

Arguing for Creationism

If someone said a slug turned into a man last night, you would laugh in his face. Yet, if you basically say the same thing occurred over millions of years, then some call it "science." Evolutionary theory is opinion and belief, and I disagree with it. What partially helped me become a creationist was looking at pro-evolution texts and drawing the conclusion that the texts cried for evidence that was at best questionable.

There is much support for intelligent design. I am concerned that those who call themselves scientists write it off quickly and avidly attempt to prevent its teaching. Some evolutionists are passionate about their doctrine and will go to great lengths to promote it.

In speaking of *Pierolapithecus catalaunicus*, an alleged ancestor of both apes and humans, *Science* paper co-author Salvador Moya-Sola said scarcity in the fossil record in Africa is problematic. Another co-author Meike Kohler said he didn't like the phrase "missing link." What's wrong with that phrase (especially if it's accurate)?

Dr. Ken Ham questions how authors know how 'Lucy' (one of our supposed ancestors depicted by artists as somewhat human, yet ape-like) looked. Any artist could make a "creature" look ape-like based on a human skull. He shared how a medical illustrator was denied a drawing of 'Lucy' he submitted for a biology text because it was too human-like and needed to look more ape-like.

Dr. Werner Gitt, information scientist and author of *In the Beginning was Information*, says information requires a code, the code a "free and deliberate convention," and information a mental source and being "established voluntarily by a free will" (i.e., a Creator).

We live in a designed, purposeful world (created, not from chance) located optimally in the Solar System with ideal size and gravitational pull, a protective magnetic field, and the proper rate of rotation for warming/cooling. Earth sustains life, has an abundance of flowing water, has a favorable climate, fertile soil, ocean tides that cleanse shorelines, and a life-supporting atmosphere.

John F. Ashton, author of *In Six Days: Why 50 Scientists Believe in Creationism*, shares from scientists across disciplines supporting Creationism. Among them are the following:

Dr. Jerry R. Bergman (biology) says information does not arise by chance and, if left to itself, would result in *disorder*. He shares about the complexity of genetic code of 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."

Dr. Ker C. Thomson (geophysics) discusses how The Second Law of Thermodynamics -- the long-range universal decay process -- produces a breakdown of complexity, the opposite of what evolution requires.

Dr. John R. Baumgardner (geophysics) says the number of random trials required to get even a useful 3D protein structure including amino acids necessary for life 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."

Dr. AJ Monty White (physical chemistry) says he's amazed how evolutionists make claims they have proven life randomly arose according to their experiments, but never point out that their experiments are *based on intellect and not chance*.

Dr. Walter J. Veith (zoology) shares how natural selection does not create features, adaptations, or life, but merely selects for features that provide greater survival value.

Dr. Don Batten (agricultural science) argues that enzymes produce the pure amino acids and sugars necessary for life, but enzyme manufacturing requires a living cell (i.e. could not have arisen from non-living material).

Other academic voices support creation and challenge evolution:

Dr. Michael Behe (biochemistry) cites intelligent design as the logical explanation for the complex biochemical machines in all life.

Dr. Philip Johnson (law) depicts evolution as grounded in naturalistic philosophy, not scientific fact, and lacking supportive empirical evidence despite claims. He says evolution would have been abandoned long ago if it were a scientific hypothesis based on a rigorous study of evidence.

James Nickel (mathematics) shows how mathematics reveals God's design in nature as evidenced by the Fibonacci sequence. This sequence relates to Pascal's Triangle, the golden ratio Phi, and the Golden Rectangle. The sequence is found in spiral arrangements including petals, pine cones, and pineapple; in leaf positioning of the Phyllotaxis; in the mathematics of the quantum matrix, of rabbit populations, and of the genealogy of male bees. Phi relates to 5-petaled flowers, starfish, and sand dollars. The Golden Rectangle relates to the chambered nautilus, hurricane storm clouds, spiral galaxy, and the cochlea of the human ear. Pascal's Triangle relates to binomials and probability.

Do you *still* want to *believe* we are here by chance? Do you *still* want to put your faith in evolution? I spent my elementary through graduate school years reading texts, which asserted evolution was fact. However, there is a wealth of resources that show otherwise. Please see <http://beacondeacon.freewebspace.com/creation.htm> for a list of resources.

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