

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** I created this site, [OriginScience.com](http://OriginScience.com), and the chart below (along with another site debunking young-earth creationism, [CreationCrisis.com](http://CreationCrisis.com)) while I was still a struggling Christian.

I eventually abandoned the faith and am now an atheist. The chart below and the sites [OriginScience.com](http://OriginScience.com) and [CreationCrisis.com](http://CreationCrisis.com) REMAIN UNCHANGED. [My new site is here.](#)

There are a few ERRORS in the chart below regarding naturalistic evolution, where my Christian bias at the time affected what I wrote. Those errors are pointed out [here](#).



# ORIGIN VIEWS COMPARISON CHART

BETA 1  
MAY 31, 2007 [CLICK FOR PDF VERSION](#)

y.o. = years old. All figures are approx. Text in red indicates a diversion from secular science. Text in gray provides additional info. [Printable PDF Version](#)

YOUNG-EARTH CREATIONISM (YEC)	OLD-EARTH CREATIONISM (OEC)	THEISTIC EVOLUTION (TE)	NATURALISTIC EVOLUTION (NE)
<p><b>Universe:</b> 6,000-10,000 y.o.</p> <p><b>Earth:</b> 6,000-10,000 y.o.</p> <p><b>Earliest life forms:</b> 6,000-10,000 y.o.</p> <p><b>Pre-humans/hominids:</b> n/a</p> <p><b>Mod. Humans:</b> 6,000-10,000 y.o.</p>	<p><b>Universe:</b> 13.7 billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Earth:</b> 4.5 billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Earliest life forms:</b> 3+ billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Pre-humans/hominids:</b> 3-7 mil. y.o.</p> <p><b>Mod. Humans:</b> 10,000-100,000 y.o.</p>	<p><b>Universe:</b> 13.7 billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Earth:</b> 4.5 billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Earliest life forms:</b> 3+ billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Pre-humans/hominids:</b> 3-7 mil. y.o.</p> <p><b>Mod. Humans:</b> 50,000-200,000 y.o.</p>	<p><b>Universe:</b> 13.7 billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Earth:</b> 4.5 billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Earliest life forms:</b> 3+ billion y.o.</p> <p><b>Pre-humans/hominids:</b> 3-7 mil. y.o.</p> <p><b>Mod. Humans:</b> 50,000-200,000 y.o.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: THE FORMATION OF THE OBSERVABLE UNIVERSE</b></p> <p>Against overwhelming evidence that the Big Bang occurred billions of years ago, argues that the earth and the universe are only 6,000 - 10,000 years old. Interprets all evidence in light of a traditional / literal understanding of Scripture, specifically that in the space of 6 literal days (144 hours), the entire known universe was spoken into existence, the earth was created, and all life forms, including humans, were created on earth within the last 10,000 years.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: THE FORMATION OF THE OBSERVABLE UNIVERSE</b></p> <p>Recognizes evidence indicating that the Big Bang occurred around 13.7 billion years ago, when all matter exploded into the universe from what is believed to have been an infinitesimal speck. Our sun, a star itself, formed over time (through the observable process of star formation), and eventually spun off the matter that formed the planets of our solar system, including earth, about 4.5 billion years ago. Proponents of this view see these events as being part of the Creation process that occurred over six long 'day-ages' (or epochs), which equated to billions of years.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: THE FORMATION OF THE OBSERVABLE UNIVERSE</b></p> <p>Recognizes evidence indicating that the Big Bang occurred around 13.7 billion years ago, when all matter exploded into the universe from what is believed to have been an infinitesimal speck. Our sun, a star itself, formed over time (through the observable process of star formation), and eventually spun off the matter that formed the planets of our solar system, including earth, about 4.5 billion years ago.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: THE FORMATION OF THE OBSERVABLE UNIVERSE</b></p> <p>Recognizes evidence indicating that the Big Bang occurred around 13.7 billion years ago, when all matter exploded into the universe from what is believed to have been an infinitesimal speck. Our sun, a star itself, formed over time (through the observable process of star formation), and eventually spun off the matter that formed the planets of our solar system, including earth, about 4.5 billion years ago.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: LIFE / HUMANS</b></p> <p>Argues that 6,000 - 10,000 years ago during the 6 days (144 hours) of Creation all life, including man, was created by God. Man was specifically created in the image of God, with a soul, and the unique ability to commune with God. No death occurred before the creation of man, and no evolution from one species to another has ever occurred throughout the history of time. Argues that apart from God's miraculous intervention life cannot come from non-life, and order cannot spring from disorder, two principles that are normally upheld by science, except when it pertains to naturalistic evolution. Proponents of YEC also point out that macro-evolution (between species), as opposed to micro-evolution (changes in the same species) has also never been observed in nature, apart from so-called transitional fossils.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: LIFE / HUMANS</b></p> <p>As the earth cooled around 4 billion years ago, the earliest life forms were created by God; and sporadically, over billions of years, all other life forms were created. In the last 10,000 -100,000 years, man was specifically created in the image of God, with a soul, and the unique ability to commune with God. Death would necessarily have occurred prior to the creation of man. No evolution from one species to another has ever occurred throughout the history of time. Argues that apart from God's miraculous intervention life cannot come from non-life, and order cannot spring from disorder, two principles that are normally upheld by science, except when it pertains to naturalistic evolution. Proponents of this view also point out that macro-evolution (between species), as opposed to micro-evolution (changes in the same species) has also never been observed in nature, apart from so-called transitional fossils.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: LIFE / HUMANS</b></p> <p>As the earth cooled around 4 billion years ago, the earliest life forms evolved; and over billions of years, God used the process of evolution to create all life forms, including man. At some point, God placed a soul into a pre-human / hominid to 'create' the first man. Uncertainty exists as to whether or not other 'humans' existed before the 'first man,' or whether the biblical Adam was indeed the first man or not. Death would necessarily have occurred prior to the 'evolutionary creation' of man. Some proponents argue that apart from God's miraculous intervention life cannot come from non-life, and order cannot spring from disorder, two principles that are normally upheld by science, except when it pertains to naturalistic evolution. Macro-evolution (between species), as opposed to micro-evolution (changes in the same species) has never been observed in nature, apart from so-called transitional fossils.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: LIFE / HUMANS</b></p> <p>As the earth cooled around 4 billion years ago, the earliest life forms evolved; and over billions of years, all other life forms, including man, evolved through macro-evolution (from one species to another). No outside force played any role in the evolutionary processes that occurred. Random chance and natural selection were strictly responsible for the evolution of all life forms, including man. Man, by his very nature, is an evolved animal, without a soul. The human mind, will, emotions, conscious, and sense of morality are merely biological and chemical components/apparatus, made possible through evolution. Argues that apart from any miraculous intervention life came from non-life, and order sprang from disorder, notions that are normally considered violations of scientific principle, except when it pertains to naturalistic evolution. Macro-evolution (between species), as opposed to micro-evolution (changes in the same species) has never been observed in nature, apart from so-called transitional fossils.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: COSMIC MICROWAVE BACKGROUND RADIATION</b></p> <p>Denies the scientific conclusions that are derived from measurements of cosmic microwave background radiation, which is generally understood to indicate the amount of time that has passed since the Big Bang occurred, now thought to be 13.7 billion years an amount of time which also corresponds well with the independently-calculated age of stars. Proponents of this view believe the universe cannot be older than 6,000 - 10,000 years old, based primarily on their interpretation of Scripture.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: COSMIC MICROWAVE BACKGROUND RADIATION</b></p> <p>Upholds the scientific conclusions that are derived from measurements of cosmic microwave background radiation, which is generally understood to indicate the amount of time that has passed since the Big Bang occurred, now thought to be 13.7 billion years an amount of time which also corresponds well with the independently-calculated age of stars.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: COSMIC MICROWAVE BACKGROUND RADIATION</b></p> <p>Upholds the scientific conclusions that are derived from measurements of cosmic microwave background radiation, which is generally understood to indicate the amount of time that has passed since the Big Bang occurred, now thought to be 13.7 billion years an amount of time which also corresponds well with the independently-calculated age of stars.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: COSMIC MICROWAVE BACKGROUND RADIATION</b></p> <p>Upholds the scientific conclusions that are derived from measurements of cosmic microwave background radiation, which is generally understood to indicate the amount of time that has passed since the Big Bang occurred, now thought to be 13.7 billion years an amount of time which also corresponds well with the independently-calculated age of stars.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: STARS / STARLIGHT / SPEED OF LIGHT</b></p> <p>Argues the speed of light must have</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: STARS / STARLIGHT / SPEED OF LIGHT</b></p> <p>Recognizes the speed of light as</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: STARS / STARLIGHT / SPEED OF LIGHT</b></p> <p>Recognizes the speed of light as</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: STARS / STARLIGHT / SPEED OF LIGHT</b></p> <p>Recognizes the speed of light as</p>

<p>changed (slowed down), or that there must be some other explanation to disprove the overwhelmingly clear science indicating that most stars are 1-10 billion years old (and some are over 13 billion years old), since proponents of this view believe the universe cannot be older than 6,000 - 10,000 years old. Any change in the fixed speed of light over any period of time would have had enormous consequences on our universe. Also, as Dr. Norman Geisler observed, "We have watched star explosions that happened billions of years ago, but if the universe is not billions of years old, then we are seeing light from stars that never existed because they would have died before Creation. Why would God deceive us with the evidence? The old earth view seems to fit the evidence better and causes no problem with the Bible."</p>	<p>constant, and acknowledges the overwhelmingly clear science indicating most stars are 1-10 billion years old, and some are over 13 billion years old. Outside the young-earth creationist community, the estimated age of stars is universally accepted. In 1997, the Hubble Space Telescope photographed an exploding supernova an event that actually took place 10 billion years ago, but whose light is just now reaching us. The Hubble Telescope can see stars as they were approx. 10 billion years ago, with glimpses of stars even further back. The next generation deep-space telescope (launching in 2013) is expected to see stars as they were 13.2 billion years ago, estimated to have formed only a few hundred million years after the Big Bang.</p>	<p>constant, and acknowledges the overwhelmingly clear science indicating most stars are 1-10 billion years old, and some are over 13 billion years old. Outside the young-earth creationist community, the estimated age of stars is universally accepted. In 1997, the Hubble Space Telescope photographed an exploding supernova an event that actually took place 10 billion years ago, but whose light is just now reaching us. The Hubble Telescope can see stars as they were approx. 10 billion years ago, with glimpses of stars even further back. The next generation deep-space telescope (launching in 2013) is expected to see stars as they were 13.2 billion years ago, estimated to have formed only a few hundred million years after the Big Bang.</p>	<p>constant, and acknowledges the overwhelmingly clear science indicating most stars are 1-10 billion years old, and some are over 13 billion years old. Outside the young-earth creationist community, the estimated age of stars is universally accepted. In 1997, the Hubble Space Telescope photographed an exploding supernova an event that actually took place 10 billion years ago, but whose light is just now reaching us. The Hubble Telescope can see stars as they were approx. 10 billion years ago, with glimpses of stars even further back. The next generation deep-space telescope (launching in 2013) is expected to see stars as they were 13.2 billion years ago, estimated to have formed only a few hundred million years after the Big Bang.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: RADIOMETRIC DATING</b></p> <p>Denies the reliability of all forms of radiometric dating, whenever any rocks are dated beyond 6,000 - 10,000 years old. Proponents of this view dismiss the reliability of radiometric dating, claiming that measurements can vary widely and be contradictory. While this is true to an extent, only young-earth creationists in a community of otherwise unanimous scientific agreement even remotely consider radiometric dating to be fundamentally flawed. When geologists use multiple independent tests to confirm their results, variation has little if any bearing on the final conclusions. Finding even one geologist outside the young-earth creationist community who disputes the overall findings of radiometric dating is virtually impossible.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: RADIOMETRIC DATING</b></p> <p>Accepts the general reliability of radiometric (rock) dating, which indicates that rocks on earth can be dated up to 4 billion years old. Radiometric dating is equivalent to reading the 'clocks in the rocks.' Eight different radioactive elements are used to determine the age of the rocks containing them. The 'parent element,' gradually decays into a 'daughter element.' In the case of uranium, it gradually decays into lead. Geologists simply grind the rock into powder, remove any contaminated portions, and separate the uranium from the lead. Since the decay rate is constant, geologists can then determine the approximate age of the rock. Geologists use as many as four or more independent radiometric dating methods to determine the age of rocks in a given area. The general reliability of radiometric dating is universally accepted among geologists, excluding only young-earth creationists.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: RADIOMETRIC DATING</b></p> <p>Accepts the general reliability of radiometric (rock) dating, which indicates that rocks on earth can be dated up to 4 billion years old. Radiometric dating is equivalent to reading the 'clocks in the rocks.' Eight different radioactive elements are used to determine the age of the rocks containing them. The 'parent element,' gradually decays into a 'daughter element.' In the case of uranium, it gradually decays into lead. Geologists simply grind the rock into powder, remove any contaminated portions, and separate the uranium from the lead. Since the decay rate is constant, geologists can then determine the approximate age of the rock. Geologists use as many as four or more independent radiometric dating methods to determine the age of rocks in a given area. The general reliability of radiometric dating is universally accepted among geologists, excluding only young-earth creationists.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: RADIOMETRIC DATING</b></p> <p>Accepts the general reliability of radiometric (rock) dating, which indicates that rocks on earth can be dated up to 4 billion years old. Radiometric dating is equivalent to reading the 'clocks in the rocks.' Eight different radioactive elements are used to determine the age of the rocks containing them. The 'parent element,' gradually decays into a 'daughter element.' In the case of uranium, it gradually decays into lead. Geologists simply grind the rock into powder, remove any contaminated portions, and separate the uranium from the lead. Since the decay rate is constant, geologists can then determine the approximate age of the rock. Geologists use as many as four or more independent radiometric dating methods to determine the age of rocks in a given area. The general reliability of radiometric dating is universally accepted among geologists, excluding only young-earth creationists.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: THE FOSSIL RECORD</b></p> <p>Denies that fossils exist showing any age greater than 6,000 - 10,000 years. Proponents generally believe the majority of fossils appearing to be millions of years old were created during Noah's Flood. Proponents also deny that fossils provide support for evolution between species, especially due to the overwhelming lack of transitional fossils that have been found to date.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: THE FOSSIL RECORD</b></p> <p>Upholds the scientific consensus that fossils exist showing that life has existed on earth for millions of years actually billions of years, in the case of the earliest life forms. Denies that fossils provide support for evolution between species, especially due to the overwhelming lack of transitional fossils that have been found to date. Over 200 million fossils have been found and classified into approx. 250 thousand different species. If all living and extinct species evolved gradually over billions of years, it would be expected that a percentage of fossils would show transitional forms. If a mere 1% of the 200 million fossils collected to date showed transitional forms, their number would equal 2 million. Instead, less than 100 fossils have ever been found that even remotely fit into the category of transitional forms. The fossil record does not support transitional forms. Instead, it appears to support the extinction of one species and the 'sudden appearance' of completely new species, in direct contradiction to what scientists would expect to see, if species gradually mutated from one species to another over millions of years.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: THE FOSSIL RECORD</b></p> <p>Upholds the scientific consensus that fossils exist showing that life has existed on earth for millions of years actually billions of years, in the case of the earliest life forms. Asserts that the relatively small number of fossils that can (even remotely) be classified as transitional fossils do indeed provide adequate proof of evolution between species arguing that because such rare / specialized conditions must exist for fossilization to occur, that it is no surprise more transitional fossils have not been found.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: THE FOSSIL RECORD</b></p> <p>Upholds the scientific consensus that fossils exist showing that life has existed on earth for millions of years actually billions of years, in the case of the earliest life forms. Asserts that the relatively small number of fossils that can (even remotely) be classified as transitional fossils do indeed provide adequate proof of evolution between species arguing that because such rare / specialized conditions must exist for fossilization to occur, that it is no surprise more transitional fossils have not been found.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: DINOSAURS</b></p> <p>Denies all evidence indicating otherwise, in arguing that dinosaurs were created during 6 literal days of Creation, 6,000 - 10,000 years ago. Dinosaurs therefore lived concurrently with humans, and died out sometime in the last 10,000 years. Some proponents of young-earth creationism actually believe that dinosaurs may still exist in remote, largely unexplored regions of the world.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: DINOSAURS</b></p> <p>Dinosaurs were created by God, apart from evolution, in one of the many interspersed 'creation events' that took place over billions of years. Affirms evidence indicating that dinosaurs lived from around 210 million years ago until around 65 million years ago, when they died out, long before the arrival of humans or pre-humans / hominids. Current research postulates that dinosaurs became extinct due to suffocation, following a giant meteor striking the earth, which resulted in a dust cloud blanketing the planet.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: DINOSAURS</b></p> <p>Along with all the other animals, dinosaurs evolved over time as part of a process that was engineered, and/or guided by God. Affirms evidence indicating that dinosaurs lived from around 210 million years ago until around 65 million years ago, when they died out, long before the arrival of humans or pre-humans / hominids. Current research postulates that dinosaurs became extinct due to suffocation, following a giant meteor striking the earth, which resulted in a dust cloud blanketing the planet.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: DINOSAURS</b></p> <p>Along with all the other animals, dinosaurs evolved over time. Affirms evidence indicating that dinosaurs lived from around 210 million years ago until around 65 million years ago, when they died out, long before the arrival of humans or pre-humans / hominids. Current research postulates that dinosaurs became extinct due to suffocation, following a giant meteor striking the earth, which resulted in a dust cloud blanketing the planet.</p>

<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: DNA RESEARCH</b></p> <p>Denies that human DNA shows evidence of 'shared ancestry' / gene artifacts that 'descended' from animals to humans over millions of years. Since DNA research is considered to be in a constant state of flux at this time, conclusions in this field are ever-changing. In early 2007, it was announced that Neanderthal and other hominid species (which Young-Earth Creationists consider to be either 'fully' human or ape species) have now been completely ruled out as ancestors of modern humans.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: DNA RESEARCH</b></p> <p>Denies that human DNA shows evidence of 'shared ancestry' / gene artifacts that 'descended' from animals to humans over millions of years. Argues against the common genetic understanding that 'junk DNA' or pseudogenes (found in human DNA) are 'copied errors' from millions or billions of years of evolution. Proponents of this view believe that uses will eventually be discovered for the portions of DNA now referred to as 'junk DNA'. While evolutionists claim there is additional evidence in the DNA showing 'shared ancestry,' apart from 'junk DNA,' Old-Earth Creationists argue this is evidence of 'common design' and not 'shared ancestry.' Secular geneticists currently interpret DNA as showing that all humans living today are descendants of a 'population group' estimated to range from hundreds up to ten thousand in opposition to a biblical understanding that all humans are direct ancestors of the biblical Adam and Eve. However, secular genetics research acknowledges what is known as 'Mitochondrial Eve' and 'Y-Chromosomal Adam.' A woman (from Africa) who has been labeled 'Mitochondrial Eve,' though NOT considered to be the 'first' woman, is shown in the DNA to be the female ancestor of all humans living today, and is thought to have lived around 143,000 years ago. Old-Earth Creationists believe she may be the biblical Eve. A man (also from Africa) has been labeled 'Y-Chromosomal Adam.' He is shown in the DNA to be the male ancestor of all humans living today, and is thought to have lived around 59,000 years ago. Old-Earth Creationists believe he may be the biblical Noah. He would have carried Eve's DNA, and his sons would have been the ancestors of all humans living after Noah if the entire human population, besides Noah and his extended family, had died in the Flood. Since DNA research is considered to be in a constant state of flux at this time, conclusions in this field are ever-changing. Neanderthal and certain other hominid species have now been completely ruled out as ancestors of modern humans.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: DNA RESEARCH</b></p> <p>Argues that human DNA appears to show evidence of 'shared ancestry' / gene artifacts that 'descended' from animals to humans over millions of years. (See notes on 'junk DNA' and 'Mitochondrial Eve' and 'Y-Chromosomal Adam' in the OEC column.) Since DNA research is considered to be in a constant state of flux at this time, conclusions in this field are ever-changing. In early 2007, it was announced that Neanderthal and other hominid species have now been completely ruled out as ancestors of modern humans.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: DNA RESEARCH</b></p> <p>Argues that human DNA appears to show evidence of 'shared ancestry' / gene artifacts that 'descended' from animals to humans over millions of years. (See notes on 'junk DNA' and 'Mitochondrial Eve' and 'Y-Chromosomal Adam' in the OEC column.) Since DNA research is considered to be in a constant state of flux at this time, conclusions in this field are ever-changing. In early 2007, it was announced that Neanderthal and other hominid species have now been completely ruled out as ancestors of modern humans.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW - Re: NOAH'S FLOOD</b></p> <p>Affirming the literalist understanding of the biblical record, argues that a worldwide flood occurred within the last 6,000 - 10,000 years, in which all land creatures were destroyed, including the entire human population. This view contradicts geological evidence indicating that no worldwide flood has ever occurred in the history of planet earth (and that there isn't enough water on earth to do so). Also contradicts genetic research showing that no 'population bottleneck' of this magnitude a total population reduction to only a few people has ever occurred in the history of 'modern humans,' especially not in the last 10,000 years.</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW - Re: NOAH'S FLOOD</b></p> <p>Seeking to affirm the biblical record in a limited sense, argues that a regional flood occurred within the last 10,000-100,000 years, in which the entire human population (along with land creatures living in the vicinity) were destroyed. Since geological evidence is lacking to support even a regional flood of this magnitude any time in the last 5 million years, this position is maintained only by appealing to God's miraculous intervention, in causing the flood to accomplish His intended purpose. Geological evidence indicates the flood waters would have flowed into the sea within a few weeks, rather than months, as is indicated in the Genesis account. Also contradicts genetic research showing that no 'population bottleneck' of this magnitude a total population reduction to only a few people has ever occurred in the history of 'modern humans.' However, there is currently debate as to whether a 'bottleneck' might possibly have occurred sometime in the last 100,000 years; although the 'bottleneck' in question is not believed to have reduced the entire human population to anywhere near as low a figure as the Genesis record indicates (Noah and his extended family). See related DNA info above.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW - Re: NOAH'S FLOOD</b></p> <p>Among theistic evolutionists, perspectives vary as to whether or not the biblical flood ever occurred, or whether the story was meant to be understood merely in an allegorical sense.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW - Re: NOAH'S FLOOD</b></p> <p>Since geological and genetic evidence appears to contradict the story, it is widely regarded as myth, with absolutely no bearing on reality. Claims are also made that the biblical story was lifted from Sumerian literature, since a similar flood story surfaced in their culture prior to the time the biblical story was recorded by Moses, long after the event had supposedly taken place.</p>
<p><b>YEC VIEW: MAJOR PROBLEMS:</b></p> <p><b>Scientific problems:</b> Contradicts multiple fields of science and mountains of evidence indicating that the universe is nearly 14 billion years old; most stars are 1-10 billion years old; the sun and earth are 4.5 billion years old; numerous meteorites and moon rocks are 4.5 billion years old; thousands of earth rocks and fossils are up to 4 billion years old; and artifacts in human genes appear to be millions, if not billions, of</p>	<p><b>OEC VIEW: MAJOR PROBLEMS:</b></p> <p><b>Biblical issues:</b> Days become epochs; death occurs before the Fall of Man; Genealogies are extended from an estimated 6,000 years to between 10,000 and 100,000 years. (Huge gaps are 'assumed' in the genealogies to account for the fact that science places the advent of modern humans in the timeframe of 50,000 - 100,000+ years ago.) Reduces the biblically-described worldwide flood to a regional flood.</p>	<p><b>TE VIEW: MAJOR PROBLEMS:</b></p> <p><b>Biblical issues:</b> The first 11 chapters of Genesis are generally relegated to the level of 'biblical myth' or allegory, to allow for a completely objective scientific understanding of the world with the only assumption being that God participated somehow in the process, albeit invisibly and untraceably.</p>	<p><b>NE VIEW: MAJOR PROBLEMS</b></p> <p><b>Scientific problems:</b> Science alone cannot explain what, if anything, existed before the Big Bang or what caused it. Nor can it account for the incredible complexity of the universe, or the amazing 'appearance of fine-tuning' in the universe and especially on earth, where life exists and thrives, unlike anywhere else in the known universe (based on existing knowledge at this time). Science is also unable to explain</p>

years old (though DNA research is constantly changing at this time). Other findings on earth include: glacial ice cores over 180,000 years old, lake sediments over 35,000 years old, and bristlecone pine trees, whose 'rings' indicate an age of nearly 12,000 years old. Most damning against this view is the evidence from starlight. Astronomers have photographed images from stars  $\blacklozenge$  exploding supernovas  $\blacklozenge$  billions of light years away, that actually exploded and burned out billions of years ago; while on earth, the light from these events was not visible until recently  $\blacklozenge$  billions of years later. Following simple logic, Young-Earth Creationists are left essentially having to deny that these events ever happened at all  $\blacklozenge$  if not in the last 10,000 years, which is incomprehensibly impossible, according to the observable laws that govern our universe.

**Scientific problems:** Ignores supposed evolutionary evidences including the (very) limited transitional fossil record, and apparent  $\blacklozenge$  though hotly debated  $\blacklozenge$  DNA evidences for 'shared ancestry.' (Also, even a 'regional flood' of biblical proportions cannot be supported geologically, apart from miraculous intervention.)

what caused life to originate. Its presuppositions violate the second law of thermodynamics (entropy), which states that order cannot spring from disorder; also violates the law of biogenesis, which states that life cannot spontaneously arise from non-life. The most candid biologists will also agree that the fossil record is sorely lacking in transitional fossils.

Intelligent Design proponents claim that naturalistic evolution does not account for what is known as 'irreducible complexity,' the belief that the simplest organisms could not function at all unless they had been 'created' with all the necessary components. It is argued that this 'functional state' would not likely have evolved instantly, through a process of gradual, random mutations. Evolutionists, however, believe this assertion is erroneous.

**EDITOR'S NOTE:** I created this site, [OriginScience.com](http://OriginScience.com), and the chart above (along with another site debunking young-earth creationism, [CreationCrisis.com](http://CreationCrisis.com)) while I was still a struggling Christian.

I eventually abandoned the faith and am now an atheist. The chart above and the sites [OriginScience.com](http://OriginScience.com) and [CreationCrisis.com](http://CreationCrisis.com) REMAIN UNCHANGED. [My new site is here.](#)

There are a few ERRORS in the chart above regarding naturalistic evolution, where my Christian bias at the time affected what I wrote. Those errors are pointed out [here](#).

**BETA 1**  
MAY 31, 2007

**CLICK FOR**  
**PDF VERSION**

[Printable PDF Version](#)

[To View PDF, download FREE Adobe Reader](#)

[HOME](#) Chart / text copyright  $\blacklozenge$  2007 OriginScience.com. To PRINT this chart, change your page orientation from portrait to landscape (so it will print wide).

[CONTACT US](#) to share your story, or to offer suggestions for improving this chart. Your input is welcome.

[RESEARCH LINKS](#) - Categorized research links covering issues discussed in this chart. This is a beta version. Citations coming soon.

Check out another comparative chart taken from the old-earth creationist book, *Creation as Science*, by Hugh Ross:

**[CREATION/EVOLUTION MODEL 'TESTABLE PREDICTIONS' COMPARISON CHART](#)** (PDF)

**[FROM OLD-EARTH CREATIONIST MINISTRY, REASONS TO BELIEVE](#)**

This chart presents each of the four views above as TESTABLE MODELS, and contrasts the four views, based on detailed scientific 'predictions.' The premise of the 'testable model' approach is that as scientific research progresses, certain propositions will be proven true and certain propositions will be proven false. Evidences from all fields of science are expected to eventually favor one view of origins over all others.



## ORIGIN VIEWS COMPARISON CHART: Young-Earth Creationism (YEC) vs. Old-Earth Creationism (OEC) vs. Theistic Evolution (TE) vs. Naturalistic Evolution (NE)