The Scientific Case For Creation #3

Introduction. The Big Bang and materialistic philosophies simply cannot be explained within the realm of physics as we know it. The sudden emergence of matter, space, time and energy points to the need for some kind of transcendence. As we have seen in the other two lessons and we will see today, science is driving us to the conclusion that the world is much more complicated than can be explained by scientists. It is only through the supernatural that we can understand the mystery of existence.

A largely unknown secret is that many scientists are now driven to faith in God by their own work. We live in a technological culture where many people believe science trumps all other forms of knowledge. When students learn about Darwinism, they are convinced that science and faith are at odds.

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). As we are discovering in this series of lessons, scientific evidence actually supports a belief in God.

I. ***The Laws Of Probability***

A. One of the limitations of science is that, by its very nature, it deals not with absolute proof, but with probability. In the widely used biology text that he co-authored, George Gaylord Simpson warned the student of this fact when he wrote, "We speak in terms of 'acceptance,' 'confidence,' and 'probability,' not 'proof.' If by proof is meant the establishment of eternal and absolute truth, open to no possible exception or modification, then proof has no place in the natural sciences. Alternatively, proof in a natural science, such as biology, must be defined as the attainment of a high degree of confidence."

B. Probability is a practical and proven concept. Since probability studies deal with randomness, and since evolution, in its entirety, is built upon the very concept of randomness, it would appear that the laws of probability could shed some light on the possibility of evolution having occurred, which is why James Coppedge remarked, "A central question

we will be investigating is this: Do the laws of chance allow one to consider evolution as being within the realm of conceivable probability?"

C. Emile Borel's law of probability states that the occurrence of any event, where the chances are beyond one in one followed by 50 zeroes, is an event that we can state with certainty never will happen, no matter how much time is allotted and no matter how many conceivable opportunities could exist for the event to take place.
   1. Harold Morowitz estimated that the probability for the chance formation of the smallest, simplest form of living organism known is one chance in $1x10^{340,000,000}$. The size of this figure is truly staggering, since there are supposed to be only approximately 10^{80} elementary particles (electrons and protons) in the whole Universe.
   2. Carl Sagan estimated that the chance of life evolving on any given single planet, like the Earth, is one chance in $1 \times 10^{2,000,000,000}$. This figure is so large that it would take 6,000 books of 300 pages each just to write the number! A number this large is so infinitely beyond Borel's upper limit for such an event to occur that it is mind boggling. There is, according to Borel's law of probability, absolutely no chance that life could have "evolved spontaneously" on the Earth.
   3. If we assume the Universe to be 5 billion light years in radius, and assume that it is crammed with tiny particles the size of electrons, it has been estimated that conceivably 10^{130} particles could exist in the Universe. Every structure, every process, every system, every "event" in the Universe must consist of these particles, in various combinations and interchanges. If, to be generous, we assume that each particle can take part in 10^{20} events each second, and then allow 10^{20} seconds of cosmic history (this would correspond to 3,000 billion years or 100-200 times the current maximum estimate of the age of the Universe), then the greatest conceivable number of separate events that could take place in all of space and time would be $10^{130} \times 10^{20} \times 10^{20} = 10^{170}$ events. So in order for life to appear, one of these events (or some combination of them) must bring a number of these particles together in a system with enough order (or stored information) to enable it to reproduce itself. And this system must come into being by mere chance.

D. In discussing the bacterium *E. coli*, Carl Sagan noted that this one "simple" organism contains 1×10^{12} (a trillion) bits of data stored in its genes and chromosomes, and then observed that if we were to count every letter on every line on every page of every book in the world's largest library (10 million volumes), we would have approximately a trillion letters. In other words, the amount of data (information) con-

tained in approximately 10 million volumes is contained in the genetic code of the "simple" *E. coli* bacterium! Yet we are asked to believe that this marvelous organism, with its obvious complexity, occurred through purely chance processes.

E. If I were to flip a coin, you would expect it to land on tails exactly one half of the time over several flips. But what if I said I could do it 100 times in a row? The probability of that occurring would be 10^{29}, and that would be extraordinarily unlikely to happen. But if I did it, you would conclude that the demonstration was rigged. The same is true for the Universe. Because it is in existence against such impossibly high odds, you should naturally conclude that it exists because of a Designer.
    1. Evolutionist Richard Dawkins once observed, "The more statistically improbable a thing is, the less we can believe that it just happened by blind chance. Superficially the obvious alternative to chance is an intelligent Designer."
        a) It is not superficial to teach, as creationists do, that design implies a Designer.
        b) Nor is it superficial to advocate that our beautifully ordered world hardly can be the result of "blind chance."
    2. After evolutionists see these huge numbers, we are often told that anything can happen, given enough time. But what are the chances of a Universe created by chance? Chance is incapable of creating a single molecule, let alone an entire Universe. Chance is not an entity; it has no being, power or force. Chance only describes mathematical possibilities, but it is has no real power, let alone creative power.
    3. Claude Tresmontant, eminent philosopher of science from the University of Paris, stated, "No theory of chance can explain the creation of the world. Before chance can send atoms whirling through infinite void, the atoms have to exist! What has to be explained is the being of the world and matter. It makes no sense to say that chance can account for the creation of being."

II. ***The Fossil Record***

A. The renowned evolutionist LeGros Clark once remarked that "... the really crucial evidence for evolution must be provided by the paleontologist whose business it is to study the fossil record."
    1. In the past, some were confident that it was in "nature's museum" where the evolutionist ultimately would make his unassailable stand against creation. But as it turns out, some of the strongest evidence for creation is found within the fossil record.
    2. The fact that fossils occur, and represent the environments in which

they once lived, is not under dispute. It is the interpretation placed on those fossils by evolutionists that creationists call into question.

a) Philip Johnson commented in a similar vein in his book, *Darwin on Trial*: "The Darwinist approach has consistently been to find some supporting fossil evidence, claim it as 'proof' for evolution and then ignore all the difficulties."
b) The methodology of the evolutionist in interpreting both the location and the importance of various fossils within the geological record relies upon circular reasoning. The process begins with the assumption that life has progressed from the simple to the complex (i.e., evolution is true). On this basis, the fossils then are arranged in order from the simple to the complex.

B. Almost every biology textbook exhibits the evolutionary "tree of life" that show these very sequences. Surely such dramatic but gradual changes should be witnessed in the fossil record.
   1. Charles Darwin himself said that there should be "innumerable transitional links" in the fossil record. Darwin argued that, due to natural selection, "the number of intermediate varieties, which have formerly existed, [must] be truly enormous."
   2. However, he went on to admit, "Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic chain; and this, perhaps, is the most obvious and serious objection which can be argued against this theory. The explanation lies, I believe, in the extreme imperfection of the geological record."
   3. This is like a prosecuting attorney trying a murder case, and saying in his opening speech, "We know that the defendant is guilty of murder, although we cannot find a motive, the weapon, the body or any witnesses."

C. Predictions of the two models.
   1. As the evidence from the fossil record is considered, it is essential to know exactly what the evolution and creation models predict, so that the predictions can be compared to the actual data.
      a) The evolution model, on the one hand, predicts: (a) The "oldest" rocks would contain evidence of the most "primitive" forms of life capable of fossilization; (b) "Younger" rocks would exhibit more "complex" forms of life; (c) A gradual change from "simple-to-complex" would be apparent; and (d) Large numbers of transitional forms would be present.
      b) The creation model, on the other hand, predicts: (a) The "oldest" rocks would not always contain evidence of the most "primitive" forms of life, and "younger" rocks would not always contain evidence of more "complex" forms of life; (b) A "simple-to-complex" gradation of life forms would not always appear; in-

stead, there would be a sudden "explosion" of diverse and highly complex forms of life; and (c) There would be a regular and systematic absence of transitional forms, since there were no transitional forms.

2. As one examines the predictions of each of the two models in light of the actual data, it becomes clear that the evidence from the fossil record is strongly against evolution and for creation, which explains why some scientists have suggested that evolutionists no longer use the fossil record as proof of evolution.
3. Evolutionist Richard Dawkins of Oxford University, wrote, "The Cambrian strata of rocks, vintage about 600 million years, are the oldest in which we find most of the major invertebrate groups. And we find many of them already in an advanced state of evolution, the very first time they appear. It is as though they were just planted there, without any evolutionary history. Needless to say, this appearance of sudden planting has delighted creationists."
4. If the fossil record is to offer support for evolution, it must demonstrate an unambiguous sequence of fully functional intermediate forms. By "unambiguous" and "functional" it is meant that certain conditions must be met before an organism (fossil or living) can be considered to be a true intermediate form.
   a) Proper transitional or incipient structures never are found. The reason for this is the obvious design that is inherent in any living thing, whether it be a bacterium or a whale, a fungus or an orchid.
   b) Stephen J. Gould said, "All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms; transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt."
      (1) Bats, for example, appear suddenly in the fossil record 60 million years ago (according to evolutionary timetables), yet were not preceded by any known transitional forms; nor do they differ greatly from the modern species. This is only one of many exceptions.
      (2) Duane Gish has commented, "None of the intermediate fossils that would be expected on the basis of the evolution model has been found between single-celled organisms and invertebrates, between invertebrates and vertebrates, between fish and amphibians, between amphibians and reptiles, between reptiles and birds or mammals, or between 'lower' mammals and primates."
5. It is still, as it was in Darwin's day, overwhelmingly true that the first representatives of all the major classes of organisms known to biology are already highly characteristic of their class when they

make their initial appearance in the fossil record. David Kitts said, "Despite the bright promise that paleontology provides a means of 'seeing' evolution, it has presented some nasty difficulties for evolutionists, the most notorious of which is the presence of 'gaps' in the fossil record. Evolution requires intermediate forms between species, and paleontology does not provide them." And he listed two characteristics of the fossil record that cannot be ignored:

a) Stasis -- Most species exhibit no directional change during their tenure on earth. They appear in the fossil record looking much the same as when they disappear.
b) Sudden appearance -- In any local area, a species does not rise gradually by the steady transformation of its ancestors; it appears all at once and "fully formed."

6. The creation model, as stated earlier, predicts a sudden "explosion" of life -- fully formed plants and animals. The creation model predicts a mixture of life forms. The creation model predicts a systematic absence of transitional forms. The actual evidence from the fossil record clearly shows: (a) fully formed life appearing suddenly; (b) a mixture of life forms (e.g., almost all, if not all, of the phyla in the Cambrian period); and (c) a serious lack of transitional forms.
7. There is more to the fossil record than a "sudden explosion." As James Eldredge correctly noted, "We have been looking at the fossil record as a general test of the notion that life has evolved: to falsify that general idea, we would have to show that forms of life we considered more advanced appear earlier than the simpler forms."
   a) However, there is hardly an example of a form of life we consider more advanced in certain respects than the trilobite. In fact, one part of this creature in particular poses a tremendous problem for evolutionary theory.
   b) Each trilobite eye possessed a large lens made out of a mineral called calcite. This means the lens was not flexible, and thus it could not adjust for focusing like the lens in our eyes.
   c) To compensate for this, the trilobite lens incorporated no less than four complex optical principles in a system known as an "optical doublet," perhaps making it one of the most sophisticated visual systems in the biological world. This is amazing for an animal that supposedly died out millions of years before "advanced" eyes like ours first appeared.

D. Polystrate fossils.
   1. Henry Morris discussed polystrate fossils in his book, *Biblical Cosmology and Modern Science,* where he first explained the process of stratification.
      a) Stratification (or layered sequence) is a universal characteristic

of sedimentary rocks. A stratum of sediment is formed by deposition under essentially continuous and uniform hydraulic conditions. When the sedimentation stops for a while before another period of deposition, the new stratum will be visibly distinguishable from the earlier by a stratification line (actually a surface).

b) Distinct strata also result when there is a change in the velocity of flow or other hydraulic characteristics. Sedimentary beds as now found are typically composed of many "strata," and it is in such beds that most fossils are found.

c) Large fossils have been found which extend through several strata, often 20 feet or more in thickness. Ken Ham has noted, "There are a number of places on the earth where fossils actually penetrate more than one layer of rock. These are called 'polystrate fossils.'"

2. Such phenomena clearly violate the idea of a gradually accumulated geologic column since, generally speaking, an evolutionary overview of that column suggests that each stratum (layer) was laid down over many thousands (or even millions) of years.
3. Probably the most widely recognized of the polystrate fossils are tree trunks that extend vertically through several sections of rock -- rock that supposedly was deposited during vast epochs of time. However, organic material (such as wood) that is exposed to the elements will rot, not fossilize. Thus, the entire length of these tree trunks must have been preserved quickly, which suggests that the sedimentary layers surrounding them must have been deposited rapidly, possibly during a single catastrophe.

a) For example, in Joggins, Nova Scotia, there are many erect fossil trees that are scattered throughout 2,500 feet of layers. You can actually see these fossil trees, which are beautifully preserved, penetrate through layers that were supposedly laid down over millions of years.

b) After discussing the effects of the May 1980 eruption of Mount St. Helens, geologist Trevor Major remarked, "Upright tree stumps found in many coal beds represent, not the remains of trees growing in a peat swamp, but the effects of a flood or similar disaster."

c) William J. Fritz wrote, "Deposits of recent mud flows on Mount St. Helens demonstrate conclusively that stumps can be transported and deposited upright. These observations support conclusions that some vertical trees in the Yellowstone 'fossil forests' were transported in a geologic situation directly comparable to that of Mount St. Helens."

E. Human fossils.

1. Of all the branches to be found on that infamous evolutionary "tree of life," the one leading to man should be the best documented. After all, as the most recent evolutionary arrival, pre-human fossils supposedly would have been exposed to natural decay processes for the shortest length of time, and thus should be better preserved and easier to find than any others.
   a) Consider, for example, how many dinosaur fossils we possess, and those animals were supposed to have existed over a hundred million years before man! In addition, since hominid fossils are of the greatest interest to man (because they are supposed to represent his past), it is safe to say that more people have been searching for them longer than for any other type of fossils.
   b) If there are any real transitional forms anywhere in the world, they should be documented most abundantly in the line leading from the first primate to modern man. Certainly, the fossils in this field have received the most publicity.
2. Lyall Watson, writing in *Science Digest,* put it bluntly: "The fossils that decorate our family tree are so scarce that there are still more scientists than specimens. The remarkable fact is that all the physical evidence we have for human evolution can still be placed, with room to spare, inside a single coffin."
3. Lord Solly Zuckerman published his views in his book, *Beyond the Ivory Tower*. He studied the australopithecines for more than 15 years and concluded that if man descended from an apelike ancestor, he did so without leaving any fossil record trace.
4. In Homo erectus, all of the following characteristics display a human pattern, while in australopithecines, an ape pattern is evident: growth pattern, dental structure and development, facial structure and development, brain morphology, height to weight ratio, probable position of larynx based on the contours of the base of the skull making speech possible, and the size of the birth canal relative to the size of the brain.
   a) Where some Homo erectus fossils differ from humans can be explained by the effects of inbreeding, dietary restrictions and a harsh environment. But evolutionists need an intermediate, and Homo erectus is the only option available.
   b) From other fragmentary fossils, it has been discovered that neanderthals, when healthy, stood erect and walked normally. They were simply stronger, stockier members of the human family.
   c) Homo erectus, neanderthals and Homo sapiens form a continuum of the human family. The different forms represent genetic variation within a species and not distinct species. Even our

similarity to apes can be sufficiently explained by a common Designer who decided to use basically the same materials to construct similar, but functionally different, structures.

5. The fossil evidence for evolution (human or otherwise) simply is not there. Apes always have been apes, and humans always have been humans. Evolutionists certainly are in an embarrassing position today. They can find neither the transitional forms their theory demands, nor the mechanism to explain how the evolutionary process supposedly occurred. The available facts, however, do fit the creation model.

Conclusion. The icons of Darwinism (the Miller experiment, Darwin's "tree of life," Haeckel's embryos and the *archaeopteryx* missing link) have been shown to be untrue. Much of what science teachers have been telling students is simply wrong. Yet, how many have had seeds of doubt planted in high school or college when they studied Darwinism? We need to be able to help people get the answers to their questions about God and His created Universe (1 Peter 3:15).

Creationists have an impressive arsenal of evidence to confirm the conclusion that the creation model better fits the available scientific facts than the evolution model. Darwinism is a merely materialistic philosophy masquerading as science, and people are recognizing it for what it is. Science, done right, points toward God. We can discover His fingerprints in the vastness of the Universe, in the dusty relics of paleontology and in the complexity of the cell. It is my belief that the positive case for intelligent design in the Universe has become absolutely compelling.

Though man is not at the physical center of the Universe, he most certainly is at the center of its purpose. The coincidences are simply too amazing to have been the result of happenstance -- the impression of design is overwhelming. The skeptic needs to invent a whole new set of physical laws and a whole new set of mechanisms that are not a natural extrapolation from anything we know or have experienced. Though the beauty of the Universe is, at times, overwhelming, if we mistake the signpost for what is signposted, we will attach our hopes and longings to lesser goals, which cannot finally quench our thirst for meaning.