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**CREATION SCIENCE**

The Journal of the Creation Science Movement, restoring faith in the Bible and science

*Image: Utah skyline by DR04 CC-BY-3.0*
“How did birds get their feathers? Complex feathers might have originally evolved because birds’ dinosaur ancestors found them sexually attractive.”

“This fossil showed evidence of pennaceous feathers, and some were asymmetric.”

“Persons and his colleague Philip Currie at the University of Alberta, Canada, think it wasn’t natural selection but sexual selection that drove feather evolution. Complex feathers might have been poor insulators, but if they helped dinosaurs secure more mating opportunities then there would have been a good reason to evolve and retain them. Biologists already know that sexual selection can shape feathers in dramatic ways, says Persons. Perhaps most famously, many biologists think male peacocks evolved elaborate tail feathers largely to impress peahens”.

Evolutionists struggle to explain how dinosaurs “evolved” lightweight asymmetric flight feathers when they clearly could not fly!! Even if a dinosaur developed flight feathers it could never fly without a host of other very specific design features. This whole story is a lame attempt to make the impossible seem possible. Anyone who reviews the facts will realise that birds could not have evolved from dinosaurs. The set of necessary avian design features needed for flight is so comprehensive that a miracle would be needed if they were to suddenly appear together. It is much easier to believe that God created birds as recorded in the Bible: “Then God said, ‘Let the waters abound with an abundance of living creatures, and let birds fly above the earth across the face of the firmament of the heavens.’ So God created great sea creatures and every living thing that moves, with which the waters abounded, according to their kind, and every winged bird according to its kind.” Genesis Ch1 V 20,21.
THE BLUE WHALE ... DID IT EVOLVE?

On the BBC EARTH website an article by Alfie Shaw confidently states:

"Far bigger than any dinosaur, the blue whale is the largest known animal to have ever lived. An adult blue whale can grow to a massive 30m long and weigh more than 180,000kg - that’s about the same as 40 elephants, 30 Tyrannosaurus Rex or 2,670 average-sized men. But this giant among giants started as something far smaller. Like all whales, the blue whale evolved from a four-legged mammal that lived on land some 48 million years ago. This ancient ancestor, Pakicetus, was only 1.8m long. It foraged in streams and some of its descendants became adapted to living in water. This eventually led to a completely aquatic creature called Dorudon ("Spear-Tooth"), which lived 37 million years ago and grew 4.5m long".

Katie Pavid of the Natural History Museum says:

"Pakicetus (pictured right) looked nothing like a whale, but it would have felt at home in the water. It lived on land, on the edge of lakes and riverbanks in what is now Pakistan and India. It hunted small land animals and freshwater fish, and could even hear underwater. Eventually the relatives of this animal ventured further into the water and evolved to cope with their new environment".

The only feature of Pakicetus that in any way hints at aquatic capability is the thickened, bony structure of the skull, which resembles a cetacean skull structure. However, it lacked the bony jaw structure needed to hold the fat pad found in cetaceans which enables sound transmission underwater. Thus, Pakicetus was not adapted to hear underwater as are modern whales. The Pakicetus is assumed to have evolved into a Dorudon by those who believe in the unproven theory of evolution. Similarly, the Dorudon is assumed to have evolved into a blue whale.

The story of a small, land based mammal evolving into a huge whale is like a children's fairy tale. You can accept it if you are prepared to suspend disbelief and travel into a wonderful place of fantasy and imagination.
NECESSARY DESIGN FEATURES OF THE BLUE WHALE

Specialised feeding design with baleen plates and no teeth. Eating krill by gulping and filtering

Eating krill by gulping and filtering

Controlled tail fluke with a system of tendons and muscles

Modified vertebral joints to allow tail movement

No hind legs or remains of these

Upper closeable blowhole for breathing

MALE: Internal testicles with countercurrent cooling system

FEMALE: recessed nipples for feeding calves with high pressure ejection

Front legs modified into flippers

Thick blubber for insulation

Sensitive underwater hearing

Collapsible lungs with surfactant for inflation

Floating ribs to allow lung collapse when diving

Horizontal diaphragm to allow lung collapse

Horizontal diaphragm to allow lung collapse when diving

This schematic shows just the very basic anatomical differences between a land based mammal and a whale. All the features are needed for a fully aquatic existence. A half adapted creature would not survive on land or in water. The gradual evolution of a whale is an impossibility, in the same way that a Land Rover could not gradually turn into a submarine. The whale is designed for aquatic life.

The assumptions about whale evolution are made on the basis of ZERO evidence. We can study the blue whale. Everything else relies on fictional stories which somehow link modern fossil finds to the Blue Whale. Who was there to observe the changes? Did anyone document the anatomy, physiology and feeding habits of Pakicetus? There is no gradual fossil evidence to link the land based Pakicetus and the aquatic Dorudon and the whale. Any proposed transitional creatures are more like amphibious sea lions and otters than proto whales. This whole evolutionary tale is pure science fiction and should not be believed as science fact. Like all living creatures, the whale shows remarkable engineering design, achieved through complex anatomy, physiology and biochemistry. Good design comes from God, not chance mutations.
Rutger Hauer was a Dutch actor who appeared in many films but is best known for his memorable role as the replicant Roy Batty in the 1982 Ridley Scott film: 

**BLADE RUNNER**

He gave his role a stunning intensity, playing opposite Harrison Ford. The film has become a cult sci-fi classic and recently a sequel has been made - *BLADE RUNNER 2049*

The original film *Blade Runner* was memorable not only because of its imaginative futurescape and sets, but also due to its subject matter. The film is the story of four “synthetic” humans, called *replicants*, who have amazing abilities but only a four year lifespan. These four escape from an off-world colony back to Earth and are hunted down by the Blade Runner, played by Harrison Ford.

The replicants have returned to Earth to find their designer and creator, Eldon Tyrell, in the hope of increasing their lifespan. The film portrays their ultimately futile fight against their own mortality. In the last stage of the film there is a showdown between the Blade Runner and Roy Batty, who delivers some very poignant lines, partly ad-libbed by Rutger Hauer:

“I've seen things you people wouldn't believe... Attack ships on fire off the shoulder of Orion... I watched sea-beams glitter in the dark, near the Tannhäuser Gate... All those moments will be lost in time, like tears in rain... Time to die.”

With these words he bows his head and dies. This epilogue throws into sharp relief the issue of our own ephemeral life on Earth and its significance. Will our lives simply be washed away just like tears in the rain? The Christian faith contains a real hope of eternal life, which is what Jesus Christ promised to those who will believe and trust in him.
WE JUST FOUND DOZENS OF MISSING GALAXIES FROM THE EARLY UNIVERSE

NEW SCIENTIST - SPACE: 7 AUGUST 2019 JONATHAN O’CALLAGHAN

“A hoard of previously missing galaxies from the early universe has now been found. Dating back to the first two billion years of the cosmos, these galaxies represent a key missing link to some of the most massive galaxies seen today.”

Tao Wang, at the University of Tokyo in Japan, and his colleagues discovered 39 massive star-forming galaxies, using the Atacama Large Millimeter/submillimeter Array (ALMA) in Chile. These galaxies are very faint indeed in the optical and UV wavebands, but can be detected at radio wavelengths using large radio dishes such as ALMA.

These galaxies are assumed to have been formed in the very early Universe due to their distance from Earth (the light travel time indicates the age). They are also assumed to be “star forming” galaxies, but in fact, no astronomer has ever observed a new star starting to shine. Any stated star formation rates are simply estimates by astrophysicists based on assumed age and the approximate number of stars observed in a galaxy. The NS article states, “Most massive galaxies today evolved from those in the early universe, but until now, astronomers had been unable to find enough massive galaxies in the early universe to account for the large number of massive galaxies five to 10 times the mass of the Milky Way we see in the local universe today.”

Wang says: “The next step will be to figure out the missing physics in producing so many massive galaxies that early”. The problem disappears when you realise that God created our Universe!
EARLY LIFE ON EARTH MAY HAVE EXISTED AS MINIATURE DROPLETS OF JELLY

NEW SCIENTIST 22 JULY 2019 MICHAEL MARSHALL

“Blobs of simple carbon-based compounds could have been the precursors to the first living cells. A new study suggests that such droplets could have formed quickly and easily on the young Earth”.

The famous Soviet biochemist, Alexander Oparin, was convinced that life started by accident. In 1924, he proposed that life on Earth developed through gradual chemical evolution of carbon-based molecules in the Earth's primordial soup. He thought that coacervates might have formed in the Earth’s oceans and one of these became the first living cell. He had no knowledge of DNA and no idea of just how complex proteins are. He did not perform any experiments to test his idea. Much later, in 1953, Miller & Urey made simple amino acids from basic chemicals.

INFORMATION A coacervate is a spherical aggregation of lipid molecules making up a colloidal inclusion which is held together by hydrophobic forces. Coacervates measure 1 to 100 micrometres across, possess osmotic properties, and form spontaneously from certain weak organic solutions.

Tokyo Tech News reports: “A team led by Tony Z. Jia of the Earth-Life Science Institute at the Tokyo Institute of Technology and Kuhan Chandru of the National University of Malaysia, has shown that simple α-hydroxy acids, like glycolic and lactic acid (which is used in facial peels), spontaneously polymerise and self-assemble into polyester microdroplets when dried at moderate temperatures followed by rehydration, (as might have happened along primitive beaches and river banks or in drying puddles). These form a new type of cell-like compartment which can trap and concentrate biomolecules like nucleic acids and proteins. These droplets, unlike most modern cells, are able to easily merge and reform and thus could have hosted versatile early genetic and metabolic systems potentially critical for the origins of life”. This all sounds like breakthrough research!!

The truth is that these new microdroplets are as far away from a living cell as one could imagine! There is no outer cell membrane, no DNA, no proteins, no organelles - nothing that is needed for a truly living, self reproducing cell. Secular, origin of life researchers are groping in the dark. Cellular life is so complex that only God himself could have designed and created the first cells.

OPARIN

LACTIC ACID MODEL
Professor James Lovelock is famous for proposing the Gaia Hypothesis - “living organisms interact with their inorganic surroundings on Earth to form a synergistic and self-regulating, complex system that helps to maintain and perpetuate the conditions for life on the planet”. Gaia is the primordial goddess who personified the Earth in Greek mythology. Lovelock co-developed the theory with the late Lynn Margulis, a microbiologist. His ideas are still not fully accepted by the scientific community.

James Lovelock began his scientific career working for the Medical Research Council after obtaining a chemistry degree from Manchester University. He later received a Ph.D. degree in medicine from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, and also a D.Sc degree in biophysics from London University. Since 1964 he has conducted an independent practice in science, although continuing his honorary academic associations. He believes that humanity is now making the transition from the “anthropocene” era to the “novacene” era, i.e. we are moving away from biological life to a cybernetic future. He imagines the world being dominated by cyborg-type people. This is something of a science fiction dream, despite the rapid advance of A.I. Systems. Machines may be able to mimic human behaviour but will never appreciate Mozart!

The Gaia hypothesis was given its name by William Golding (author of “Lord of the Flies”), who studied science and English Literature at Oxford University. Lovelock showed remarkable insight by developing this theory. All the latest scientific research shows that the biosphere is indeed an integrated system. The conditions on this planet are regulated by organic life. Plant life keeps the surface temperature and atmosphere suitable for animal and human life, as well as capturing energy and making food. The oceans also help with these processes. All waste biological material is dealt with and naturally recycled. It is almost as if the whole system has been designed to be self sustaining. This of course is what the Bible teaches in the book of Genesis. God himself created the Earth, biological life and finally mankind. In Genesis Ch1 we read, “And God saw that it was good”.

IMAGES: Earth public domain. James Lovelock CC BY-SA 1.0
Dr Anna Ijjas is a theoretical physicist who is the Lise Meitner Research Group Leader at the Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics. She writes: “Reflecting on the question of what God was doing before creation, Saint Augustine is said to have quipped: ‘He was preparing hell for those who pry into mysteries.’ Apparently the idea of hell doesn’t scare today’s scientists. As a matter of fact, many of us are trying to understand how our universe came to be.” Perhaps the scientists should be scared of hell and also read their Bibles to discover who made our Universe!

Dr Ijjas has doubts about the Big Bang model. She is not convinced about the truth of the current “inflation” theory, which seeks to overcome the problems of a Universe expanding from a primordial singularity. Inflation is an ad-hoc idea with no watertight theoretical foundations or experimental verification. It was proposed to save the Big Bang theory from being rejected.

The Big Bang model was derived from Einstein’s theory of general relativity. It proposes a spacetime expansion from an original super dense point of mass/energy. There is no explanation for how it all started and there are real problems with star & galaxy formation. The proposed “inflation field”, which is supposed to have caused an initial short burst of rapid expansion, has no origin or reason to exist. Dr Ijjas is concerned about the effects of quantum fluctuations on the very early Universe. She has, therefore, revisited an old idea (proposed by physicist Paul Steinhardt) of a cycling Universe, which contracts, bounces and expands again. This process requires a source of energy to halt and smoothly reverse the contraction. Dr Ijjas has developed a theoretical model to describe this. As yet there is no experimental evidence to back up this idea or reject it. A cycling Universe stretches backwards and forwards in time to infinity. The Bible says that God created the Universe and everything. It all had a beginning so a cycling Universe would not be possible. Secular theorists will believe anything except God’s word.
“Next-generation telescopes and new ways of detecting life on other planets are transforming the search for extraterrestrials. We may finally be about to find out if aliens exist”.

“for the first time in human history we are reaching the technological sophistication needed to provide a genuine answer.”

“IT IS the biggest question in the universe: are we alone? Philosophers have debated the question for millennia.”

Organic life on earth produces a mixture of atmospheric gases that would not exist on a lifeless planet. This gives Earth’s atmosphere a unique spectral biosignature.

Dr Sarah Rugheimer completed her doctoral studies on the topic of the detection of spectral biosignatures on exoplanets. She is convinced that there may be life on other planets in our galaxy. She believes that this is the “biggest question in the Universe”. This begs certain other questions: 1. Why is this the biggest question in the Universe? 2. Is it likely that life could develop on other planets? 3. How did life start on this planet? People who have no belief in God as the creator of life here will normally subscribe to philosophical naturalism. This means that life MUST have started by accident. Therefore, it is possible that a similar process could take place on other Earth-like planets. The quest to discover life “out there” is in fact a search for the significance and meaning of our own lives. When the creator God is taken out of the equation, the uniqueness of human life on Earth would make the Universe seem a very lonely place. Our own lives would seem to be a meaningless blip in a vast cosmos. The biggest questions are actually whether we are indeed created and whether death is the end for us. Possible alien life will not change our own destinies! The number of possible civilisations on other worlds was dealt with by the astronomer Frank Drake via his famous equation (mentioned by Dr Rugheimer).

\[
N = R^* \cdot f_l \cdot n_e \cdot f_t \cdot f_i \cdot f_c \cdot L
\]

This equation has a number of terms. The last four must have assumed, not measured values. The major tacit assumption is that life could start by accident. The scientific evidence indicates that the chance formation of the first living cell is impossible chemically and from an information content viewpoint. We are clearly created and thus accountable to the God who made us. We will not find our destiny out in space but with our creator who made us to be with him for eternity. The choice however is ours...
WANTED
THE ANSWER TO LIFE

10 million dollar reward

Entrepreneurs offer $10m prize for cracking mystery of DNA

Wealthy investors are offering a $10m prize to the first scientific team that can create a genetic code from simple chemicals. (June 2019)

The Evolution 2.0 prize is an initiative by Perry Marshall, an online marketing entrepreneur based in Chicago. It will be judged by prominent scientists, including George Church, genetics professor at Harvard University, and Denis Noble, the Oxford University biologist.

Professor Noble says: “The biggest problems in science today are: how life got going in the first place and what is the origin of the genetic code. We want to know whether the way information is encoded in DNA is the result of chance or whether there are good chemical reasons why the code should be the way it is”.

The DNA double helix is in every living cell and is an information rich molecule. It codes for protein synthesis in the cell, as well as containing all the instructions for making and regulating living organisms. It has a multi-layer code and recently more scientists have realised that this information needs a source. The laws of chemistry and physics do not essentially dictate the ordering of base pairs in DNA. It is just like a computer program but written with the base pairs on the DNA strand. Every cell contains the machinery for reading and decoding the information in DNA.

Codes must be designed and written. Coded information must be derived from an intelligent source. Random chance will not generate information, nor will mixing chemicals in a test tube do this. Professor Noble has a forlorn hope of finding a materialistic answer to life. God himself has told us in the Bible that HE created life and so we already know where DNA information originates from!

IMAGES: Perry Marshall  CC BY-SA 3.0. Denis Noble, DNA, Dollar bills, public domain
The teaching of creationism could "creep in" to schools under Wales' new curriculum, scientists have said. A letter signed by 46 individuals and organisations, including Sir David Attenborough, asks the Welsh Government to explicitly ban the teaching of creationism as science. Organised by campaign group Humanists UK, it also calls for primary school pupils to be taught about evolution. The Welsh Government said it expects "all pupils will be taught evolution".

The scientists further say: "What's more, without an explicit ban on teaching creationism, intelligent design and other pseudoscientific theories as evidence-based, such teaching may begin to creep into the school curriculum, when it is vital children in Wales are not exposed to pseudoscientific doctrines masquerading as science". These learned scientists are rather ingenuous in their acceptance of evolution as evidence based!

The well known anthropologist and broadcaster, Professor Alice Roberts, has signed the letter. She has previously said, “There is a role for discussing creationism in religious studies at schools, but it has no place in science education" and "creationism has the potential to ruin a scientific education". It is difficult to see how the study of the foundational sciences (physics and chemistry) could in any way be prejudiced by acceptance of a creationist viewpoint.

The truth is that this letter is just a way of ensuring that children are indoctrinated with an uncritical view of evolutionary dogma. They do not yet have the intellectual maturity to evaluate any evidence presented. The scientists themselves have swallowed the Darwinian fiction hook, line & sinker. These apparently learned scientists do not seem to understand the difference between science and philosophy. Creationism is NOT a scientific theory or idea. It therefore CANNOT be “pseudoscience”. Scientific discoveries strongly suggest that we live in a created Universe and that life has been created, but this is not scientific proof as no controlled experiment can be performed to test the idea. Evolution is in the same situation. It is NOT testable by means of any controlled experiment. All lab experiments produce very minor changes (mainly to bacteria) but there is no means to test whether major species/species changes ever happened or indeed are even possible. Genetic evidence and the irreducibly complex nature of life does in fact show that change by means of gradual evolution is actually impossible. Fossil evidence CANNOT be used to SCIENTIFICALLY prove that one species changed into another. Evolutionists simply invent a “tree of life” and assert that one creature changed into another. Although they may be unaware of this, these scientists are grossly hypocritical in calling creationism a pseudoscientific doctrine when evolutionism is in a worse position! It is evolution that should be banned from science lessons as it is unscientific, not evidence based, and could never in principle be proven.
DON'T GO BANANAS: SHOULD WE BE CUTTING DOWN ON THE FRUIT WE EAT?
NEW SCIENTIST  31 AUGUST 2019   JAMES WONG

Amy Plowman (Director of living collections at Paignton Zoo) has rightly noted that monkeys at the zoo are given food (bananas) that would be a treat for humans but is far removed from their diet of leaves in the wild. *Inter alia*, bananas are too full of sugar. The press made much of the idea of depriving the captive simians of their bananas. The Plowman diet improved the health and behaviour of the monkeys, and dieticians began claiming that fruit was also bad for humans. After all, they had been schooled in the ideas of Darwin. Amy Plowman repudiates this idea.

James Wong concludes: “It seems, much like zookeepers of the past, our close relatedness to monkeys means many of us, low carb activists included, can't but help project their needs onto ourselves and vice versa. But to do so requires us to ignore one small detail, which even I as a botanist can confirm. Humans aren't zoo monkeys. Shocking, I know.” (Editor’s note: We are not descendants of simians!)

THIS WATERY PLANET IS THE BEST PLACE TO HUNT LIFE WE'VE SEEN SO FAR
NEW SCIENTIST  11 SEPTEMBER 2019   LEAH CRANE

A team led by Björn Benneke at the University of Montreal and a group at UCL led by Angelo Tsiaras have discovered water molecules in the atmosphere of an exoplanet. They looked at spectral signatures in the planet’s atmosphere as it made a transit around its parent star. The planet, K2-18b, is about 110 light years from Earth and is about twice the size of Earth. The planet is in the “habitable zone” i.e. the surface temperature should allow liquid water to exist. That is the good news!

Laura Kreidberg, at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in Massachusetts says, “While K2-18 b probably does have a rocky core, it is probably mostly gaseous, making it more similar to Neptune than Earth. The jury is still out on whether a planet like this could be habitable. If there were life there, it definitely wouldn’t be like life as we know it on Earth. It would have to float about in the planet’s thick atmosphere, because the pressure at the surface is probably far too high for any organisms we know of to survive”. This is the bad news! The search for ET continues as the astrophysics community spend millions on finding so called habitable exoplanets. CSM has previously commented that the probability of the biochemistry of life self assembling is effectively zero, and this is the same for exoplanets. We will not find life in space. Our planet is really quite unique.
"OLA ROSLING isn’t afraid to point out your mistakes. He is the president of Gapminder, the foundation he set up with his wife Anna Rosling Rönnlund and his late father Hans Rosling. Gapminder is dedicated to exposing common misconceptions about the world and promoting a fact-based viewpoint”.

The Gapminder Foundation does indeed showcase impressive graphs and statistics which prove how some aspects of modern life are much better than in past decades or even centuries. Rosling is a Swedish statistician and so is very qualified to produce meaningful data sets. Some facts are below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child deaths before fifth birthday</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in hunger</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population literacy</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are heartening statistics. There is no doubt that modern science, technology and medicine have enabled us to improve the basic quality of life for a significant proportion of humanity.

These statistics do however disguise some bleaker facts. The 96% of children who survive beyond five years old are growing up on a planet that has seen two world wars, and mass human genocide in the last hundred years or so. Our wonderful science & technology is propelling us towards a future where global warming is a real threat and where the planet’s precious resources are used (often for profit) as if there were no tomorrow.

Over 3% GDP of the USA is spent on armaments (UK about 2%). Many so called third world countries have rich rulers & armies, while the unfortunate poor in their populations starve.

Thoughtful people are genuinely concerned about our future. We pollute the planet and kill each other in the name of progress. The world does seem out of control! This is prophesied in the Bible. The real underlying problem is human sin and the rejection of God and his standards. God sent his son, Jesus Christ, into the world to deal with sin - but the world thinks that politics, science and technology will solve all our problems.
EUROPEANS HAVE STEADILY ACCUMULATED MUTATIONS FOR THOUSANDS OF YEARS

NEW SCIENTIST  9 SEPTEMBER 2019   MICHAEL MARSHALL

“The number of mildly harmful mutations in the European population has gradually increased over the last 45,000 years, ever since modern humans arrived on the continent. The mutations may be a lingering effect of the original migration into Europe. “These mutations that today are associated with genetic disease do not decrease over time,” says Stéphane Aris-Brosou of the University of Ottawa in Canada. However, while many of the mutations are linked to diseases, their effects are minor and it is unlikely that they are causing the people who have them significant harm”.

The study by Stéphane Aris-Brosou of the University of Ottawa is the first to include more ancient humans. The author comments that very deleterious mutations would probably not be inherited as they would prove fatal. However, this study is very damaging to the so called theory of evolution. Mutations are not improving humans, but are inexorably accumulating and will eventually lead to our demise! Ergo, we have not evolved. Dr John Sanford deals with this topic in his book “Genetic Entropy & the mystery of the Genome”. God created us genetically perfect, but the fall of man marred this world and we have been declining ever since!

TRUE NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS: SOLVING THE BIGGEST MYSTERY OF YOUR MIND

NEW SCIENTIST  18 SEPTEMBER 2019   MICHAEL GRAZIANO

“CONSCIOUSNESS is a slippery concept. It isn’t just the stuff in your head. It is the subjective experience of some of that stuff. When you stub your toe, your brain doesn’t merely process information and trigger a reaction: you have a feeling of pain. When you are happy, you experience joy. The ethereal nature of experience is the mystery at the heart of consciousness. How does the brain, a physical object, generate a non-physical essence?”

Professor Graziano immediately acknowledges that consciousness is non-physical. He then goes on later to state the following:

“Our attention schema theory explains why people think there is a hard problem of consciousness at all. Efficiency requires the quickest and dirtiest model possible, so the attention schema leaves aside all the little details of signals and neurons and synapses. Instead, the brain describes a simplified version of itself, then reports this as a ghostly, non-physical essence, a magical ability to mentally possess items. Introspection – or cognition accessing internal information – can never return any other answer. It is like a machine stuck in a logic loop. The attention schema is like a self-reflecting mirror: it is the brain’s representation of how the brain represents things, and is a specific example of higher-order thought. In this account, consciousness isn’t so much an illusion as a self-caricature.” (Note: This is an epiphenomenal view of consciousness)

This whole last statement can only be described as incoherent nonsense. Michael Graziano says that consciousness is non-physical, and then describes a physical mechanism where “the brain” reports a model of itself to itself, as if it were already a volitional conscious entity with choice! He further says:

“According to this new idea we should be able to engineer human-like consciousness into a machine.” I thought that he said consciousness is non-physical, but a machine is purely physical! As said in the August journal, we are living souls inside a material body.
WE’VE FINALLY FOUND A SKULL FROM ONE OF OUR MOST IMPORTANT ANCESTORS

NEW SCIENTIST 24 JULY 2019  MICHAEL MARSHALL

“For the first time, a partial skull belonging to one of our most important ancestral species has been found in Africa. The skull sheds light on a crucial stage of our evolution. The skull was discovered in 2016. Yohannes Haile-Selassie of the Cleveland Museum of Natural History in Ohio and his colleagues were excavating in the Woranso-Mille area of Ethiopia. One day a local man named Ali Bereino approached Haile-Selassie with a hominin upper jawbone that he had found”.

The remaining pieces of the skull were found three metres away under a 0.5m pile of three month old goat faeces. The skull has been identified as an older male of the species Australopithecus anamensis. This species is claimed to be the ancestor of the Australopithecus afarensis species. (The well known “Lucy” skeleton was named afarensis). Australopithecus africanus is supposed to be a species branching from afarensis. The anamensis skull was dated using adjacent tuff (volcanic ash) layers. The technique used was Ar/Ar dating: an indirect method which relies on a calibration from a K/Ar method date. The latter method is notoriously unreliable. This latest partial skull find is said to be the earliest australopithecine. An intelligent reader may realise that this whole evolutionary story really is a house of cards! The fossils are evaluated through the lens of a Darwinian paradigm. It is assumed that humans evolved from these ape-like creatures. When we accept the truth of Noah’s flood, then any evolutionary timeline collapses and these apes can be identified simply as co-existent species.

DELIVER US FROM EVIL: HOW BIOLOGY, NOT RELIGION, MADE HUMANS MORAL

NEW SCIENTIST 25 SEPTEMBER 2019  PATRICIA CHURCHLAND

“Our survival instinct should undercut morality – but our mammalian brains pulled off an amazing evolutionary trick. A SIMPLE interpretation of biological evolution says that nature selects for selfishness. Always. Selfish genes increase survival, so are the ones that get passed on. If altruistic genes happen to poke their heads up, they are quickly whacked. In this reading, the desire to do good by others must be taught – usually with the threat of punishment by a wrathful God, censorious parent or nosy cop. The only underlying motive for any altruism is fear.”

Patricia Churchland is a philosopher with an interest in neurophilosophy and is also an ardent evolutionist. She has a reductionist approach to human behaviour, which she regards as little more than evolved instinct. She anthropomorphises social altruism in animals and applies this trait to humans, forgetting that we alone have the capacity for abstract thought. She also forgets that human moral codes need a source, and transcend mere survival altruism. She effectively lives with a cognitive dissonance, at once saying that 1% of humans lack a “conscience”, and then stating that we are creatures with an “evolved morality”. You can’t have your cake and eat it! The truth is that we do have God-given, real moral choice. Our nature has been tainted by sin and so we see man’s inhumanity to man, as well as genuine altruism. God provided a written moral code in the Bible to show us how to live. We cannot live up to this so God sent his Son to save us. We have a moral sense because God gave this to us, not because of any biology or legalistic religious rules. We were created with the ability to recognise right & wrong.
SWEPT THEM ALL AWAY

The story of Noah’s Ark is usually treated as a children’s story, a myth or legend. However, it occupies three chapters of God’s Word. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Creator of all things, refers to it, comparing the effect of the flood to his second coming in judgment.

A flood that covered every high hill and lasted just over a year had to be devastating, but fortunately God promised it wouldn’t be repeated. There have been countless local floods since, but none like Noah’s. Only Noah’s family survived despite his preaching salvation through the Ark. Most people groups have a folk memory of the event, handed down through Shem, Ham and Japheth.

So how severe was the flood? We know about tsunamis - giant waves, created by earthquakes or large landslips - travelling at speed. When they make landfall, they uproot trees and smash buildings. Now imagine such waves, driven by the tides, encircling the globe for a year, unhindered by islands and continents. The ground would be eroded down to the igneous base rocks, with the sediment held in suspension, aiding the erosion process. Some vegetation might form large floating mats. Men and beasts would all be swept away. The biblical account in Genesis records that after 150 days the storms abated and the sediment, with its burden of dead creatures, began to settle. Marine bivalves were buried alive and so their fossils shells are closed. Sea lilies were fossilized intact. Those that die today rot and become a pile of little bones. Large creatures and upright trees were buried rapidly before they could decay.

When scientists drilled the sea bed 70 miles off the coast of Norway in their search for oil, the core contained a slice of bone from a terrestrial dinosaur – a Plateosaurus – buried a mile and a half deep in sediment. What sort of rushing mighty tsunami wave catapulted this large reptile off the land and deposited it 70 miles offshore, buried in miles of sediment?

Genesis tells us that the earth was full of violence, and that every thought of the imagination of man’s heart was only evil continually. Noah, a just man, found grace in the eyes of the Lord. By faith, Hebrews tells us, he and his household were saved. Today too, there is none righteous, no not one.

God sent His Son, Jesus of Nazareth, into the world. The ‘Lamb of God’ did not inherit Adam’s sinful nature. He did no sin, neither was any guile found in His mouth. He was holy, blameless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and he came to give His unblemished life as a ransom for many. By grace we are saved, through faith, and that not of ourselves. It is the gift of God. When Christ returns in judgement, it will be as in the days of Noah – universal. Our eternity depends on our response to Christ’s offer of salvation. Neither is there salvation in any other.

Dr David Rosevear
Dear CSM members & readers,

We hope that you find this journal interesting and informative, possibly prompting further reading and research. It has been written so that it is not only of interest to convinced creationists but so that others can read and learn about the disparity between the clear teaching in the Bible and many populist ideas which are dressed up as science. Therefore, we hope that you will pass on this journal to friends, colleagues and fellow church members. Also, we welcome constructive feedback on the the journal style and content. The journal is written & produced firstly for the CSM membership, so we aim to fulfil a need that is not dealt with by conventional church sermons and teaching. Please encourage others who are interested in creation matters to subscribe to our journal. The annual cost is minimal and we make no profit from this. The activities of CSM are supported via voluntary donations, which we never ask for or expect. We trust God to supply our needs and to direct our ministry.
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**WHAT WE BELIEVE**

CSM exists to help Christians and non-Christians understand that we live in a created Universe. We believe that the Bible is the revealed word of God and that the teaching in Genesis is accurate. God created the material Universe and then he created organic life, culminating in the creation of mankind. He endowed men and women with souls and gave them free will. This allowed the first humans to go against God’s instructions, leading to a fallen world. God sent his son, Jesus Christ, into the world to reunite us with him. Jesus paid the penalty for man’s rebellion and wrongdoing by dying on a Roman cross. We only have to turn to God and ask for forgiveness for him to accept us.

CSM rejects evolutionary teaching as it is false, misleading and unscientific. We endeavour to present the scientific evidence that shows the truth of God’s word, that we live in a Universe and world designed and created by God.
I am the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End.  Rev 22:13
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RESTORING FAITH IN THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE

CSM is a non-denominational Christian organisation founded in 1932 to counter evolutionary teaching.