord is not slack concerning his promise not willing it says that any should perish at the end of verse nine but that all should come to repentance the whole point of 2 peter 3 is as it says in verse 10 there is a day of the lord coming so in the context of 2 peter 3 there is a reference to job to to the flood and of course the flood is in the biblical teaching a judgment so we are looking tonight at god's judgment and that's what you need to remember all the time as we look at these rocks i'm going to leave these behind but this one is a wonderful ammonite okay which with both halves here at least a good part of the top half there there's other ammonites here which i'm going to leave and i believe martin your daughter is here somewhere so she might like one of these fossils and i know barry has laid claim to one of them so i'm going to leave them for anybody here in the whitby area who would like to have them but i've just collected these today with john we we lugged a great big one up we split it into two and lo and behold the lower half had a much bigger ammonite in it and we hadn't realized it port mulgrave and all along this coastline is full of jurassic ammonites and if you go to some places a little bit south of here two miles south what's it called salt something salt salt salt salt take yeah salty whatever anyway there you can get dinosaur bones and other things so there's we call this the northern jurassic coastline and did lime regis is the southern jurassic coastline and it's most interesting the isle of wight has been called dinosaur island and these creatures were obviously roaming so when were they roaming is the issue of course and many people will try and say millions of years old we're going to be dealing with that tonight i've already shown you that film so we won't show it again but i want you to see that the argument tonight is not about do we believe in science i love looking at these fossils right i love looking at the museums where they got full of all sorts of creatures but the problem is the interpretation of them so never let it be said that christians don't like evidence or people who believe in creation don't like evidence we love the evidence the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of a creation plus the flood right and it's the flood that we're basically dealing with tonight so you never want to be afraid of evidence evidence actually properly put and explained actually fits beautifully with the creation stroke flood model just to line up a lot of skulls as people do sometimes and say oh this one changed into that one into the other one it's no argument whatsoever you've got to ask the question how did those skulls or how did the creatures here get buried and that of course is what the issue is so we all know even those who oppose us know full well that what is at stake is is this bible correct in one of the films that david attenborough did i can't remember which one it was now but he very ceremoniously talked about the british museum and sir richard owen and they've of course taken sir richard owen out of the statue they've taken it out of the british museum and they put darwin and all his glory in the british museum as soon as you go in

and he says we used to believe in genesis it said at the beginning of the film but now we know differently and he shows him closing the bible well of course he's welcome to his view but actually he knows full well that the issue is is he correct he knows even though he's opposing us that the issue is is genesis reliable and is man just a different variety of an ape like creature does it matter actually we all know it does matter the problem is as i said within the church the evangelical church there are those who are trying to say it doesn't matter the problem is not out there with the world the world knows that it matters right i've been trying to get this over to you quite a lot and that's i hope you've got the message that the world knows more than the evangelical christians do in some areas and it was saying i said this the other night it's the same in the time of christ the pharisees knew more about what the lord was saying than the disciples did our problem is that within the evangelical church we haven't grasped the seriousness of this issue let me repeat it's not a salvation issue i accept that but having said that it's not a salvation issue it is an issue as to the authority of the scripture does the bible start being the word of god in genesis 1 or does it start being the word of god in genesis 12 that really is the issue when we talk about evolution we're talking about the idea that peas got to uh people over millions of years or molecules got to melons and then got to men uh over millions of years and the peas got to presidents and prime ministers as well you know that's the idea that we're thinking of not the idea of adaptation which we do accept does take place so you do get dogs which are artificially bred sometimes to produce tiny dogs if you really do want a tiny dog or if you want a proper dog like we saw doberman today john and i as we were going down to port mulgrave beautiful dog you know people breed all sorts of dogs i'm the dalmatians suddenly walked into our house i don't know where it came from but in john's house where did that dog come from next door just walked in just don't own the place um but you know so you get all sorts of dogs and but they're still dogs even the chihuahua if you really want one and have a pushchair to take it for a walk you know even that's a dog right but then so is a great day in a dog and a rottweiler not that i'd have one of them you know they're dogs as well and so so are poodles which ken hand doesn't like um some of you know that keeps on referring to people but you see the creation position is not that we deny that there are different types of dogs obviously different types of human beings some have big ears like me some have a small some are big we all know that but they're still human natural selection gives variety but it's not an engine for changing a mouse into an elephant or changing a reptile to spread wings and become a bird which is seriously what evolution teaches now we're going to then take this so that's again defining our terms we're going to take this now and start looking at one or two examples of creatures which we have today which are buried in the rocks then we're going to look at creatures which we do not have today which are buried in the rocks then lastly i'm going to deal with how old are the rocks okay first of all we're going to look at an example of a creature we do have today giraffes marvelous beasts look so graceful when they bend

their heads down did you know that they have a special function in the neck special muscles to stop the blood flooding their brains and having a brain hemorrhage because they're so tall the heart is so powerful it needs to be powerful to pump the blood right up there well imagine what happens as it droops its head it's got to have special muscles to restrict the blood flow otherwise it would have a seizure okay and similarly those muscles relax when it lifts its neck but that's not my main point tonight my main point tonight is that when you look at the fossils of the uh giraffes they are recognizable as giraffes hardly surprising because giraffes have always been giraffes the only difference actually is their size where do they lie in the fossil record please don't be put off by this diagram which will come up quite a few times in this talk the diagram is not there for you to sort of actually say oh i've got to understand all this detail no the diagram is there as a reference for what the evolutionist speaks of right he speaks of a gradual progression of life over millions of years i don't accept that he believes in millions of years half a billion years roughly down here and then gradually moving up to the present day he labels but so do many people who are those who take my view also accept these labels we are in whitby here and we are in the jurassic coastline that's because as you drive through the vale of pickering as you come from leeds uh you and york you will see you're basically driving over cretaceous rock and the rock has all been washed away in the vale of pickering and as you look across the north york moors with what used to be the golf balls whatever it is now they've got in place i can't remember what it's called looks like the bridge of a ship as you look across the vale of pickering to whitby you actually see that there's been a great washing away of all the top layers which is has exposed the jurassic rock with ammonites as you can see there which tend to be in jurassic rock and you have other creatures in there these are the other things underneath if you go to devon you tend to see devonian slate which is where that name has come from and cambrian way on the west in scotland and in wales you get cambrian rock which is all the mountains have been pushed up the very lower down layers have been pushed right up the granites of the cambrian rock are mainly on the west of our country and all the mountains tend to be the big mountains tend to be on the west and but the point is you can find these layers in other parts of the world as well sometimes there are huge layers missing which isn't going to be in my talk tonight but uh if you want to raise that question at the end i can speak to that although i'm an amateur in this area i'm not a professional geologist but i'm just making one major point that giraffes sit basically in what we call the tertiary layer and they are recognizable as giraffes now we could look at other things that we find in the rocks i'll just mention one of them uh just at this point a feather which i could do a whole talk on has an amazing mechanism of intricate uh intricate barbules which have hooks on sliding over ridges which are in between the bars right supposed to have come from a reptile scale but when you actually look at the rocks please don't think that i accept this millions of years i do not i'm using their reference terms against them right i'm saying supposing it is millions of years right for the time being i'm just saying let's walk into your argument mr evolutionist or miss evolutionist you say it's millions of years so we'll use your terms right so we'll argue on your territory right so i'm arguing

on their territory and i'm saying here's amber which is supposedly 25 million years old which is hardened resin resin which is squeezed out of trees okay and trapped in here is a feather that's neat isn't it that means that you could if you wish this would be rather valuable to do it to you can actually break open that amber and you could take the feather out and it would look like no different to a modern feather in fact this is a fossil feather from archaeopteryx supposedly supposedly meant to be a halfway creature between reptiles and birds but it shows every indication of being an ordinary feather just like today's feathers and that one is meant to be 125 million years old so my point is as you probably realize i'm gradually going down this geological column now feathers have remained the same no change so that's my main point that i'm making in this first part of the talk you all understanding me not too complicated it will get at one point you'll need an ice cream right i'll tell you when you need it you may just need a few people you know to wake you up at that point because we're going to touch on radioactive dating and i know that's the hard bit right but i'll tell you i'll warn you when we come to it this point is basically saying that creatures have remained the same how about this one this is a butterfly of course we could do a whole talk about monarch butterflies and the way they wonderfully you know lay their uh they start off their lives well to be frank they have an amazing cycle monarch butterflies all butterflies of course start off as caterpillars which is an amazing feat which evolution can't explain because in order to get a new caterpillar you've got to have the second creature caterpillars by the way don't lay eggs do they uh-huh do caterpillars lay eggs no they don't so in order to propagate this creature you've got to have the second creature immediately you're going to evolve supposedly from a worm-like creature to to a caterpillar stroke butterfly you've got to have the two creatures ready to go right because if you don't you won't be able to propagate it i think god has deliberately made butterflies and what the technical term is metamorphosis in order to show to us hit the wonder of what he has done because there's no evolutionist that i know of who can possibly explain where butterflies and moths and all creatures which have two body plans come from you can't explain it because you've got to evolve if you say it happened gradually at one point when it starts you've got to have the two body plans there otherwise you won't propagate it anyway back to the main point and that is that the scales of a butterfly are so delicate that if you touch them you will cause the creature to be not able to fly anymore they're very very delicate so how on earth this is actually a moth because you can see from the little tips of the antennae how how did this moth or a butterfly you can find fossils of butterflies they're rare but how did this creature get fossilized there is a second message coming through this first part and that is this not only have butterflies and moths not changed but also how do you get a fossil of something which flies because you know that when butterflies spread their wings out and they come to the end of their lives they actually leave those wings spread out and if you were to pick up a dead butterfly after a few days just disintegrate in fact if you were to you know touch its body or put something on it like a book it would just disintegrate underneath the dust you wouldn't get that impression so this is telling you

[20:18] that this fossil must have happened sorry if you're squeamish about this but this creature must have been buried alive it's the only way you can explain it because that is the blood is still going through the creature and it's pumping as it were and leaving an impression in the clay and the mud which buried this so everything is telling you that this creature was buried fast and the big message of course is that butterflies have remained the same now we could talk about the flight of damselflies and i'm tempted to but i'm not going to because we will run out of time but damselflies in the rocks have remained the same this is i'll explain where this is in the layers in a moment but this one's lost one of its wings but clearly it's recognizable as a damselfly so what's the message here damselflies have remained the same as well right where do damselflies start by the way while you're thinking we'll talk about dragonflies dragonflies have a bit of a fatter body and they are amazing creatures dragonflies they also start off at a similar point to damselflies they don't start off in in land where do they start off as in the water that is staggering so here you've got metamorphosis that means two body plants with a creature which breathes in water using gills when it's a nymph then it climbs out of the water and it becomes a new creature so the very fact that we have dragonflies and damselflies is one great big blow to any evolutionary idea particularly when you see that dragonflies are the same in the fossil record as they are today which i is the main point of what i want to say i will play this film has also been the home of another kind of insect with an equally ancient ancestry and it too is beginning to emerge from the water this is a nymph coming out of the water bigger and more ferocious than the mayfly larvae it has been feeding on tadpoles and even small fish but that phase of its life is over now each one has to haul itself out of the water and into the air on the top of its thorax it carries a bulging backpack it's going to breathe differently it hunches itself and its outer skin splits a very different creature begins to appear white threads are drawn out of its flanks they are the linings of thin tubes that penetrate deep into its body air tubes that will enable the insect to breathe now that it is out of water it gulps air inflating its body forcing fluid into the bundle on its back its wings begin to unfurl the wings open they'll never close again next the huge muscles within its thorax must be exercised to prepare them for action and it's away

now you'll see a fossil of what the that's his view of course look at these they're almost identical he said this we are he said it however they're by no means the oldest we know that there were other dragonflies even earlier 225 million years ago that were flying through the coal measure swamps we don't have complete specimens of any of those but there are some tantalizing and amazing fragments and here's one this is stunning this fossil this marvelously preserved wing has very much the same pattern of veins supporting panels of membrane as getting species the thing that makes it different is its size from base to tip it measures 12 inches 30 centimeters little imagination is needed to replace the membrane that must have been there this insect must have had a wingspan as big as a seagull's well we'll leave we'll leave that there but he he was saying it himself that dragonflies are the same in the fossil record as today here's please pass this fossil round fossils show every evidence of the creatures being the same as today i could go through a number of creatures please don't drop these that's a real fossil that one is not a real fossil but i still don't want it broken because it's a plaster cast we're going to look at some other creatures in a moment and eventually we will come to plants that is a very delicate one please don't drop these ones which are now coming round please be very careful that is a plant fossil coming round and this is a plant fossil coming round which we're going to come to in a moment and my main point is that these fossils show every evidence of being the same as today i'm going to show you this is a modern dance or fly the reason i put that one up is i took it because uh and we found this just just not far away from lake louise in the rocky mountains when we were on our 40th wedding anniversary juliet and i last year and we just happened to go by bow lake and we had a house sandwiches or whatever it was there and we saw not only that we saw them skimming over the lake and look at this we'd found the i don't know whether you call it a chrysalis when they come out of the water but they just come out they basically just come out of their previous existence in the water wonderful so these creatures david attenborough was clearly saying that the panel of membranes that he was talking about are exactly the same as modern ones the size was different but essentially there is no change and now going right down the geological column to creatures supposedly 240 million years ago so taking them on their own logic these creatures show that they haven't changed right i said to you i just mentioned some fossils of plants i happen to go through i think this was albany in new york i sometimes do have a bit of time at airports as you can imagine which is a bit boring

but sometimes they have some displays at the american airports and i think this was at albany and this is a marvelous fossil i took this picture of it obviously i couldn't take it with me but this is from pennsylvania and it's from pennsylvania and shale in the later carboniferous and this raises another issue how on earth do you get that fossil of a plant and how do you get the fossil of the plants which are coming around it's exactly the same it raises issue if i raises issues if i pluck a plant right after a few days what happens droops right how are you going to get that impression then in the mud the only way you can do it is while it's still fresh probably still attached to its root whether or not that's true certainly very fresh and it's buried and it leaves that amazing impression in the rocks so friends even the plants show evidence that a that they are the same as today a b that actually they haven't changed at all how about this one this is an octopus right this octopus was found in cretaceous rock which is just above uh jurassic and uh this octopus you could even see the suckers on the arms of the octopus they're so astonished the evolutionists as to the detail found in the fossil particularly when you realize that you're really only dealing with cartilage you're not really dealing with bones and when these creatures die in the ocean they don't just lie politely on the bottom of the ocean ready to be buried in silk do they it's a free meal for something like a shark and other creatures which want to eat this stuff so friends you need to realize that the evidence here is pretty strong that these creatures a they are the same as today that's the main point but b these creatures are also showing that they were buried pretty fast and quickly buried under the uh under the mud i could go through all sorts of other creatures which i won't do now because i think we made our point on the first issue that i was trying to raise which is that there is a lot of creatures which are the same as today right now i'm going to come on to the second point which is this because i anticipate an evolutionist and there may be someone in the audience and you must feel free to ask the question at the end if you don't agree with me if you think that the evidence actually is for slow deposition over millions of years and it may be that you're a christian thinking that i'm seeking to obviously put over the position which i maintain is the biblical position but you may think differently and i want you to have the freedom to question me at the end i don't mind being questioned i welcome it as long as we don't have too much heat in fact if probably i would suggest no heat and that we also have a have a respect to the fact that the bible does clearly teach this if you're a christian uh clearly teaches that god created everything you may have differences of view as to what i'm saying and if you're not a christian at least respect the fact that i am seeking to show you hard evidence you may not agree with the bible so but what i'm now going to go on to because i anticipate an evolutionist saying to me you have cherry picked you've just taken the particular creatures which agree with your thesis you know the position you're taking because i haven't talked about all these down here but they're also support the point they would say what about creatures we don't have today okay so let's do that so we'll look at creatures we don't have today we're going to look at dinosaurs and we're going to look at trilobites now i can't do the same

argument obviously i can't say here's a dinosaur we have today and here's the fossil i can't do it right um i cannot use that argument but what i can do is show you some amazing details which come from the fossils themselves that film by the way is just showing you that we do actually find and do not deny that there are bones and remains of these creatures i myself have been to utah and seen these footprints i was in peru in november and way in the middle of peru in the foothills of some pretty high mountains was a track of dinosaurs you know something had made those footprints and it was clearly dinosaurs because there were three three toad creatures so we're going to look at these two creatures so we're going to look at trilobites which are buried down here and dinosaurs which are generally as you know buried in these layers not far away from here there are some remains as you know um so trilobites now what were trilobites well i need to send some trilobites around this is interesting because of course an evolutionist we must respect their view they they say this is this um this is related to us so we have to treat this with respect because this could be your great great great great great great great great great great great great great great great great great uncle sorry i've made a a little bit of a funny at their expense, forgive me, but that is seriously what an evolutionist believes, because he believes that all life is connected, right? So he believes that this somehow is connected to your family tree. I don't believe that for a moment, but as you have a look at this, you'll see that if we call this Fred, he was buried on Peter, because Peter's impression is unbelief, so there's clearly two trilobites which were buried together, and clearly squeezed quite a lot in that case. There are some more trilobites here, and maybe you'd like to just send this one round. This one, you can actually see the protruding of eyes at the front, and it's the eyes which are interesting for trilobites, because trilobite eyes are compound eyes. The damsel flies and the dragonflies that I was showing you earlier are amazing because they have spherical compound eyes, almost completely spherical, okay? And compound eyes means that they are made of lots and lots and lots and lots of lenses, right? Hundreds of lenses, all individual lenses all going all the way around so they can see very clearly. This creature also had compound eyes, but get this, those eyes, those lenses were not made of proteins. Would you believe it that these eyes are made of calcite, calcium carbonate.

And I've got a lump of calcium carbonate here, and I'm going to pass this round as well. Now, sorry, this has got a bit ancient, this bit of card, so please keep the card with it, and you'll see, I'll pass it round this one. You can see that there's, it looks like there's two lines, but in fact there's only one line, if you look on the card, because calcite, calcite has this effect.

[36:20] It will cause the image at the bottom to become two images. Now, I could give you a lecture on physics as to the reason for this, but I'm going to not burden you with that.

But, suffice to say that there is a reason, and it's to do with the fact that light has two parts. If you have Polaroid sunglasses, right, you take out one part of the light, because light comes in at two angles, right, two polarisations, which are at right angles to each other.

And what happens with this material, of which every little lens of the trilobite is made, right, natural calcite will actually have the effect of bending one phase of the light, one polarisation of the light, I should say, at one angle, and the other polarisation is bent at a different angle, which is why you get two images, which is why, if you put a Polaroid lens on top of a lump of calcite, you can actually get it to change from one image to the next, by actually rotating a polarised, you know, a sunglass lens, basically.

If you just rotate it, you can actually get one image, and then the other image, and not two images. OK, so you get the point. That's the physics. There's more to it than that, but I won't burden you with too much of the detail.

Now, when you actually go back and look at those lenses that I've just referred to, there is a centre line of this lens, OK?

[38:10] Just part that point, right? There is a centre line. If you actually look and do some experiments on this natural calcite, there is one angle and one position where, if you were to look down it, but it's very difficult to find it because you've not only got to get it right this way, you've actually got to get it right in rotation as well, and there is one line where that matter of two images becomes one, right?

Guess which line the centre line of each one of those lenses is lined up to. You've probably realised where I'm going. It's lined up exactly to that angle, as though an optician or somebody who really knew about optics had actually carved out each individual lens to make sure that trilobites were not seeing two images.

How do we know that? Well, because what they do is you take out one of these lenses, which are, this is magnified 100, 200 times.

They are tiny. They're just about, you know, less than a millimetre. You can see on those trilobite lens going round, trilobite eyes going round. They take them out, put them in a laboratory, shine a laser through them, and they find that the optics is just incredible for these trilobites.

Let me tell you something else about these lenses. These lenses were so brilliant that nobody knew about trilobites in the 1600s and 1700s, and when they were developing lenses for telescopes and all sorts of things, mainly for telescopes, they realised that even if you've got a glass lens, you get a problem at the edges.

[40:01] You get lots of colours. If you're long-sighted, some of you are, you've got fat lenses, and they tend to make colours on the edges. Right? And to get rid of those, you have to make a special shape.

Either this shape or that shape, Descartes and Heuigen found would get rid of that. Would you believe it, that trilobites also have that special shape in their lenses?

I tell you, I tell you, the great optician of all made these lenses. To suggest that trilobites were evolving is frankly absurd.

Let me play you this little video clip, which might help you to understand that. Let's see. Let's see. If evolution were true, the fossil record should show one type of animal life in the lowest layers, then two, then four, and so on.

But Darwin himself had a difficult time explaining what we now call the Cambrian explosion of life. Cambrian rock layers contain nearly all the basic animal forms, including echinoderms, arthropods, and even chordates, with no trace of transitional fossils in lower pre-Cambrian rocks.

[41:15] And each fossil exhibits amazing complexity. For example, Cambrian arthropods had advanced compound eyes, like we see today in dragonflies and bees. The eyes were tuned to the way light travels through water, allowing the creature to see straight.

This required each eye to have over 3,000 interconnected lenses. Compare that to only one lens in each human eye. Cambrian rocks also contain fossil fish that look like today's lance-elixit hagfish.

The fish had perfectly crafted skeletal supports inside their bodies, an opposite arrangement from Cambrian arthropods like trilobites. The Cambrian layers show an amazing amount of diversity and complexity.

Evolutionists claim it happened in a mere 5 to 10 million years, the equivalent to a blink of an eye in so-called geologic time. Sudden appearance? Instant complexity? That doesn't sound much like evolution.

Instead, the fossil record shows fully formed creature groups right from the start. Now, you can find all sorts of little video clips like that on the ICR website.

[42:18] It's well worth sending not just your young people to, obviously that's put in a nice chatty style, but actually we can learn a lot from the Institute of Creation Research.

They are brilliant guys. They are doing super work. And nobody, even in the Christian world, is recognising the enormous work that's been done by that group.

Not just Answers in Genesis, Creation Ministries International, some of us know them as well. But I do encourage you to support the research of these great guys in ICR.

I really do love their work. OK, now come... So I've dealt with trilobites. Now we come to dinosaurs. Now, dinosaurs are interesting. Some of them come, really big ones. Now, whether it really would have looked like that in Whitby High Street on a dark night, I do not know.

But, of course, Steven Spielberg has promoted that idea. But what we do know is that sometimes they are buried in their thousands.

[43:23] Now, this is the interesting point. So I'm not now going to use the argument of the great detail of this creature showing that there is no precursors, as that film was saying, to trilobites.

And they weren't really showing any indications that were changing into something else. That was my argument about the trilobite. This time, I'm going to talk about the way that they were buried. Right?

Because we're further up the geological column. And very interestingly, this shows it, not that they were always buried in their thousands, but this particular case does show it.

And it's not isolated. There are other cases where the mass burial of dinosaurs has taken place. This is in Europe. It's in Spain. And there is 8,000 of this armour-clad plant-eating dinosaur which are buried, and it just said in rather small print at the end of this article, buried with turtles and crocodiles.

Ah! Number one, what were these land creatures doing buried with water creatures? Turtles are essentially water creatures and crocodiles, not that I particularly want to meet one of them on a dark night in Whitby either.

[44:39] They are water creatures, so I'm not likely to meet one on the dark night in Whitby High Street. but I certainly don't want to be close to one of them. And I wouldn't have thought that these armour-clad plant-eating dinosaurs would have liked to have been with those crocodiles either.

So what were they doing? I have a book here which mentions a mass burial of creatures. Do you think it might just be relevant? You see, that's the main issue that I want to bring out which of course is that we actually agree with the evolutionists that they've become extinct.

Right? So dinosaurs will become extinct. Oh, we've got a point of agreement. But the issue is when did they become extinct? And that of course is the real issue. We know that they've become extinct and we know that they were buried in this case with crocodiles.

What do we know about crocodiles? Well, not particularly nice creatures but we find back to our first point that crocodiles are recognisable in the fossil record as, would you believe it, crocodiles.

Clearly crocodiles were giving birth to crocodiles and carrying on giving birth to crocodiles such that we can recognise right throughout the fossil record they must have actually been doing giving birth to crocodiles whether it was over millions of years I doubt but nevertheless they're recognisable they were large in the past but they're recognisable as crocodiles.

[46:11] My point is this now that crocodiles are the same in the past as today but now my point is that this is the same layers in which you find the dinosaurs.

So I'm going to suggest to you it's getting a bit of a weak argument if you say that dinosaurs were changing markedly such that some people would say that birds are effectively modern versions of dinosaurs.

That's what they actually will say. I don't think the evidence supports it because in the very rocks where dinosaurs are found you also have other creatures which were not changing at all.

why do you rest your argument on just one creature which we don't have today which actually shows every evidence that it was just simply doing very well for you thank you but was buried quickly.

So now we have the issue as to what really happened with those rocks. Now this is where you need the ice cream break because now I'm actually going to touch on radioactive dating.

[47:20] Right. Let me say this we've got an ex-coal miner here and he knows far more about coal than I do but when I've studied coal which I did do a bit for my work I noticed something very remarkable.

Coal is found all over the world. We find it of course in this part of the world but you find it more in the west of Yorkshire and of course the south of Yorkshire and you find it in all over Europe.

You find it all over Indonesia and Malaysia. You find it way down in Australia. You find coal in Antarctica. You find coal buried under massive layers in all parts of the world.

Even in New Zealand you find coal. Now coal here is found such that in this particular coal field it's offshore it's found to be three miles thick of coal.

Now that doesn't happen here but the coal itself is a witness to something very remarkable. Let me tell you for why. Coal is made out of vegetation.

[48:36] Right? My friend Brian who's here tonight actually will testify to the fact that he's worked of course in mines and has found great big tree trucks down there.

For a long while where I was working in Leeds University at the fuel and energy department we used to have a massive base of a tree just found in a coal mine just in our corridor.

It's a very valuable fossil. you will find all over the world there is evidence of massive vegetation.

Look at this one. I thought you'd be interested in this. Under Illinois near Chicago ancient trees were found. This was mentioned on the BBC and of course from the interpretation of the evolutionists they have to say these forests grew just a few million years apart.

They've got layers here of trees then they've got layers there some 300 million years ago and are now stacked on one on top of the other. This is under a place very close to Chicago.

[49:45] Then it says it appears the ancient land experienced repeated periods of subsidence and flooding which buried the forest in a vertical sequence. Might there just be an alternative explanation?

I have a book here did I mention it earlier which actually refers to a lot of water burying a lot of things all over the land including plants and forests.

Do you think it might just be relevant? Of course it is. You see what really the coal shows and I'll just give you one other bit of evidence here. If you put a lot of vegetation from your garden and you put it at the bottom of your garden what happens?

It just becomes compost. Do you get coal? The answer is no. If you had a lot of water there and you just dumped it in the water would you get coal? No. You might get peat which is what tends to happen in Ireland.

You've got a massive amount of peat bogs there where vegetation and water basically has got together and it's formed peat but you don't get high rank coal.

[50:56] A rank of coal is the value of percentage carbon right? High rank means you've got somewhere near 80-90% carbon which is basically what we tend to find in Yorkshire.

It's fairly hard coal but when you get out to Borneo and if you get to Africa to Nigeria you get low rank coal. It's called brown coal. Okay. But you'll never even get brown coal unless how are you going to do it?

Shall I tell you how you do it? There's only one way and that is to bury the vegetation such that the air cannot get at it and then you get slowly all the carbon disintegrates in the hydrocarbons which plants and trees are made of and it disintegrates both into its constituent carbon a bit of hydrogen comes off because hydrogen's in there as well and there's very little other stuff that's a bit of sulphur and other impurities.

That's how you get coal. In fact you can get coal by putting any bit of wood, put it into an oven, heat it up to 140 degrees but you must have the oven full of nitrogen, no oxygen.

Leave it there for about six or seven hours, maybe a whole day, pull it out, you'll find you've just got coal. You can form coal fast.

[52:18] You do not need millions of years. You don't actually need a huge amount of pressure either. The pressure will help and generally the pressure is probably what's needed to produce oil but that's another subject.

So there is widespread evidence of catastrophe actually in the rocks. You find in some coal layers have tree fossils going all the way through them and other layers would not coal now.

You also will find tree trunks running all the way through them. When I was in Australia a few years ago, here's an example in New South Wales of a polystrate fossil running all the way through layers which are meant to have been laid down over millions of years.

And lying on the beach was a bit of wood but it was petrified. Right? You can find this all over the world, examples of petrified trees on beaches.

Everything is telling you that there is something very remarkable that has taken place and that the burial has happened quickly. Briefly, let's just deal with radioactive dating.

[53:23] This is where you really do need to wake up. So if you've got something to chew, chew on it, right? Don't go to sleep. And if you do go to sleep, please don't wake me up with your snores, right? Okay?

Not that I'll be asleep. But if I had something wrong. If you've got a sand clock, right? How do you know how long that sand clock's been going?

If I was to see a sand clock, you know, sat here, how long would I know it been going? Actually, I wouldn't know. Because I would need to know what were the initial conditions.

Did the chap set it up with a lot of sand at the top? Or did he set it up with maybe three quarters of the sand in the top? You don't know until you ask somebody who was there. Ah!

You need to know the initial conditions. That's the technical term. In order to understand. Now, why is that relevant? Well, without going into all the technical stuff here, but radioactive dating is to do with one element or one compound changing into another compound, right?

[54:27] It's usually something like potassium changing into argon. The reason it changes is because of the number of neutrons and the number of protons is altering.

The number of protons determines what element it is, right? And the number of neutrons will do things like changing the molecular weight, right? Or the mass number of it.

Now, this is true then in the same way as a sand clock. It's true when it comes to radioactive decay, except that you're dealing with an exponential curve.

But otherwise, the issues are the same. You need to know whether the rate of change has always been the same and you need to know what the initial conditions are. and you don't know either. Even though people have very complicated systems to get around this, and you can read the literature, the Institute of Creation Research has run a series of articles on this recently, in the end it boils down to those two main issues that you do not know how much was there to begin with, and you do not know whether the rate of decay has been the same in the past.

Okay, this will wake you up. Nearly every textbook in Science Magazine teaches that the Earth is billions of years old, and the primary dating method used for determining this is what is called radioisotope dating, or radiometric dating.

[55:51] Now, this is a reliable method for measuring absolute ages of rocks and the age of the Earth, right? Huh. First off, many scientists now regard the age of the Earth to be between 4.55 and 4.6 billion years old.

Okay. So if this method is reliable and accurate, why the 50 million year discrepancy? That seems like a lot, but let's get into some details here and see what's going on. Keep in mind, there's all kinds of scientific jargon on this topic, and so we'll just present a very straightforward, simplified version of the process.

Radiometric dating is the process of estimating the ages of rocks based on the decay of radioactive elements in them. Basically, there are certain kinds of atoms in nature that are unstable and spontaneously decay into other kinds of atoms.

For instance, uranium will radioactively decay through a series of steps until it becomes the stable element called lead. The original element is called the parent element, and the end result is called the daughter element. Radioisotope dating is commonly used to date igneous rocks, rocks which formed when hot molten material cooled and solidified.

The dating clock started when the rock cooled. During the molten state, it is assumed that the intense heat forced any gaseous daughter elements to escape. It is assumed that once the rock cooled, no more atoms escaped, and any daughter element now found in the rock is a result of radioactive decay since that rock formed.

[57:03] The decay rate is measured in terms of half-life, that is the length of time it takes half of the remaining atoms of a radioactive parent element to decay. Now, of course, that can be measured in a laboratory, and it is assumed that since we know the decay rate, we can calculate backwards and come up with the age of the rock.

But is that all there is to it? Here's where it gets tricky. It's true we can measure a decay rate using observational science, but there's another kind of science that is required to accurately calculate dates for rocks, and that is what we call historical science.

Historical science deals with the things in the past, and therefore it cannot be repeated and tested. Dating methods require both types of science, because in order to get accurate rock dates, one would have to accurately know both the decay rate and the initial conditions of the rock sample.

Right? Since radioisotope dating uses both types of science, we can't directly measure the ages of rocks. There are assumptions involved. For instance, how do we know what the initial conditions were in the rock sample?

How do we know the amounts of parent or daughter elements now in that sample haven't been altered by other processes in the past? How does someone know the decay rate has remained constant since the rock formed? The answer is, they don't.

[58:07] Let's simplify here and talk about a typical hourglass. Let's say you walk into a room and you see an hourglass with sand at the top and sand at the bottom, and some sand sprinkling from the top chamber to the bottom. Well, observational science would allow us to see and measure the sand, and then calculate how long the hourglass has been running, right?

We could make our sand measurements and then calculate when the hourglass was turned over, right? Well, those calculations could be wrong, because we may have failed to consider some major assumptions, like was there any sand at the bottom when the hourglass was turned over?

Has any sand been added or taken out of the hourglass? Has the sand always been falling at a constant rate? Since we did not observe the initial conditions when the hourglass started, and we haven't been watching the sand all the time since then, we must make assumptions.

All three of those assumptions can affect our time calculations. Now, of course, there's more to understanding all of this, but enough you can find those on the answers in Genesis.

That's not an ICR one, but let me just close this off by actually dealing with a major issue, which is this. Carbon-14 decays very quickly by comparison.

[59:20] The half-life, did you pick that up? The time taken to come to half the original value of the parent element. The half-life of carbon-14 Professor Libby found to be 5,730 years.

This is interesting because this then means that in order to get down to one, if you carry this on, you know, if you get down to one over 32 of what was there to be four, it becomes 20,000.

48,000 years. And if you divide by two 10 times, that's one over two to the 10th, and we come to one thousandth of what was there before, right?

So that would be 10 times 5,700 years, which is almost 60,000 years, okay? If we were to actually look at when we get to one millionth of carbon-14, we actually find that you would get down to one millionth in about 110,000 years.

Now this is why it's important. 110,000 years is way, way less than even a million years, isn't it? Okay? Now, if you get down to one millionth, you've effectively lost all presence of carbon-14 detectable at all, right?

[60:46] Now, this is where the punch comes. I talked about coal. Did you know that coal repeatedly shows evidence of significant amounts of carbon-14 in it?

all over the world, people have looked at coal and they found that there is carbon-14 present, which means that it cannot be more than, I know it's more than biblical timescales at the moment, but I'll deal with that right at the end.

But it's much, much less than millions of years. It's about 100,000 years at the very most, okay? But this is where it really gets very interesting.

Did you know that recently people have actually looked at dinosaur bones? And dinosaur bones have been found to have significant amounts of carbon-14 in them.

Repeatedly found. Not just Tyrannosaurus Rex bones, but other bones here have been found to have dates which come out as 20,000, 30,000 years.

[61:54] I know that's more than biblical. I'll show you why in a moment, okay? But the point is, it's not 65 million years old. Are you getting it? Fossilized wood has been found to have significant amounts of carbon-14 in it.

Now this is very interesting. The reason why it could easily collapse down to biblical timescales is for the following reason. The same issue applies with carbon-14 as applied with all the other radioisotope methods, right?

You don't know how much carbon-14 was in the carbon dioxide in the air that that creature was breathing before he died, okay? We're breathing in air, which has got some carbon dioxide in it, which has got carbon-14 in it.

So when I die, if you were to dig up my bones, and I hope you don't, but if you did, you would actually find, hey, Andy was breathing in some carbon dioxide, which had got some C-14 in it. Well, of course he did, because I was breathing in carbon-14, which we got today.

And we know roughly how much carbon-14 is in the atmosphere. So these dates are on the assumption that the amount of carbon-14 in the atmosphere in the past was the same as today.

[63:02] But there's every reason to believe, because I've got a book here which talks about a worldwide flood, and I won't go into the detail, but the amount of water in the atmosphere does affect the production of carbon-14, right?

that because in the past there was protection of cosmic radiation, which brings carbon-14, it could well have actually been much less carbon-14 in the atmosphere in the past than today.

And as soon as you say that there was much less in the past, those dates collapsed down to biblical timescales. 3,000 years, 2,500 years, that sort of timescale.

Okay. So I want you to see that everything is showing us that actually those creatures, like dinosaurs that I mentioned earlier, died in the flood.

Look at this. Did you know that people have found soft tissue in dinosaurs? Tissue which was in the marrow of the femur bone of a T-Rex.

[64:09] Mary Schweitzer from Montana found this. Tissue that you could have actually put into a microwave and had a T-Rex steak. Soft, squeegee tissue.

Even you could see the blood vessels in them. That is not 65 million years old. And Mary Schweitzer was astonished herself when she found it. She claims to be a believer and has actually spoken recently at a conference with some others who claim to be believers.

And she of course tries to match evolution with, but really to be frank, the evidence is strongly saying this is not millions of years old.

These dinosaur bones repeatedly have been found. This is not an isolated case with soft tissue in them. So when you build the argument of that evidence and the carbon-14 as well, it's telling you these creatures were buried of the order of a few thousand years ago in the worldwide flood.

So what am I saying? This is a summary. That actually what we have here is catastrophe. Fish that I had coming around.

[65:23] Here's another example of a fish eating another fish. All right. Here's an example of an ichthyosaur giving birth to a baby ichthyosaur. Everything is telling you this is a Kodak moment and there was a catastrophe.

Buried in the process of doing something. Bam! They were buried. Whether they looked like that, I don't know, but they got buried and that was the end of them. Okay? These creatures suffered a catastrophe.

So when I showed you earlier all those creatures which we do have today, they showed, they were examples of catastrophe. The logical alternative is the worldwide flood.

We need to have biblical glasses. Biblical glasses applied to the issue of dinosaurs, which people are particularly concerned about, says that they were created on the fifth and sixth days.

They would have gone on to the ark. You say, do you believe that dinosaurs went on to the ark? Yes. Because all land, air breathing creatures went on to an ark.

[66:32] But once you realise, sorry, I've gone backwards. Once you realise that the ark is not that. Once you realise that that is fiction.

Once you realise that the biblical ark is this one. then you see that everything makes sense. Because we're dealing with an ark which is 150 yards long.

You know what a 100 yard race course looks like? 100 metre race course. Is that 50% longer than that? Almost twice the length of a Boeing 747.

Not quite twice. So forget that. That's nonsense. Once you've got the biblical ark in your mind. Everything makes sense. So you say, well why did the dinosaurs die out then?

Because two went in, two must have come out of each creature. Yes, they did. But those creatures actually died out afterwards because conditions changed after the flood.

[67:37] In fact, there is some evidence that these creatures still existed up to quite recent times. In Cambodia, there is a stegosaurus drawn on the wall.

Right? And carved out of the wall. What's that doing there? This Angkor Wat, which is where this is, was built about a thousand years ago.

If you go to Carlisle, in the middle of Carlisle Cathedral, you will find that there is buried there, middle of Carlisle Cathedral, you will find buried there is Bishop Bell.

We don't know much about Bishop Bell, but we do know that he seemed to, or the people who thought well of him, decided to carve all sorts of creatures around his grave. And this is distinctly looks like a dinosaur.

So in, this was about 500 years ago when he was buried. So it means that 500 years ago, people were actually recognising that there were creatures with long necks and a face there facing backwards and a long tail, which strongly suggests that these people knew about dinosaurs.

[68:57] Job 40, of course, refers to Behemoth. So Job knew about dinosaurs. Behemoth isn't, doesn't use the word dinosaur because the word dinosaur was coined in the 1800s, but it says he moves his tail like a cedar.

Well, that's not true of an elephant, which some people put in the margin. Or a rhinoceros, not rhinoceros, they sometimes put a hippopotamus, which has got a curly, squiggly little tail.

Clearly, this, many people think, is the description of maybe something like an apatosaurus or a diplodocus. So friends, once you start looking at things through biblical glasses, then everything begins to make sense.

May I suggest to you then, as I started, 2 Peter 3 is referring to a real event of judgment. We need to take seriously the worldwide flood.

We also need to realise that that same chapter speaks of a future disaster, which will come to this world, which God has ordained.

[70:16] Let me ask you, are you safe tonight? Not from a worldwide flood, but from that event to come.

In the flood, you were lost if you were outside. You were saved if you were inside. What is the way to be saved today? The cross of Christ.

The message of the rocks is judgment. The message, once we get it from a biblical perspective, is that we need to be saved.

Let me ask you, are you sure that you have closed with the Lord Jesus Christ tonight, who bled and died, that you might be forgiven? Most of you here are Christians, but some of you may not be.

I have a booklet that I've been offering each night. If you'd like to know more about how you personally can close with the Lord Jesus Christ, take this from me and I'll gladly give it to you.

[71:19] Maybe somebody who's a Christian here can help you to understand the wonder of what Jesus did in bleeding and dying for our salvation. Peter, let's just have a few questions.

And if five minutes or so, and then there'll be a cup of tea, I guess. So, Pastor Peter, thank you very much for your patience.