Arguing for Creationism

If someone walked up to you and said he saw a slug turn into a man last night, you would laugh in his face. Yet, if you basically say the same thing occurred over hundreds of thousands or millions of or 4.5 billion years, then some call it "science" and "fact." I see the Theory of Evolution as opinion and belief, and I disagree with it.

Before I was even a Christian, I became a creationist, and I did so by looking at pro-evolution texts and drawing the conclusion that the texts leapt and cried for evidence that was at best questionable.

I appreciate Jon Anderson's editorials and am thankful for someone who doesn't just buy into what he's told, but rather critically thinks about what he's taught.

There is a wealth of support for intelligent design and creationism. It concerns me that those who call themselves scientists write it off so quickly and passionately attempt to prevent the teaching of such material. Some evolutionists are passionate about their doctrine and will go to great lengths to promote it.

Last fall, an article about the *Pierolapithecus catalaunicus*, an alleged ancestor of both apes and humans, included some interesting quotes from *Science* paper co-author Salvador Moya-Sola who said, "The problem is the fossil record. . . . The fossil record in Africa, especially in the upper Miocene, is very scarce. And the fossils are very rare" (Associated Press, "Making the Connection?", *The Daily News Record*, 11/29/2004). Another co-author Meike Kohler said that he didn't like to use the phrase "missing link" (Associated Press, "Making the Connection?", *The Daily News Record*, 11/29/2004). What's wrong with the phrase *missing link* (especially if it is accurate)?

On October 16, 2002, Dr. Ken Ham made these statements in a radio broadcast:

> "Did you know that evolutionary scientists like to portray themselves as unbiased researchers? But are they very good at reconstructing the fossil record of human ancestors?
>
> A student approached me once with an illustrated book on evolution in his hand. He opened to a picture of one of our supposed ancestors called 'Lucy.' Lucy looked somewhat human, but yet ape-like.
>
> The student asked me, 'How do they know Lucy looked like this?' I replied that this was a good question. I explained that if someone were to dig up his own skull in a hundred years, they could find an artist to draw pictures and make him look ape-like *or* human-like. The student wondered: 'Do scientists really just *make up* information?' I responded, 'Actually, sometimes they do.'
>
> I shared with him the account of a medical illustrator who was contracted to produce drawings for a biology text. One of the drawings was to be of Lucy. When the illustrator finished his drawing, the book's authors rejected it, claiming it was too human -like. He was told to make Lucy look more ape-like. . . ."

Sometimes, "scientists" make up information. Some of evolutionary theory is just that. I think the idea of *punctuated equilibrium* is a good example.

Dr. Werner Gitt, information scientist, shared seven impossibility theorems of information for practically all laws of nature in his book *In the Beginning was Information* (p. 80):

- It is impossible to set up, store, or transmit information without using a code.
- It is impossible to have a code apart from a free and deliberate convention.
- It is impossible that information can exist without having had a mental source.
- It is impossible for information to exist without having been established voluntarily by a free will.

- It is impossible for information to exist without all five hierarchical levels: statistics, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and apobetics.
- It is impossible that information can originate in statistical processes.

The "mental source" and "free will" point to a Creator.

We live in a purposeful, informational world that is well-designed (created, not one arisen out of chance). The earth is located in the optimum location of the Solar System. The earth is an orb with an ideal size and gravitational pull, a protective magnetic field, and the proper rate of rotation for warming and cooling. The earth sustains life. It has an abundance of flowing water, has a favorable climate, fertile soil, ocean tides that cleanse the shorelines, and a life-supporting atmosphere filled with clouds that transport the life-supporting treasure of water.

In the book *In Six Days: Why 50 Scientists Believe in Creationism*, John F. Ashton, editor, shares from scientists across various disciplines who share support for Creationism and refute evolution. Among them are the following:

Dr. Jerry R. Bergman (biology) says that support for instantaneous creation is seen in "daily observation that information does not come about by chance and, if left to itself, *disorder* usually soon results (Ashton, ed., p. 23). He shares about the complexity of information in the genetic code of both plants and animals, saying that "time alone will not allow for the naturalistic construction of life. Evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould stated that even if evolutionary history on earth repeated itself a *million times*, he doubts whether anything like *Homo sapiens* would ever develop again (Gould 1989)" (Ashton, ed., pp. 24-25). Dr. Bergman also discusses the 206 parts in the average adult human skeleton could be aligned in 206! (206 factorial) different ways, approximately equal to a 1 followed by 388 zeroes; thus, the probability of the 1 correct position of the bones in the skeleton will occur only once out of 10^388 times, meaning occurring randomly *"less than once in 10 billion years"* (Ashton, ed., pp. 25-26). And yet, all our integrated parts and cells, are more complex than just the skeleton itself.

Dr. Ariel A. Roth (biology) argues that the complexity of interdependent parts that do not function unless other fully functional parts are also present is a problem for evolution; he offers the simple example of the muscle requiring the nerve, which requires the brain, and he contrasts the muscle with the complexity of the eye and brain (Ashton, ed., pp. 75-76).

Dr. Stephen Grocott (inorganic chemistry) argues that "The complexity of the simplest imaginable living organism is mind-boggling. You need to have the cell wall, the energy system, a system of self-repair, a reproduction system, and a means for taking in 'food' and expelling 'waste', a means for interpreting the complex genetic code and replicating it, etc., etc. The combined telecommunication systems of the world are far less complex, and yet no one believes they arose by chance" (Ashton, ed., p.136). Dr. Grocott further discusses fossils and how it is "Nonsense!" to believe that fossilization occurs gradually over years because "[t]he recently dead (or living) organism must be rapidly buried in sediment that can harden and exclude oxygen. . . . just what you'd expect from a catastrophic worldwide flood" (Ashton, ed., p. 138).

Dr. Ker C. Thomson (geophysics) states, "The Second Law of Thermodynamics states that there is a long-range decay process which ultimately and surely grips everything in the universe that we know about. That process produces a break-down of complexity, not its increase. This is the exact opposite of what evolution requires" (Ashton, ed., pp. 199-200).

Dr. John R. Baumgardner (geophysics) asks if random molecular interactions create life, and asserts evidence that is a resounding, "No!" He argues that the number of random trials required to get even a useful 3D protein structure including amino acids would be "a hundred billion billion times the upper bound" of "the total number of molecules ever to exist in the history of the cosmos" (Ashton, ed., p. 208).

Dr. AJ Monty White (physical chemistry) shares that he is amazed how chemical evolutionists make claims they have proven that life randomly came about on a so-called prebiotic earth according to their

experiments, but never point out that their experiments themselves are based on intellect and not chance (Ashton, ed., pp. 242-243).

Dr. Walter J. Veith (zoology) points out how "natural selection does not create features, adaptations or even life; it merely selects for features that provide greater survival value. The features themselves must still come into existence by random chance processes or by design. Moreover, because the mechanism operates by elimination, it must eventually lead to less and less diversity, which is precisely what we see in the fossil record and in the declining species diversity of our time" (Ashton, ed., p. 250).

Dr. Larry Vardiman (meteorology) rejects the theory of evolution due to the "incredible evidence for design" in the natural world, the laws of nature, built-in sources of information in the DNA molecule, and how evolution cannot explain such design (Ashton, ed., p. 306).

Dr. Don Batten (agricultural science) argues that "Only enzymes produce the pure amino acids and sugars necessary for life, but enzyme manufacture requires a living cell. Life is based on life" (Ashton, ed., p. 352). He also discusses how mutations and natural selection cause loss of information and complexity, the opposite of what evolution requires (Ashton, ed., pp. 357-358).

Other academic voices support creation and refute evolution:

Dr. Michael Behe, associate professor of Biochemistry at Lehigh University, argues for intelligent design as the obvious logical explanation for the complex biochemical machines found in all life (Behe, *Darwin's Black Box*: Free Press, 1996).

Dr. Philip Johnson, Berkeley University law professor, stated that evolution is grounded in naturalistic philosophy, not scientific fact, that there is a lack of empirical evidence supporting evolution in spite of claims, that evolution is itself a religion, and that evolution would have been abandoned long ago if it were a scientific hypothesis based on a rigorous study of evidence (Johnson, *Darwin on Trial*, Regnery Gateway, Washington, DC, 1991).

James Nickel, author of *Mathematics: Is God Silent?*, points out how mathematics reveals God's design in nature as evidenced by the Fibonacci sequence. The Fibonacci sequence is found in the petal arrangement of flowers; is found in the spiral arrangements of petals, pine cones, and pineapple; in the leaf positioning of the Phyllotaxis, in the mathematics of the quantum matrix, of rabbit populations, and of the genealogy of male bees (pp. 240-244). Nickel explains the mathematical relationship between the Fibonacci sequence and the golden ratio Phi and how Kepler called Phi the "Divine Proportion" since it has so many applications in creation, such as how it relates to the Pentagram/Pentagon and thus 5-petaled flowers, starfish, and sand dollars (pp. 245-247). Nickel shows Phi's relationship to the Golden Rectangle, which applies to the chambered nautilus, hurricane storm clouds, spiral galaxy, and the cochlea of the human ear (pp. 247-249). He further points out applications for hexagons and crystallography (pp. 250-251). As if this weren't enough to point to intelligent design, Nickel shows that not only is Phi and the Golden Rectangle related to the Fibonacci sequence, but that Pascal's triangle is related to the sequence, thus bringing up mathematical relationships to binomials and probability (p. 256).

Do you still want to *believe* that we are all here by chance? Do you still want to put your faith in evolution? I spent my years in elementary school, middle school, high school, college, and graduate school reading texts, which asserted that evolution was fact. However, there is a wealth of resources that show otherwise. Among some of my favorites are the following:

John F. Ashton, Editor	*In Six Days (why 50 scientists believe Creationism)*
John F. Ashton, Editor	*On the Seventh Day: Forty scientists and academics explain why they believe in God*
Donald E. Chittick	*The Puzzle of Ancient Man: Advanced*

	Technology in Past Civilizations?
Ken Ham	*Did Adam Have a Bellybutton?*
Harold Hill	*From Goo to You by the Way of the Zoo*
Dr. Henry Morris	*The Remarkable Record of Job*
James Nickel	*Mathematics: Is God Silent?*
Dennis R. Petersen	*Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation Volume 1*
Dennis R. Petersen	*Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation Volume 2*
Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D.	*Refuting Evolution*
Jonathan Sarfati, Ph.D., with Mike Matthews	*Refuting Evolution 2*
Lee Strobel	*The Case for a Creator*
Carl Wieland	*Stones and Bones: Powerful Evidence Against Evolution*

May you not just buy into what you have been taught or told, but may you think critically about ***all*** the information presented.

-- James "Jamie" Johnson