

Scientific Support for a Young Earth

Adapted from <http://www.answersingenesis.org/home/area/feedback/2006/0303.asp>

Dear Dr. Mortenson,

...What are the most compelling scientific evidences of a young earth?

With Joy in Jesus,
Tony

Tony,

...Regarding the impact of intelligent design arguments on intellectuals, this strategy of using design arguments which are divorced from Scripture was tried once before, in the early 19th century, and it failed to convert people or to overcome the growing skepticism in the once-Christian cultures of Britain and America. In fact, many of those who were arguing for design in this way were also leading the church to reject Genesis 1–11 and accept the geological theory of millions of years—50 years before Darwin published his famous book on evolution...

Scientific arguments for a young earth are numerous:

1. The old-earth idea was developed historically, not from letting the physical facts speak for themselves but by imposing anti-biblical philosophical assumptions onto the geological observations. See this [article](#) and this [DVD](#).
2. The radiometric dating methods are based on those same naturalistic, uniformitarian, anti-biblical assumptions and there is plenty of published evidence that they do not give valid dates. Besides the RATE research mentioned earlier, consider the well-researched arguments in the 10-page article [Does Carbon-14 Disprove the Bible?](#) You cannot expect this icon of evolution to be overthrown in a few short paragraphs.
3. John Morris's book (*The Young Earth*) gives a good layman's summary (with documentation and plenty of pictures to illustrate) of some of the strongest evidence for a young-earth and global Flood. For more in-depth arguments see John Woodmorappe's book (*Studies in Flood Geology*). Excellent DVDs illustrating some of these points are on Mt. St. Helens (*Mount St. Helens: Explosive Evidence for Catastrophe*) and Grand Canyon (*The Grand Canyon: Monument to the Flood*). Creationist scientists (or any scientists, for that matter) don't have answers to everything and so are continuing to do research (and the number of qualified creationist geologists is increasing), but following is some of the evidence brought out in these resources:
 - a. The almost complete absence of evidence of erosion or soil layers or the activity of living things (plant roots, burrow marks, etc.) [is missing] at the upper surface of the various strata (showing that the stratum did not lay there for thousands or millions of years before the next layer was deposited).
 - b. Polystrate fossils (usually trees)... cut through more than one layer of rock (even different kinds of rock supposedly deposited over thousands if not millions of years). The trees would have rotted and left no fossil evidence if the deposition rate was that slow.

- c. Soft-sediment deformation—that thousands of feet of sedimentary rocks (of various layers)—are bent (like a stack of thin pancakes over the edge of a plate), as we see at the mile-deep Kaibab Upwarp in the Grand Canyon. Clearly the whole, mile-deep deposit of various kinds of sediment was still relatively soft and probably wet (not like it is today) when the earthquake occurred that uplifted one part of the series of strata.
 - d. Many fossils... show (require) very rapid burial and fossilization. For example, soft parts (jellyfish, animal feces, scales and fins of fish) or whole, large, fully articulated skeletons (e.g., whales or large dinosaurs such as T-Rex) are preserved. Or we find many creatures' bodies contorted. All this evidence shows that these creatures were buried rapidly (in many cases even buried alive) and fossilized before scavengers, micro-decay organisms and erosional processes could erase the evidence. These are found all over the world and all through the various strata.
 - e. The rock record [screams] “Noah’s Flood” and “young earth.” The secular geologists can’t hear or see the message because of their academic indoctrination in anti-biblical, naturalistic, uniformitarian assumptions. The reason that most Christian geologists can’t see it is the same, plus the fact that they have believed the scientific establishment more than the Bible that they claim to believe is the inspired, inerrant Word of God. There are also thoroughly researched scientific refutations of skeptical objections to Noah’s Ark and the Flood [here](#), which strengthen one’s faith in the biblical account of the Flood.
4. Creationists still have many challenges regarding the scientific evidence for a young universe, but distant starlight is no more of a problem for young-earth creationists than it is for big bang proponents, as this DVD by [Dr. Jason Lisle](#) (Ph.D. in astrophysics) shows: [Distant Starlight](#).

Both God’s Word and His creation are saying the same thing. And over the past 50 years, true science has been increasingly confirming Scripture. With more research by both evolutionists and creationists in the years ahead, we can fully expect that many questions that young-earth creationists cannot presently answer will later be answered and will be shown to confirm that God created the whole universe a few thousand years ago, then cursed His whole creation a few days later because of Adam’s sin and then destroyed it with a global, catastrophic, year-long flood at the time of Noah, just as the Bible clearly teaches.

I hope that you will consider these resources and study Genesis 1–11 more carefully, and then submit to the authority of God’s Word in all things.

God bless,
[Dr. Terry Mortenson](#)
Answers in Genesis–USA

Note from Dr. Griffith:

Please look up this site and click on the underlined links above for further study in this vital subject:
<https://answersingenesis.org/evidence-for-creation/most-compelling-scientific-evidence-of-young-earth/>