

Does the strength of your Christian faith and Creationism depend on evolution being false?

What makes your story of creationism fundamentally different and more probable than all other creation stories that exist now, have existed before, and will exist in the future?

Is there any kind of observation which, if it were seen, would change Creationism? It is open to modification based on new discoveries like science is?

Why does the human chromosome #2 appear to have been created by the fusion of two different chimpanzee chromosomes, complete with structures which would not be necessary if it was created as a single, unified chromosome? One example of this is the presence of a vestigial telomeres. These are normally found only at the ends of a chromosome, but in chromosome 2 we see additional telomere sequences in the middle—almost as if two chromosomes had merged to form one.

Source: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. October 15, 1991 vol. 88 no. 20 9051-9055

If all design must have a designer, then how do you explain a sharp rock? Is there a “rock sharpener”? If a sharp rock is a product of natural processes, why can't design be natural?

Any good scientific theory makes predictions—either predictions of what will be observed or what may be found. For example, the theory of evolution makes a number of predictions. It predicts that an animal that exists at a later time in the tree of life should not be found in earlier eras. So, finding a fossilized sparrow in Precambrian era rocks would falsify the theory outright. But we make no such discoveries. It also predicts that finding an organism without DNA or something entirely different to perpetuate genetic information on earth would be impossible, since all life is related according to the theory.

My question is: what predictions does Creationism make, and do you have any **specific** examples of a successful prediction Creationism has made in the past based on empirical evidence? Additionally, do you have a **specific** example of a discovery that would falsify a Creationism prediction?

Variation within species is easy to detect. Just look around the room and observe how different our genes make us in external appearance alone. What **specific** genetic barriers are in place that would prevent a multitude of these variations from cropping up and accumulating in two isolated populations of one species, to such a degree that two organisms that were once the same species are no longer able to reproduce?

A species of insect-eating lizards (5 males, 5 females) was introduced onto an island not native to them (Pod Mrcaru) in 1971. A war broke out (Croatian War of Independence) and resulted in the island being neglected for 36 years. When the scientists went back, they noticed the lizards had changed in many ways. They had switched to eating mostly vegetation, and as a result they

had wider, deeper, stronger bites to get more plant matter per bite. Their legs are shorter and they are slower since they no longer needed to hunt down insects. Internally, a **brand new structure**, called a cecal valve (it slows the digestion of food by narrowing the digestive tract), had appeared seemingly spontaneously. It appears the lizard had evolved an entirely new structure, not a simple adaptation of an existing one to fit their new environment and much less energetic lifestyle as herbivores. This took approximately 30 generations. How does Creationism account for natural phenomenon such as this, and why is this not evidence that massive changes within a species can cause speciation?

Source: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. March 25, 2008 vol. 105 no. 12 4792-4795

There are a number of examples of transitional fossils for many currently existing organisms. One of these examples is the cetaceans, or the group of animals that includes whales, porpoises, and dolphins. We know that these animals' ancestors were once land dwellers because 1) they require to resurface for air, 2) their bone structures in their hands resemble land mammals more than they do fish, and 3) the movements of their spines are more characteristic of mammals than they are of fish, who move their spines horizontally. Thus, we would expect to find some transitional fossils filling this gap between land dwellers and sea dwellers.

We've found them. We have numerous fossil examples that demonstrate a transition from land-dwelling to sea-dwelling creatures. Ambulocetus, Rodhocetus, and Basilosaurus were discovered in successive geological strata, and have bone structures we would expect to find in an animal that is slowly changing for life at sea. We see shortening of hind limbs, change from feet to flippers, and shift of the nasal cavity towards the top of the head, as well as numerous other developments. We also see the partial development of hind limbs in the embryos of modern whales today. Does creationism have a rational explanation for the existence of this phenomena accounting for both the skeletal similarities between the seemingly transitional fossils and modern whales, and the embryonic development features of today's cetaceans?

Source: *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. May 30, 2006 vol. 103 no. 22 8414 – 8418

If Noah's flood was an accurate depiction of a historic event, how did the fish and sea creatures manage to survive? In order for saltwater creatures to survive, it must have rained saltwater, but then what happened to freshwater fish and river-living fish? Did Noah have on-board, climate-controlled aquariums to support the sea life? How did the survivors aboard the ark cope with the increased air pressure? Is there any empirical evidence to support your conclusions?

In the original Hebrew text of Genesis, the word 'eres' is used to explain the extent of Noah's flood. However, there are many variations to this word's true meaning, such as earth, ground, land upon which I stand, world, and territory. What physical evidence do you have that shows that the flood was global, rather than local, since the Bible is so unclear on this issue?