

I believe the greatest threat to finding God today is Scientists.
They speak as if Darwin's theory of evolution is not a theory.
They speak in millions and billions of years as if it is a FACT.
None of this agrees with Scripture.

The main problem with '**evolution (theory of)**', is that there is no evidence.

On this..... (a pet hate)

If it was a fact that life evolved by accident upon accident, then the ground would be absolutely full of all the freaks and mutations along the way to this.

Not so.

Every thing ever dug up has been allocated to their type ("kind") as in Genesis 1.

While on this, Wikipedia states that there are 35million SNP's alone in difference between chimp and humans. (a little deceptive when saying that they share 96% of human genes let alone that we have 1 pair of chromosomes less, are bipeds, and have a Soul which gives us CHOICE, and all other life is driven by instinct)

That is a lot of accidents and mutations, many in sequence for a chimp to evolve into a human.

Not as easy to believe?

What about all the different versions of humans over the million years all over the Earth.

No 'missing link', they are all missing!

Where is Science and Scientists in this?

Has science ever created a single living cell INTENTIONALLY from the innate and chemicals.? NO

Yet they want us to believe that it happened by accident "abiogenesis" in a "cosmic soup" and then hide this rubbish behind 100s of millions of years.

Is that Science? If so, then it is full of guesswork assumptions and theories.

Watch for it. They have claimed Evolution is Fact. You don't hear "theory of..." anymore.

Tell me which Scientists are screaming out that it is still just a theory.

It disgusts me. A system that allows them to peddle the lie (deception) AND others to remain silent on it.

Science ONLY FINDS what GOD has already done.

Scientists have not invented gravity or friction or any other physical law.

So, please humour me.

'They' say that a **banana shares 60% of human DNA**.

So it is possible then that one day a banana skin may contain a human offspring, arms legs heart brain etc albeit maybe bonsai version. I hear you laughing...how ridiculous!!! I am with you.

But the same 'they' say we evolved from a single cell amoeba which only shares about 3%.

I don't hear you laughing.

Surely something 60% along the way towards human has so much greater chance than the amoeba.

Yes. You should be angry that they have shoved this absolute LIE but worse DECEPTION (by padding it with FACTS rather than TRUTH) down our throats for generations now and 'they' are still no closer.

Lets not mention the **chook and the egg**. btw they share 60% of our DNA too.

DNA.....

boggles me and probably you too, but.....

do you know that an amoeba has 100 times and some 200 times the number of DNA pairs in their genome than Humans? Humans have over 3 billion, amoeba can have nearly 700 billion. But dont hold your breath waiting for one to walk out of the swamps.

But why give it any credence let alone believe it enough to change who you are.

Know how big a billion is? If you counted out loud at an average of 1 per 5 secs it would take you over 150 years. Over 400 years if 12 hrs a day 5 days a week.

Not much more than a billion minutes ago Jesus walked the Earth.

More

look up **CARBON DATING**

based on cosmic ray/C14 **assumption**.....pardon? Where is the Science???

“.....difficulty arises from the extremely low abundance of ^{14}C . Only 0.000000001% of the carbon in today's atmosphere is ^{14}C , making it incredibly difficult to measure and extremely sensitive to contamination. “

Error in Radiocarbon Dating from Phys.org

When Willard F. Libby developed the radiocarbon dating method he **assumed** that the rate of carbon-14 production has been constant through the past 70,000 years (Fleming p. 58). However, the concentration of carbon-14 in the atmosphere has deviated, especially during the last 10,000 years (Geyh p. 167). Therefore, several correction factors have been determined based on the age of samples. The Suess effect can explain recent changes in the carbon-14 concentrations; the equilibrium of the natural carbon-14 cycle was disturbed by man with the onset of the industrial age that began around 1850 (Geyh p. 175). At most the modern samples aged within the last two hundred years will have an error factor of 25 years (Geyh p. 167). For samples within the last 2000 years, error factors range to 200 years; the factor exponentially climbs as the radiocarbon material ages. For the period from 2000 to 7300 years ago, the error factor reaches 800 years and for samples dating to 11,000 years estimates may be off by as much as 1,100 years (Geyh p. 168).

Manning, professor of archaeology at Cornell University and director of the Cornell Tree-Ring Laboratory,

"We went looking to test the **assumption** behind the whole field of radiocarbon dating," Manning said. "We know from atmospheric measurements over the last 50 years that radiocarbon levels vary through the year, and we also know that plants typically grow at different times in different parts of the Northern Hemisphere. So we wondered whether the radiocarbon levels relevant to dating organic material might also vary for different areas and whether this might affect archaeological dating."

The authors measured a series of carbon-14 ages in southern Jordan tree rings, with established calendar dates between 1610 and 1940 A.D. They found that contemporary plant material growing in the southern Levant shows an average offset in radiocarbon age of about 19 years compared the current Northern Hemisphere standard calibration curve.

Manning noted that "scholars working on the early Iron Age and Biblical chronology in Jordan and Israel are doing sophisticated projects with radiocarbon age analysis, which argue for very precise findings. This then becomes the timeline of history. But our work indicates that it's arguable their fundamental basis is faulty—they are using a calibration curve that is not accurate

Applying their results to previously published chronologies, the researchers show how even the relatively small offsets they observe can shift calendar dates by enough to alter ongoing archaeological, historical and paleoclimate debates.

"There has been much debate for several decades among scholars arguing for different chronologies sometimes only decades to a century apart—each with major historical implications. And yet these studies ... **may all be inaccurate since they are using the wrong radiocarbon information**," Manning said.

Their version CANNOT be RELIED UPON

The Bible says that there was no rain until the flood which was about year 1656 about 4380 years ago. Check the genealogy in the Bible... So a very short cosmic ray time pre-flood and very little C14 creation. There has not been 70,000 years of C14 creation.

Bible Proof on rainfall? **The rainbow.**

New to the survivors at the time, not to us. No sun thru vapour in the lower atmosphere pre-flood.
Gen 7:11 In the six hundredth year of Noah's life (yes things were different pre-flood), on the seventeenth day of the second month—on that day all the springs of the **great deep burst forth**, (underground) and the **floodgates of the heavens** were opened. 12 And rain fell on the earth forty days and forty nights.....

.....and eventually covered the tallest mountain by 20 feet.

A lot of water in the atmosphere

It is likely that the Earth had no oceans before the flood and smaller, the size of Gondwanaland with some seas. A lot happened at the flood, so lets not assume the Himalayas existed but Mt Ararat did.

Pre-flood there were no oceans, no seasons, the earth smaller, the core more concentrated, both axis aligned, AND stronger magnetic field, deflecting cosmic rays.

The magnetic field has decreased in strength by 30% in the last 3000 years, so more cosmic ray bombardment.

Above says the assumption was that nothing has changed in 70000 years.
The dinosaurs were pre flood. In comparison to today, little cosmic rays, little C14, therefore assumed very old.

The Earth and the Universe were stretched (scripture) during the flood to contain the consequences of sin.

Today they are making calibration changes to allow for CO2 % air composition changes due to the industrial age and contamination from the nuclear tests. That's Science. Assumptions and guesswork constants and adjustments.

Unfortunately, they don't seek what the Creator says.

Maybe if they worked forwards from Gods Word rather than backwards using guesswork and theories.

Anyway, carbon dating, if they get their assumptions, adjustments and constants correct, should work for Biblical time lines.

The half-life of C14 is only about 5730 years.

So Science doesnt rely on it much for older samples. Know why?

They have chosen that mankind appeared 1 million years ago.

Just a stab in the dark?

NO! Because they say they can calculate the age of something by where it is found in rock layers.

How? Because they use the half-life of several isotopes found in rock.

All rock? Don't know.

All over the earth? Don't know, But would be a huge negative if not in abundance and everywhere.

Original element	Decay product	Half-life (years)
Uranium-235	Lead-207	704 million
Rubidium-87	Strontium-87	48.8 billion
Potassium-40	Argon-40	1.25 billion
Samarium-147	Neodymium-143	106 billion

These half-lives would be useless for once-living sample calculations.

Uranium is the most relied upon. But the assumption, again, is that there was **no Lead** in the rock to start with.

Sorry....enough on this

That leaves Science telling us the

AGE OF THE UNIVERSE

that they can measure light from stars and galaxies (a pinhead of fuzzy light) that are **billions** of years old.

Thats Redshift which is meant to show movement not distance and there is no proof that it works that far.

If they say any distance greater than 10,000 years on anything to do with visible light, dont believe them.

"..Light is a very very fragile thing that is corrupted by well.....almost anything and everything"

"The one thing we know about the Universe isthat we know Nothing about the Universe"

Rusty Koenig Cook Management..via Quora

Stellar Parallax is the most accurate method of calculating Star distance.

Even this has its limits of accuracy. Remember we are dealing with light from very far away with a lot of stuff in between.

Like trigonometry where a "stationery" object is viewed from 2 locations at the same angle knowing the distance between and calculating the perpendicular distance. Like to a tree on the other side of a river.

But we are restricted by the distance across the Earths orbit of the Sun.

Light takes 8 minutes to reach us from the Sun. ie only 16 light minutes as a base line across.

So now picture a line from this point each side of the Sun to the target Star forming a triangle.

There are over 500,000 minutes in 1 year. 5000 million in 10,000 years.

Lets face it 5000 million with a base of 8 isnt a triangle , it is a straight line

(for 10,000 light years away, what about the millions and billions?)

So a picture is taken in July and another in January at the same distant Star.

This is hopeless from ground observations

So they sent up the Hipparcos telescope which gives us reasonable accuracy to 150 parsecs (x3.26=500 light yrs) Since then the Gaia telescope which gives us reasonable accuracy to 1500 light years away.

That is Stars in this galaxy. Of course the edge of this galaxy is further and then further still to the others. BUT, we are NOT looking at a stationery object AND we are talking VERY MINUTE parts of one degree for calculations.

THEN there is disruption of the light waves over distance AND the star is moving and the Sun is moving in space and so is the Earth and the Milky Way galaxy itself.

Like I said, anything greater than 10000 I wouldnt believe, but really, 6000 for anything you can see in the Universe.

Genesis 1 King James Version (KJV)

1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

3 And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. (before the Sun and Moon?)

4 And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

*5 And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the **evening and the morning were the first day. (not 1000 years, millions or billions)***

6 And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

7 And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so.

*8 And God called the firmament Heaven. And the **evening and the morning were the second day.***

*16 And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he **made the stars also.***

.....

*31 And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the **evening and the morning were the sixth day.***

Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.

Genesis 2

*2 And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he **rested on the seventh day** from all his work which he had made.*

Each day was a day in Earth time (an evening and a morning)...not zillions of them.

If you knew WHY the temporary Physical realm was created, you would understand why it was done so quickly.

Please, for your sake...

when you hear science mention millions or billions.....switch off.

But, please don't believe I am against Science.

NO WAY.

I am against making theories assumptions guesses a FACT but worse the TRUTH.

How can we enjoy what comes from research and revelation into the physical realm without Scientists?

How can God get the Glory for His Creation, planning, Wisdom but basically His Awesomeness and Power without Science **FINDING** out what HE has **ALREADY DONE**, whether HE gets the credit or NOT?

Yes they don't take into account the Supernatural realm.

Thats for believers.

They will say if we can't measure or interrogate its existence it is not part of Scientific research.

And fair enough.

BUT I believe they have crossed that line many times in the Physical.

Some a little full of themselves.