

[1 - Introduction](#)

[2 - Instantaneous Creation](#)

[3 - Recent Creation](#)

[4 - Starlight, Star Distances, and the Speed of Light](#)

[5 - Genesis Is Scientific](#)

[6 - Creation versus Gradual Evolution Debate: a Summary](#)

[7 - Naturalism versus Super-Naturalism](#)

[8 - Big Bang Theory](#)

[9 - Astronomy and Academia](#)

[10 - Astrology: Earth at the Center of the Universe?](#)

[11 - Life on Other Worlds? And Conclusion](#)

[Appendix 1: Outline of the Days of Creation](#)

[Appendix 2: Scientists' Opinions on Big Bang Theory](#)

APPENDIX 2: Scientists' Opinions of Big Bang Theory

From ***A Brief History of Time: From the Big Bang to Black Holes*** by Stephen Hawking (1988).

“This [Big Bang] picture of the universe... is in agreement with all the observational evidence that we have today... Nevertheless, it leaves a number of important questions unanswered... [and goes on to say that the theory cannot explain the origin of the stars and galaxies.]

From ***“Speed of Light Slowing Down After All”*** by Carl Wieland (December, 2012)

This ‘secular CDK’ announcement [about the speed of light slowing down], by one of the biggest names in physics, should really be an antidote to the confident arrogance of long-age big-bangers. So should the recent landmark *Journal of Creation* paper by Humphreys showing observationally that we are in fact close to the centre of a bounded universe (download PDF file [Our galaxy is the centre of the universe, ‘quantized’ red shifts Show](#)).

More recent *New Scientist* articles have reported on how it seems to be acceptable to propose c-decay [speed of light slowing down] to try to solve another well-known difficulty of the big bang theory, called the *horizon problem*. That is, the cosmic microwave radiation

indicates that space is the same temperature everywhere, indicating a common influence. But no connection between distant regions would be possible, even in the assumed time since the alleged 'big bang', because of the 'horizon' of the finite speed of light.... now some physicists have proposed that the speed of light was much faster in the past, which would allow the 'horizon' to be much further away and thus accommodate the universe's thermal equilibrium.

From [**"Does the Bible Really Describe Expansion of the Universe?"**](#) By John Hartnett (August, 2011)

Hubble initially interpreted his redshifts as a Doppler effect, due to the motion of the galaxies as they rushed away from our location in the universe. Later he became disillusioned with the recession interpretation: " ... *it seems likely that red-shifts may not be due to an expanding Universe, and much of the speculation on the structure of the universe may require re-examination.*"² He said that what became known as the Hubble Law could also be due to "*some hitherto unknown principle of nature*",² but not due to expansion of space—now called cosmological expansion. [² Hubble, E.P., The 200-inch telescope and some problems it may solve, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* 59:153-167, 1947.]

However, to date there is no direct experimental evidence, from any local laboratory experiment, that establishes cosmological expansion as a real phenomenon of nature. Though it can be derived as a consequence of Einstein's general relativity theory, it has been claimed by some as another fudge factor to prop up the ailing standard Lambda cold dark matter (Λ CDM) big bang model for the origin and structure of the universe.

From [**"Does Observational Evidence Indicate the Universe is Expanding?—Part 2: the Case against Expansion"**](#) by John Hartnett (December, 2011)

The red shift of light in the universe is supposed to prove that the universe is expanding, which in turn is essential for the validity of the Big Bang. Taking together all the evidences presented here... in my opinion, it is impossible to conclude either way whether the universe

is expanding or static. The evidence is equivocal. It would seem that cosmology is far from a precision science, and there is still a lot more work that needs to be done to resolve the apparently contradictory evidence.

From *[The Creation Answers Book, chapter 5](#)*, by Don Batten, David Catchpoole, Jonathan Sarfati, Carl Wieland. Creation Book Publishers (2012)

Most people think of the universe as having a centre and an edge. This means that if you were to travel into space, you would eventually come to a place beyond which there was no more matter. In this understanding, Earth is near the centre, as it appears to be as we look out into space. This might sound like common sense, as indeed it is, but all modern secular cosmologies deny this. That is, they make the assumption that the universe has no boundary—no edge and no centre—dubbed the ‘cosmological principle’. In this assumed universe, every galaxy would be surrounded by galaxies spread evenly in all directions. In such a universe, all net gravitational forces cancel out and there is no preferred direction, so there are also no net effects of movement of astronomical objects.

This is a philosophical assumption; that is, religious. And it is made to remove Earth from its apparently privileged position near the centre of the universe (because that’s what the Bible implies—that Earth is the focus of God’s attention in creating the universe). Note the views of respected cosmologist George Ellis, once a colleague of the famous Stephen Hawking; as reported by Scientific American:

“People need to be aware that there is a range of models that could explain the observations” Ellis argues. “For instance, I can construct you a spherically symmetrical universe with Earth at its centre, and you cannot disprove it based on observations.” Ellis has published a paper on this. “You can only exclude it on philosophical grounds. In my view there is absolutely nothing wrong in that. What I want to bring into the open is the fact that we are using philosophical criteria in choosing our models. A lot of cosmology tries to hide that.”

Not only can you have such an understanding of the universe, but it

actually fits the evidence better than the no-centre, boundless universe assumed by secularists. There is now observational evidence that the universe has a centre...

Hartnett realized that these ideas also worked with a universe with a centre and an edge. Furthermore, with this approach, an acceleration (increasing velocity) of the expansion of space, such as could be expected on the fourth day of the creation week, would have profound implications for time during that period. Time dilation results, but not due to a net gravitational effect—it is due to the enormous accelerated stretching of the fabric of space. This means that on Day 4, the clocks in the outer reaches of the expanding universe were running very fast compared to clocks on Earth. This allows time for distant starlight from the galaxies being created on the fourth day to travel to Earth and be visible to Adam and Eve. Again, it's the fourth day as measured by Earth clocks, the clocks the Bible uses.

[“The Decay in the Speed of Light and the truth about Red Shift”](#) by Grady McMurtry (4 April, 2020)

The Big Bang theories state that first there was nothing and then it exploded. There is no attempt in the various Big Bang theories to account for the sudden appearance of energy and matter, much less time. The theories require that everything starts from an infinitesimal point. In the Big Bang theories the energy must come from within the universe and proceed outward. These theories also require that the expansion continues today. The Biblical account of creation does not start from an infinitesimal point. The energy of creation does not come from within the universe; it flowed into the universe.

Perhaps the single greatest problem for Big Bangers is the singularity problem, which involves the original cause of the universe and the origin of matter and energy within space. While the Big Bang theorists attempt to describe the early universe and what happened during unseen and untestable history, they have so far been unable to explain why there is a universe to begin with.

If light was faster in the past, then the earth and universe are young

and evolution theories are not true. If the speed of light was faster in the past, then radioactive elements decayed much faster in the past, and the radioactive dating techniques, so highly touted by evolutionists, are totally unreliable - they are useless. The evolutionist's presupposition of the constancy of the speed of light is an Achilles Heel for them.

Evolutionists talk about cold dark matter and dark energy as if they "know" they exist, yet both are unproven. In fact, the most recent research from the BOOMERANG (Balloon Observations of Millimetric Extragalactic Radiation and Geophysics) experiment suggests that the universe is filled only with normal matter, that there are no exotic particles and no cold dark matter.