

The Scientific Case For Creation #2

Introduction. As we noted last week, there are two and only two possibilities regarding origins. One or the other of these two philosophies (or models) must be true. All things either can, or cannot, be explained in terms of ongoing natural processes in a self-contained Universe. If they can, then evolution is true. If they cannot, then they must be explained by supernatural processes that can account for a Universe which itself was created. Some, in an attempt to offer a third alternative, have suggested "theistic evolution" which postulates both a Creator and an evolutionary scenario. But the fact remains that ultimately either there is a Creator or there is not. That question will have to be resolved, whether or not one wishes to accept a concept like theistic evolution. An appeal to theistic evolution as a possible "third alternative" in the origins controversy will not answer the basic questions involved.

The Bible unanimously states that everything in the Universe, and in fact, the Universe itself, has come into being through the design, purpose and deliberate acts of a supernatural Creator who, using processes that are not continuing as natural processes in the present, created the Universe and all it contains (Genesis 1:1-2:25; 5:1-2; 6:7; Deuteronomy 4:32; Nehemiah 9:6; Job 26:7, 13; 33:4; Psalm 8:5; 19:1-4; 33:6, 9; 100:3; 102:25; 104:30; 139:14; 148:5; Ecclesiastes 12:7; Isaiah 40:26; 42:5; 43:1, 7; 45:7-8, 12, 18; 51:13; 54:16; Ezekiel 28:13, 15; Amos 4:13; Malachi 2:10; Mark 13:39; John 1:1-3; Acts 14:15; 17:28; 1 Corinthians 11:9; Ephesians 3:9; Colossians 1:16; 3:10; 1 Timothy 4:3; Hebrews 11:3; Revelation 4:11; 10:6).

In order to examine properly the two models, they must be defined in broad, general terms, and then each must be compared to the available data in order to see how well they explain and predict various scientific facts. The evolution model includes the evidence from various fields of science for a gradual emergence of life over eons of time, with emergence of complex and diversified kinds of life from "simpler" kinds, and ultimately from nonliving matter. The creation model includes the evidence from various fields of science for a sudden creation of complex and diversified kinds of life, with gaps persisting between different kinds, and with genetic variation occurring within each kind.

For the sake of clarity, people who believe that God created the Universe reject "macroevolution" (the emergence of the complex from the simple, and change between kinds), but do not challenge "microevolution" (the formation of species or subspecies within created kinds, or genetic variation). In these three lessons, we will examine the scientific evidence for creation.

I. ***The Law Of Biogenesis***

- A. In the field of biology, one of the most commonly accepted and widely used laws of science is the Law of Biogenesis. This law was set forth many years ago to dictate what both theory and experimental evidence showed to be true among living organisms -- that life comes only from preceding life of its own type or kind.
- B. David Kirk observed, "By the end of the nineteenth century there was general agreement that life cannot arise from the nonliving under conditions that now exist upon our planet. The dictum, 'All life from pre-existing life,' became the dogma of modern biology, from which no reasonable man could be expected to dissent."
- C. Interestingly, the Law of Biogenesis was established firmly in science long before modern evolutionary theories. Also of considerable interest is the fact that students are taught consistently in high school and college biology classes the tremendous impact of, for example, Pasteur's work on the false concept of spontaneous generation (the idea that life arises on its own from nonliving antecedents).
 1. Students are given, in great detail, the historical scenario of how Pasteur triumphed over "mythology," providing science with tremendous prestige as he discredited the concept of spontaneous generation.
 2. Then, with almost the next breath, students are informed by the professor that evolution started via spontaneous generation!
- D. Nobel laureate George Wald of Harvard wrote, "The reasonable view was to believe in spontaneous generation; the only alternative, to believe in a single, primary act of supernatural creation. There is no third alternative.... Most modern biologists, having reviewed with satisfaction the downfall of the spontaneous generation hypothesis, yet unwilling to accept the alternative belief in special creation, are left with nothing. I think a scientist has no choice but to approach the origin of life through a hypothesis of spontaneous generation.... One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are, as a result, I believe, of spontaneous generation."
- E. At present, science has no satisfactory answer to the question of the origin of life. Scientists are reluctant to accept the view that life on Earth sprang from a miracle, but their choices are limited; either life was created on the earth by the will of a Being outside the grasp of scientific understanding, or it evolved on our planet spontaneously, through chemical reactions occurring in nonliving matter lying on the surface of the planet. The first theory places the question of the origin of life beyond the reach of scientific inquiry. It is a statement of faith in the power of a supreme Being not subject to the laws of science.

But the second theory is also an act of faith. The act of faith consists in assuming that the scientific view of the origin of life is correct without having concrete evidence to support that belief.

1. Green and Goldberger put it bluntly when they wrote, "There is one step that far outweighs the others in enormity: the step from macromolecules to cells. All the other steps can be accounted for on theoretical grounds -- if not correctly, at least elegantly. However, the macromolecule to cell transition is a jump of fantastic dimensions, which lies beyond the range of testable hypothesis. In this area, all is conjecture. The available facts do not provide a basis for postulation that cells arose on this planet. This is not to say that some para-physical forces were not at work. We simply wish to point out that there is no scientific evidence."
 2. Sir Francis Crick, co-discoverer of the structure of the DNA molecule, agreed when he wrote a decade earlier, "If a particular amino acid sequence was selected by chance, how rare an event would this be? This is an easy exercise in combinatorials. Suppose the chain is about two hundred amino acids long; this is, if anything rather less than the average length of proteins of all types. Since we have just twenty possibilities at each place, the number of possibilities is twenty multiplied by itself some two hundred times. This is approximately equal to 10^{260} ... An honest man, armed with all the knowledge available to us now, could only state that in some sense, the origin of life appears at the moment to be almost a miracle, so many are the conditions which would have had to have been satisfied to get it going."
- F. In spite of all the excitement surrounding origin-of-life experiments, no one has yet "created life," or even come close. In nature, there has not been a single documented case of spontaneous generation or chemical evolution.
1. Cows give rise to cows, birds to birds, tulips to tulips, corn to corn, and so on. Spontaneous generation is a woefully inadequate explanation for the incredible complexity associated with even simple living systems.
 2. Ask any farmer what he expects to get when he plants wheat seeds, and he will tell you he expects to reap wheat -- not corn, or tomatoes. Ask him what he expects to get when he breeds a bull to a cow, and he will tell you that he expects a calf to be born as the result of that union. The Law of Biogenesis rules supreme in the biological world. From peas you get peas; from tulips you get tulips; from horses you get horses; from dogs you get dogs. That is the Law of Biogenesis at work. Everything reproduces after its kind (Genesis 1:11-12, 21, 24-25).

G. In recent years, however, some evolutionists have suggested that what is commonly referred to as a "law" is not a "law" at all, but only a "principle" or "theory" or "dictum." This new terminology is being suggested by evolutionists because they have come to the stark realization of the implications of the Law of Biogenesis.

II. ***The Laws Of Genetics***

A. One of the newest, and certainly one of the most exciting, sciences is that of genetics. Every living thing -- plant, animal and human -- is a storehouse of genetic information and therefore a potential "laboratory" full of scientific knowledge. Regardless of their respective views on origins, all scientists acknowledge this.

1. As a matter of fact, this new realm of molecular genetics is where we see the most compelling evidence of design on the Earth.
2. If Darwinian evolution is going to work, it has to succeed at the microscopic level of amino acids, proteins and DNA.

B. We have just discussed that sparrows, buttercups and human beings give rise only to sparrows, buttercups and human beings. But we know this today because of our in-depth knowledge of genetics -- the study of inheritance. However, it has not always been so.

1. It is agreed unanimously that the true origin of genetics had its origin in 1865 as the result of studies performed by an Augustinian monk, Gregor Mendel.
2. The effort to locate a gene, determine what it does and discover how it functions was launched in 1906 when American scientist Thomas H. Morgan began his famous studies on the chromosomes of fruit flies.

C. Thus, the physical location of the gene has been known only since the beginning of this century. Shortly thereafter, it became clear that almost every biochemical characteristic in all living creatures was determined by genes. DNA contains the information that allows proteins to be manufactured, and proteins control cell growth and function, which ultimately are responsible for each organism. The genetic code, as found within the DNA molecule, is vital to life as we know it and it is found within the cells of every living organism on Earth.

D. The inner workings of a cell.

1. Cells are filled with a variety of organelles such as ribosomes (which aid in protein production), Golgi bodies (which package proteins), the endoplasmic reticulum (the transport system of the cell), mitochondria (which manufacture energy), vacuoles (which aid in intracellular cleaning processes), etc.
2. Furthermore, cells are absolute marvels of design when it comes to reproducing themselves. Cellular reproduction consists of at least

two important functions -- duplication of the cell's genetic material, and cleavage of the cell's cytoplasmic matrix into two separate parts.

- a) Once a fertilized human cell begins to develop, the original plans are faithfully copied each time the cell divides so that every one of the one hundred trillion cells in our body contains a perfect replica of the original plans for the whole body.
 - b) The DNA is structured in such a way that it can be replicated every time a cell divides in two. Each of the two daughter cells has to have identically the same genetic information after the division and copying process. This replication is so precise that it can be compared to 280 clerks copying the entire Bible sequentially each one from the previous one, with at most a single letter being transposed erroneously in the entire copying process. One cell division lasts from 20 to 80 minutes, and during this time the entire molecular library, equivalent to one thousand books, is copied correctly.
3. Anatomist Ernst Haeckel, Charles Darwin's chief supporter in Germany in the mid-nineteenth century, once wrote that "it contained merely 'homogeneous globules of plasm' that were composed chiefly of carbon with an admixture of hydrogen, nitrogen and sulfur. These component parts properly united produce the soul and body of the animated world, and suitably nursed became man. With this single argument the mystery of the universe is explained, the Deity annulled, and a new era of infinite knowledge ushered in."
 4. Counting everything, there are more than twenty sections in each cell. It is astonishing to think that this remarkable piece of machinery, which possesses the ultimate capacity to construct every living thing that has ever existed on Earth, from a giant redwood to the human brain, can construct all its own components in a matter of minutes and is on the order of several thousand million million times smaller than the smallest piece of functional machinery ever constructed by man. So you have numerous components, all of which have to be in place or nothing works. The only force known to be able to make irreducibly complex machines is intelligent design.
 - a) Dr. Michael Behe stated, "Now we've probed to the bottom of life, so to speak -- we're at the level of molecules -- and there's complexity all the way down... A system is irreducibly complex if it has a number of different components that all work together to accomplish the task of the system, and if you were to remove one of the components, the system would no longer function... Evolution can't produce an irreducibly complex biological ma-

chine suddenly, all at once, because it's much too complicated."

- b) As an example of the marvel of design, we will briefly consider the flagellum. The flagellum is the biological machine for propelling bacteria cells. The flagellum is kind of like an outboard motor. The flagellum's "propeller" is long and whiplike and can spin at 10,000 rpms. The propeller can stop spinning within a quarter turn and instantly start spinning the other way at 10,000 rpms. Its size is about 1/10,000 of an inch. It consists of a paddle, a rotor and a motor made up of various proteins. If you eliminate one of those parts it simply will not work at all. It is irreducibly complex and a huge stumbling block to Darwinian theory.
- c) Many say that if we just have patience, science will discover how a flagellum is so complex. But the complexity we see is not going to be alleviated by the more we learn; it can only get more complicated. We will only discover more details about the system.

E. DNA and genes.

1. A gene is the blueprint the cell uses to assemble a protein that is composed of a long necklace of amino acids (with each protein consisting of a distinct sequence of those amino acids). In DNA, there are long lines of adenine, cytosine, guanine and thymine that are precisely arranged in order to create protein structure and folding. To build one protein, you typically need 1,200 to 2,000 letters or bases.
2. DNA serves as the information storehouse for a finely choreographed manufacturing process in which the right amino acids are linked together with the right bonds in the right sequence to produce the right kind of proteins that fold in the right way to build biological systems.
3. The amazing process of DNA replication is made more amazing by the fact that it takes place in a DNA fiber that is only two millionths of a millimeter thick (barely visible under an electron microscope).
 - a) Yet the amount of information contained within it is so immense in the case of human DNA that it would stretch from the North Pole to the equator if it was typed on paper, using standard letter sizes. As Bruce Anderson observed: "If the tightly coiled DNA strands (about six feet long) inside a single human adult (about one hundred trillion cells) were unwound and stretched out straight, they would cover the distance to the moon half a million times. Yet when coiled, all the strands could fit inside a teaspoon."
 - b) Evolutionist Richard Dawkins acknowledged that the cell's nu-

cleus "contains a digitally-coded database larger in information content than all 30 volumes of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* put together. And this figure is for each cell, not all the cells of a body put together."

- c) Carl Sagan estimated that if a person were to count every letter in every word in every book of the world's largest library (approximately 10 million volumes), the total number of letters would be 10^{12} , which suggests that the "simple cell" contains the information equivalent of the world's largest library!

F. The origin of the genetic code.

1. The nucleic acid-based genetic code, with its complexity, orderliness and function, provides the most powerful kind of evidence for intelligent design, which requires a Designer. But from where did it come? Since the discovery of the genetic code in the mid-1950s, materialists have suggested that those mythical parents, "father time" and "mother nature," gave birth to the genetic code via purely chance processes.
2. But the unimaginable complexity of the information on the genetic code along with the simplicity of its concept (four letters made of simple chemical molecules), together with its extreme compactness, imply an inconceivably high intelligence.
 - a) If you cannot explain where the information comes from, you have not explained life, because it is the information that makes the molecules into something that actually functions. Whenever you find a sequential arrangement that is complex and corresponds to an independent pattern of functional requirement, this kind of information is always the product of intelligence.
 - b) Furthermore, there is no attraction or bonding between the individual letters in a DNA sequence. So there is nothing chemically that forces them into any particular sequence. The sequencing has to come from somewhere else. No hypothesis has come close to explaining how the information necessary to life's origin arose by naturalistic means.

G. The function and design of the genetic code.

1. Molecular biologists recognize that the genetic code is universal, irrespective of how different living things are in their external appearances. Wherever you go in the world, whatever animal, plant, bug or blob you look at, if it is alive, it will use the same dictionary and know the same code.
2. Studies have shown that the hereditary information found within the nucleus of the living cell is placed there in a chemical "code," and this code is universal in nature. It is the language of life. The genetic code, barring a few tiny examples, is the same in every

creature.

3. This means that there was only one creation, one single event when life was born. The unity of life is an empirical fact.

H. Natural selection and genetic mutations.

1. Neo-Darwinism, as its name implies, has added something "new" to the old theory of Darwinian evolution that was supposed to have occurred solely by natural selection. The "new" is genetic mutations. As George G. Simpson and his co-authors suggested over four decades ago, "Mutations are the ultimate raw materials for evolution"
2. John J. McFadden stated, "Natural selection tends to favor organisms carrying advantageous mutations that allow them to produce more offspring." However, the true facts of science tell a story very different than these explanations.
 - a) Natural selection or "survival of the fittest" employs circular reasoning. It simply requires the "fittest" organisms to leave the most offspring, and then at the same time defines the "fittest" organisms as those that leave the most offspring. Arthur Koestler said, "Once upon a time, it all looked so simple. Nature rewarded the fit with the carrot of survival and punished the unfit with the stick of extinction. The trouble only started when it came to defining fitness.... [W]e are caught in a circular argument which completely begs the question of what makes evolution evolve." No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. In fact, no one has ever gotten near it.
 - b) Evolutionists themselves admit that mutations, are "errors" in DNA replication. And these "errors" are almost always are harmful. We know today that there are three possible kinds of mutations: (1) bad; (2) good; and (3) neutral. Neutral mutations are of no value, as they have no net effect. Furthermore, it has been shown that 99% of all remaining mutations are harmful. As long ago as 1937, Ernest Hooton observed, "I am afraid that many anthropologists (including myself) have sinned against genetic science and are leaning upon a broken reed when we depend upon mutations."
 - (1) The mathematical probability of having random mutations account for all we see around us is infinitesimal. Mutations are rare, occurring on an average of once in every ten million duplications of a DNA molecule.
 - (2) The problem for the evolution model is apparent because a series of related mutations is required. The odds of getting two mutations that are related to one another is the product

of the separate probabilities. That is one in a hundred trillion.

- (3) Mathematician Murray Eden, one of the participants in a symposium on the mathematical probabilities of evolution, wrote, "It is our contention that if 'random' is given a serious and crucial interpretation from a probabilistic point of view, the randomness postulate is highly implausible and that an adequate scientific theory of evolution must await the discovery and elucidation of new natural laws."
- c) Geneticist John F. McDonald said, "The kind of mutations that macroevolution needs -- namely, large-scale, beneficial ones -- do not occur, while the kind it does not need -- large-scale mutations with harmful effects or small-scale mutations with limited impact -- do occur, though infrequently." Mutations simply cannot be the cause of evolutionary change.

Conclusion. Today, the concrete data points strongly in the direction of God. The fool has said in his heart there is no God (Psalm 14:1). Creation is the simplest and most obvious solution to the puzzle. Many scientists see the extra-scientific implications of intelligent design and they do not like where it is leading.

The purpose of science is to find out how things got here and how they work. Science should be the search for truth, not merely the search for materialistic explanations. The great scientists of history -- Newton and Einstein, for instance -- never thought science's job was to come up with some sort of self-sufficient explanation for nature. This is a recent innovation, and not a good one -- especially in light of discoveries during the last fifty years that have pointed in the exact opposite direction. There simply are no detailed Darwinian accounts for the evolution of any fundamental biochemical or cellular system, only a variety of wishful speculations.

By faith, the Christian knows that the worlds were framed by the word of God (Hebrews 11:3). Our existence is both strange and splendid. It is strange because it is not where our true destiny lies. It is splendid because it points ahead to where that real hope might be found.

I am heavily indebted to Bert Thompson and Lee Stroebel for this material.