

# Creation Science - It's Time to Listen<sup>1,2</sup>

---

What we believe about our origin is of great importance to our lives, for what we believe about our origin inevitably conditions what we believe about our destiny. Currently, what is being taught in the classrooms of our public schools and universities is that the theory of evolution gives a scientific explanation for these origins. Since the Supreme Court banned the exclusive teaching of creation in our schools, it has gotten to the point where evolution is taught exclusively. Textbooks for our public schools have in fact turned the Supreme Court decision into a ban on the teaching of creationism. It is my observation that by the time we have graduated from high school or college, we have become so saturated with evolution that it is implanted in many of our minds as an undeniable fact. Evolution, however, is not an undeniable fact. In fact, there are a growing number of scientists and people who feel that creation provides a superior account for origins. These people feel that apart from the Bible there is an immense amount of scientific evidence to support creation. This is why it is called creation science.

I feel it is important that the creation science model of origins be taught on an equal basis with that of evolution. There is really no reason why creation should not receive this equality unless it can be shown to be strictly a religious viewpoint and scientifically bankrupt. These were the accusations made on January 5, 1982 by Judge William Ray Overton when he ruled against the state of Arkansas in the case of McLean vs. Arkansas State Board of Education over the "Balanced Treatment for Creation - Science and Evolution - Science Act." These are also the same bases for judgment by all evolutionists against creation (Jurmain 24-25)<sup>3</sup>. However, upon taking a close look at these two models of origins I think that we will find that neither of these accusations can stand. First of all, creation is no more religious than is evolution. Secondly, current scientific evidence clearly contradicts evolution's hypotheses and yet is in strict accordance with the predictions of the creation model.

Although the evolutionist complains that creation implies religion, this is in the same sense true of evolution. According to the *General Theory of Evolution*, all living things have arisen by a naturalistic, mechanistic, evolutionary process from a single living source which itself arose by a similar process from a dead, inanimate world. (Gish, p. 17) It is the origin of life from nonliving matter without intelligent planning. Creation on the other hand claims that life was brought into being suddenly by a divine creator. Creation thus says that there is a God, where evolution denies it.

Where creation supports theistic religions, evolution supports atheism and other non-theistic religions such as humanism. Says Wysong, "Evolutionists attribute to time, chance and nature the capacities that creationists attribute to God. (13, p. 419)" Both beliefs are held sacred to the individuals in a religious manner. Louis T. More, a noted paleontologist and evolutionist, states:

The more one studies paleontology, the more certain one becomes that evolution is based on faith alone; exactly the same sort of faith which it is necessary to have when one encounters the great mysteries of religion. (160-161)

More has recognized how persistent he and his colleagues have been to maintain the dogma of evolution regardless of scientific evidence. The writer of the Foreword of the 1971 edition of Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, himself a distinguished evolutionary biologist, has also recognized that evolution is simply a belief. He declares, "[The theory of evolution] forms a satisfactory faith on which to base our interpretation of nature."

In fact, evolution is an integral part of the non-theistic religion of humanism. This is proclaimed by literature printed by the humanists themselves. A pamphlet released by The Humanist Community of San Jose (California), a chapter of the American Humanist Association, quotes the following statement by Sir Julian Huxley, British biologist, and evolutionist:

I use the word "Humanist" to mean someone who believes that man is just as much a natural phenomenon as an animal or plant; that his body, mind, and soul were not supernaturally created but are products of *evolution*, and that he is not under the control or guidance of any powers. (Morris 81)

Thus, humanism is an atheistic religion with evolution as its basic dogma. While evolution is falsely being pushed as pure science, the students are being denied the opportunity to hear the alternative of creation on the grounds that it is religious.

Judging on religious implications, therefore, we can see that evolution has no more right in our schools than does creation. Although separation of religion and state has been one of the main arguments against creation's being taught, I don't think that this is a valid reason to throw either theory out. However, it is a valid reason for teaching both sides. If we don't teach both viewpoints, then we do get into a problem of state sponsored religion. Our freedom of religion is taken away when we are only allowed to hear one side of the story.

Creationists are not attempting to oust evolutionary humanism from the public schools, but only to obtain a fair hearing for theistic creationism as an alternative. Both concepts involve faith and neither is scientifically testable in the ultimate sense.

This is due to the fact that the scientific method is based on experimental observation and repeatability, neither of which can be applied to origins.

Evolution literature consistently portrays the viewpoint of the creationist as unscientific and immediately states definitions of science according to the scientific method as proof.

A hypothesis is empirical or scientific only if it can be tested by experience ... A hypothesis or theory which cannot be, at least in principle, falsified by empirical observations and experiments does not belong to the realm of science. (Ayala 700)

Although the above statement was issued by a leading evolutionary biologist, it would exclude evolution, no less than creation, from the realm of science because neither evolution nor creation is falsifiable, nor can either of them be observed. In fact there are now many evolutionists who recognize that the evolutionary theory is really a tautology and thus not falsifiable.

I argue that the "theory of evolution" does not make predictions, so far as ecology is concerned, but is instead a logical formula which can be used only to classify empiricisms and to show the relationships which such a classification implies ... these theories are actually tautologies and, as such, cannot make empirically testable predictions. *They are not scientific theories at all.* (Peters 1)

Theodosius Dobzhansky, a leading evolutionist, has admitted that the experimental method is an "impossibility" when applied to evolution (388). This is because evolution operates too slowly

for scientific observation.

Although it is impossible to scientifically prove which of the two viewpoints is really true, it is possible to construct two scientific models and make predictions based on these models. Proven laws of logic and probability can then be applied as a means of scientific comparison. The model having the most scientific evidence supporting its predictions would be considered the explanation most scientifically probable.

According to Gish, the creation model would predict a sudden appearance in the fossil record of highly complex forms of life without evidence of ancestral forms. All of the major types of life, that is the basic plant and animal forms would appear abruptly in the fossil record without evidence of transitional forms linking one basic kind to another (6).

The evolution model, on the other hand, would predict that as living forms diverged into the millions of species which have existed in the past and which exist today, we would find a slow and gradual transition of one form into another. We would predict that new types would not appear suddenly in the fossil record.

Scientific evidence clearly contradicts these predictions of evolution, but is in strict accordance with those based the model of creation. For a long time the fossil record was cited as the main proof of evolution; however, this has changed. Dr. Mark Ridley, of Oxford University's Department of Zoology, now says: "In any case, no real evolutionist, whether gradualist or punctuationalist, uses the fossil record as evidence in favor of the theory of evolution as opposed to special creation" (831). This is because the fossil record clearly lacks any proof of transitional forms necessary to the theory of evolution, and the record does not display a gradual evolution at all. Morris quotes Dr. D. V. Ager then president of the British Geological Association, in his 1976 presidential address, saying:

It must be significant that nearly all the evolutionary stories I learned as a student have now been debunked. The point emerges that, if we examine the fossil record in detail, whether at the level of orders or of species, we find-over and over again -- not gradual evolution, but the sudden explosion of one group at the expense of another. (66-67)

Concerning the evolution of plant life, Professor Corner of the Botany Department of Cambridge University, though an evolutionist himself, was quoted by Gish as saying: "... but I still think that to the unprejudiced, the fossil record of plants is strictly in favor of special creation" (86-87). Thus, as we add more and more evidence to the fossil record, it is creation and not evolution which appears to prosper scientifically.

Apart from the fossil record lacking evidence for evolution, the evolutionist is faced with the extreme improbability of life arising from non-life through random, naturalistic processes. Morris quotes the distinguished British astronomer, Sir Fred Hoyle, picturesquely describing the possibility of this occurring:

At all events, anyone with even a nodding acquaintance with the Rubik cube will concede the near-impossibility of a solution being obtained by a blind person moving the cubic faces at random. Now imagine  $10^{50}$  (1 followed by 50 zeros) blind persons each with a scrambled Rubik cube, and try to conceive of the chance of them all *simultaneously* arriving at the solved form. You then have the chance of arriving by random shuffling at just one of the many biopolymers on which life depends. The notion that not only

biopolymers but the operating program of a living cell could be arrived at by chance in a primordial organic soup here on the Earth is evidently nonsense of a high order. (29)

The evolutionists don't refute this fact, but merely state that given enough time even the impossible becomes possible (Jurmain 40-52). *Giving* this supernatural power to the element of time, however, I see as no more superstitious or scientific than giving the credit to God. Evolution, in addition to contradicting all laws of probability and logic, also is at odds with many well-established laws of physics and biology. Many scientists and evolutionists can see this and have expressed their doubts. One angry scientist, in a letter which appeared in *New Scientists* stated in part,

... despite the hostility of the witness provided by the fossil record, despite the innumerable difficulties, and despite the lack of even a credible theory, evolution survives ... Can there be any other area of science, for instance, in which a concept as intellectually barren as embryonic recapitulation could be used as evidence for a theory? (Danson 35)

With all of these holes and gaps in the theory of evolution, it seems that there is certainly room in the textbooks and our classrooms for creation science. After all, when the facts of the real world are considered, creationism fits them more naturally than does evolutionism.

Creation should certainly be taught on an equal basis with evolution in our public schools. It is neither more religious than evolution nor scientifically inferior. Furthermore, comparing the two models of origins stimulates real thinking on the part of the student. Teaching only evolution is also discriminatory to those of us who, for whatever reason, believe in creation.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Ayala, F. "Biological Evolution: Natural Selection or Random Walk?" *American Scientist*, Vol. 62, 1974: 700.
2. Coppedge, J. *Evolution: Possible or Impossible* -Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1973
3. Danson, R. *New Scientist*, Vol. 49, 1971: 35
4. Dobzhansky, T. "On Methods of Evolutionary Biology and Anthropology," *American Scientist*, Vol. 45, 1957: 388
5. Jurmain, R. & Nelson H. *Introduction to Physical Anthropology*, 3rd Edition. New York: West Publishing Co., 1985
6. Gish, D. *Evolution: The Fossils say No!*. San Diego: ICR Publishing Co., 1973.
7. Matthews, L. *The Origin of Species*, London: J. M. Dent, 1977: xii.
8. More, L. *The Dogma of Evolution*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1925: 160-161.

9. Morris, H. *Evolution in Turmoil*. San Diego: CreationLife Publishers, 1982
10. Myers, E. "Aristotle And Creationism." *Creation Research Society Quarterly* June 1987: 5-8.
11. Peters, R. "Tautology in Evolution and Ecology," *American Naturalist*, Vol. 110, No. 1, 1976:1
12. Ridley, M. "Who Doubts Evolution?" *New Scientist*, Vol. 90, June 25, 1981: 831
13. Wysong, R. *Creation-Evolution: The Controversy*. East Lansing: Inquiry Press, 1976

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is an edited version of a classroom assignment in an English course. Interestingly enough, the instructor gave high marks for the points made

<sup>2</sup> This article concerns itself with the creation-science issue. The believer's commitment to creation is based on taking God at His Word.

<sup>3</sup> Reference to the Bibliography