

Too many assertions for someone who accuses others of making assertions...Sorry for the poke, couldn't help it, but now I will bother to write the whole response and fulfilling your request of providing evidence and citations. Thank you for your patience.

Right off the bat, I want to think this was probably on me for not conveying it right, but no, I did not say that "I don't care", and such conjecture actually does rub me the wrong way. What I said, and partly to prevent the gish gallop that would be dealing with every single quote one at a time and verify whether or not they are mined, is that books are not scientific literature, and therefore do not pass any peer review, so any statement they make about the opinion of an author on something is not something that forcibly holds academic value, so why would I bother with that when you could present scientific literature that suggests life could look designed rather than evolved (although admittedly both are not mutually exclusive, I also do believe there is a God). I care a lot about anything that you have to offer, but simply taking a quote that says something along the lines of "things may look created but they aren't." and going "OMG YOU SEE THEY DONT CARE THEY WILL LIE TO DENY GOD" (/hj) just isn't the way. Give me the academic sources that are replicated by experts and also have their methodology right there to make sure you get the same results.

"The illusion of purpose and design is perhaps the most pervasive illusion about nature that science has to confront on a daily basis." - A Universe Without Purpose by Lawrence M. Krauss, www.huffingtonpost.com. April 26, 2012. (Ofc I do not entirely agree with it not having a purpose but still has a point there, like with things as evident as snowflakes)

Illusion of crafted design is a tendency we have, but that sort of feeling is not definitive evidence of anything. If you want to instead argue that something like life looks created, you could provide **your own evidence in favor of it, as well as any criteria to falsify it**. You know, if scientists actually have evidence of it looking created but simply do not mention it, you should be able to show me that without a quote and simply the empirical evidence which would demonstrate modern science is flawed and evolution was always an imaginary myth.

As a side note, I think you have been told this several times but I am not sure, but evolution doesn't say that monkeys transform into humans. Humans are part of a large clade of monkeys, and evolution doesn't affect organisms but in populations. Just like you and I would be upset if someone did use blasphemy to strawman Christianity, I would ask you to honestly represent my stance and that of the scientific community. Please.

Regarding the next paragraph, yes I actually have made a lot of research in the evidence for young earth, which I have found deeply unconvincing after actually checking the sources. Carbon dating a diamond would only trick a fool, there are no beavers in the Mesozoic and calling Castorocauda a beaver is criminal, no red blood cells or any real soft tissue in dinosaur fossils (which even then remains as a laughably low statistical outlier, whereas with many other creatures like mammoths you have no issue whatsoever), salt does leave the ocean, the moon recession argument fails to account for gravity and also gets the distance of the moon wrong...It's just a headache to remember all of that, because I had to write a whole google doc debunking two AiG articles while citing academic evidence in a discord debate, just for my opposition to never address it. I would rather focus on one thing at a time, so please do not burn yourself out going on this tangent (yet) until we address whether or

not the universe or life look directly created and millennia ago (I'm guessing you believe that too).

As for radiometric dating, what you said was a double assertion that I actually find very disrespectful to well formed geologists and paleontologists. Not only it factually works with rocks that we know the age of and match historical records in many cases (and in fact, the only people I have seen raising complaints are those in a website that demands its members to sign a statement of faith to never disagree with YEC, which automatically makes them untrustworthy even if they were right,

https://answersingenesis.org/about/faith/?srsltid=AfmBOoo0df_xmsLZbCoMLIqN_EVRI41AXh9HDaByK6LC0e36k6n6wJ5D), but radiometric dating contributes significantly to the industry of fossil fuels. If these measurements and modern geology were wrong, how come they successfully manage to supply the entire world with countless billions of tons of fossil fuels, and are used by highly competitive multi billion dollar companies to predict where things like oil will be found? And on the contrary, things like flood geology utterly fail to do that, like in the case of Zion Oil and Gas.

Also, citation needed this time for the accusation of scientists rejecting dates that don't match the geologic column as if they had a prefabricated conclusion that they need to confirm. And regarding the quote you made, I would like to point out that getting vastly different ages with different methods makes perfect sense because not all radioactive isotopes are found in the same materials, nor do they have the same half lives. That's why it is dumb to use something like carbon dating to date pre Cambrian rocks and leads to you getting hundreds of millions of years of difference: it has a very short half life, and that element was not originally there because it does not form in rocks nor is it absorbed by the tissues of a rock as they grow older (/j).

Here are some sources about the accuracy of radiometric dating and how it was confirmed from other fronts, peer reviewed of course:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00445-006-0071-8>

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/radiocarbon/article/12460year-hohenheim-oak-and-pine-treering-chronology-from-central-europea-unique-annual-record-for-radiocarbon-calibration-and-paleoenvironment-reconstructions/41104F23F7389472787A965C7AD6D702>

<https://www.science.org/doi/full/10.1126/science.1087486>

This is taking a while. I'm not used to this much yapping. My bad but there was a lot of things to address.

Finishing my response with the fossils paragraph, I am disappointed with either the conjecture you drew and/or the way I expressed myself. I said "grossly" because it would unequivocally demonstrate that something is very wrong there and inconvenient for evolution, because us finding something like a new member of Avialae in the late Jurassic 10 million years before Archaeopteryx wouldn't be a "OMG THEY ALL LIED GOTCHA!!!!" (/hj) moment, but something like an amphibian in the Cambrian would absolutely be. And

yes, it absolutely looks like evolution and that is why people like paleontologists who specialize in non avian dinosaurs only go to layers that they know preemptively are Mesozoic to find things, and never come across something like a fossilized chimp. They also have had many of their predictions fulfilled, like with animals such as Tiktaalik and several Cretaceous feathered dinosaurs during the 20th century (which helped reinforcing the idea of birds being theropods and pushed the dinosaur renaissance) which were found precisely where they were expected to be found IF evolution were true.

As for taphonomy, you do not need just one singular flooding event to justify the amount of fossils we see today. Not only that idea violates the principle of faunal succession (and would also mean the world would be unrealistically overcrowded with life, plankton being the most egregious example), but also it can absolutely occur through localized floods, volcanic eruptions, quicksand... Heck, you have things like tar pits that are very recent in California that show remains can be preserved through more mechanisms than a catastrophic flood that we cannot even explain where the water came from and where it went in the first place. And also the archaeological evidence for a flood being global is not conclusive considering we have uncut historical records of civilizations like the Egyptians and Chinese (the second of which had a calendar that started before any possible date for a flood and kept counting, so they were still alive after the supposed catastrophe) that seemed to be unaffected by that, as well as many civilizations today not having flood myths and population growth absolutely not matching what you would expect to see.

I also don't know what are you alluding to with the 90% of earth being gone, but that sure isn't evolution because evolution is just the origin of biodiversity. It belongs in biology, not geology.

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08912963.2020.1867982#d1e196> regarding living fossils, too. "Living fossils" is a sensational term. The coelacanths you see today are nowhere close to being the same as the fossil species we find. There is nothing that contradicts evolution with these animals that do not change much over a long period of time because evolution does not move at a constant speed nor are body plans forced to change as if they had an expire date... Yet still, these coelacanths are not the same as the ones from the past.

Thanks if you read until the very end. In order to prevent this from simply snowballing, could we try to focus on one point (like the first one of whether or not things actually look created and that can be verified/falsified, since that was the first thug to come up) instead of simply going on a million tangents and going nowhere? We can get back to anything else later.