

REVIEW ARTICLE

*Creation Science and the Physical Universe**

JOHN C. WHITCOMB

What is Creation Science? by Henry M. Morris and Gary E. Parker. San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, Inc., 1982. Pp. 306. \$7.95. Paper.

In this significant landmark of creationist literature, Henry M. Morris and Gary E. Parker combine their scientific skills to undermine the credibility of evolutionism. In the previous issue of this journal, the reviewer surveyed Dr. Parker's contribution in chaps. 1-3, "The Life Sciences." In the present article, the final three chaps. written by Dr. Morris ("The Physical Sciences") are analyzed, followed by a theological perspective on the entire volume.

"CREATION AND THE LAWS OF SCIENCE"

In chap. 4, Morris skillfully ties the biological and physical sciences together into one gigantic unity. "Living systems must all function in a *physical* world. Biological processes, while far more complex than physical processes, nevertheless must operate also in conformity to the physico-chemical laws which govern nonliving systems. . . . So the question of origins is not merely a biological question, to be resolved by biologists. . . . The creation/evolution issue is one of cosmic dimensions" (p. 154).

In spite of the commonly heard assertion that creationism is only one of several possible alternatives to evolutionism, the only two possible models of origins are evolution or creation. Evolution contemplates eternal, self-existent, self-contained, natural processes continuing to happen today in a mass/energy, space/time continuum without plan or design (i.e., accidental, by chance). Religions that accommodate this world-and-life view include Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, and Taoism (p. 156).

On the other hand, creationism involves a supernatural design and unique, supernatural events to bring the universe and its various components into existence. Religions that presuppose this model include orthodox Judaism, Islam, and Christianity.

*The reviewer appreciates the assistance of Dr. Donald B. DeYoung, Professor of Physics, Grace College, in the preparation of this article.

With regard to processes, "the creation model predicts only net decreases (for the universe as a whole)," but "stipulates nothing concerning the *rate* of decrease," for "this may be almost zero in times of peace and calm and very high during great catastrophes" (p. 161). To put the contrast in different terms, the creation model "suggests that there should be a conservational and disintegrative principle operating in nature," while, "if evolution is true, then there must be some innovative and integrative principle operating in the natural world which develops structure out of randomness and higher organization from lower" (p. 163).

Several clear and concise diagrams clarify an otherwise difficult discussion concerning the relevance of the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics to evolutionism and creationism. The Second Law, or Entropy (in-turning) Law, measures the deterioration of energy in a working, structured, or programmed system (p. 166). "Time's Arrow" always points downward in a system that is closed to outside, intelligent energy.

The frequently-heard claim that the earth is not a closed system, because it is "open" to the sun's energy, is effectively refuted as an "inexcusably naive" argument (p. 171). In fact, "an influx of heat energy into an open system (such as solar heat entering the earth-system)" actually decreases the order of a system, and thus aggravates the fundamental conflict between entropy and evolutionism.

Why is it, then, that some systems seem to go uphill in complexity? "There are many systems, especially artificial systems (e.g., buildings, machinery) and living systems (e.g., plants, animals) which do indeed manifest, for a long time, an increasing degree of complexity or information. . . . They are open systems, of course, and do draw on external sources of energy, or information, or order, to build up their own structure. Even though their (internal) entropy is decreased (for awhile), it is at the expense of an overall increase of entropy in the larger system outside, all fully in accord with the Second Law. But . . . most open systems do *not* increase in order. Having an open system is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition" (p. 172).

One of the most significant contributions of Morris to the current debate is his insistence that the openness of the earth to the sun's energy is totally insufficient to bring about "an increasing order unless it also possesses a highly specific program to direct its growth and a complex mechanism (or 'motor,' or 'membrane') to convert the sun's energy into the specific work of building its growth" (p. 175).

While many evolutionists might wish that time's arrow could go up as well as down, "wishing does not make it so, except in children's fairy tales!" (p. 186). Two internationally recognized authorities on thermodynamics who have not succumbed to such fairy tales are Sonntag and Van Wylen, who see "the second law of thermodynamics as man's description of the prior and continuing work of a creator, who also holds the answer to the future destiny of man and the universe" (*Fundamentals of Classical Thermodynamics* [2d ed.; New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973] 248).

"CATASROPHISM IN GEOLOGY"

In the second of his three chaps., Morris is at his best, bringing his many years of expertise in hydraulic engineering to bear upon the question of the origin of sedimentary and fossil strata. The very evidence that evolutionists most frequently appeal to, namely, the fossil evidence, turns out upon close inspection to be a virtual disaster for their theory of earth history. One prominent paleontologist, David B. Kitts, is quoted as admitting that "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" (p. 191). Other scientists, such as Valentine, Campbell, Stanley, Ridley, and Raup, are quoted to similar effect (pp. 191-94).

Thus, while most evolutionists still feel that "fossils must provide the *only* real evidence for evolution," some of the most prominent young scientists are insisting that "fossils provide *no* real evidence for evolution. Well, creationists think they are *both* right! The only *real* evidence is the fossil record, and it *doesn't* support evolution" (p. 195). This constitutes a staggering blow to a theory that all but dominates our secular (and most religious) institutions of higher learning.

Actually, the only place in the world where the evolutionary order of fossil-bearing rock formations can be found is in textbooks (p. 196). The average depth of sedimentary rock worldwide is about one mile (p. 198), and much of it is "upside down" from an evolutionary perspective, not only in the Rockies and Alps, but even in the Appalachians (p. 200). And, there is practically no evidence of violent overthrusting to cause such a reversed order. Also, any kind of rock can be found in any layer (p. 201). Even the appeal to "index fossils" to date the sedimentary rocks is now being admitted to be essentially circular reasoning by such men as David Kitts and Ronald West (p. 208).

In the light of all this, the catastrophic model of earth history is vastly superior. As young geologists such as Gould and Ager are turning to "neo-catastrophism" in the form of "punctuated equilibrium" to reconcile the fossil record with evolutionism, they finally end up with such absurdities as "revolutionary evolutionism" (p. 210). In fact, Gould goes so far as to admit that Charles Lyell, the "father of uniformitarianism," actually "imposed his imagination upon the evidence" (p. 211), a point which creationists have insisted on for over a hundred years.

What, then, is the catastrophic (or cataclysmic) model of geology? First, as Derek Ager, head of the Geology Department at Swansea University in England, admits, every sedimentary formation requires a catastrophic explanation (p. 215). Second, there is no worldwide time-gap in the geologic column. Thus, "the entire sedimentary crust fits the description of the Catastrophic Model—continuous, cataclysmic hydraulic sedimentary activity throughout the column" (p. 217).

The third prediction of this model is that normally we would expect "simpler" organisms to be found at the bottom of the column, representing their ecological zone, while more complex forms would be found in the upper strata, though exceptions should be anticipated.

"HOW AND WHEN DID THE WORLD BEGIN?"

In his final chap., Morris insists that the date of creation is a distinct issue from the fact of creation, even though evolutionism would be squeezed out of existence by a young-earth concept (p. 220). "There is only one basic question, that of creation or evolution, but there are two important corollary questions: (1) catastrophism or uniformitarianism; (a) recent or old origin" (p. 220). In this final chapter the second corollary question is answered.

The popular Big-Bang Theory of the origin of the universe is shown to be impossible. The supposed background radiation from this cosmic primeval explosion is not uniform in any direction and the matter which scattered throughout the universe from it is non-uniform also. "It has never been adequately explained how cosmic 'lumps' such as stars and galaxies could be generated from the homogeneous energies of the hypothetical explosion" (p. 224). In fact, as one evolutionist analyses the problem, "The standard Big Bang model does not give rise to lumpiness. . . . If you apply the laws of physics to this model, you get a universe that is uniform, a cosmic vastness of evenly distributed atoms with no organization of any kind" (p. 225, quoting IBM's Philip E. Seiden). Thus evolutionary astronomers are now confronted with the "lumpy Big Bang problem"! Even worse, uniform radial motion from a supposed Big Bang "could never give rise to curvilinear motion. How, then, could the linearly expanding gas soon be converted into orbiting galaxies and planetary systems?" (p. 226).

Thus, the Big Bang Theory is essentially destroyed by the Second Law of Thermodynamics and by the principle of conservation of angular momentum, even as the Steady-State Theory of Sir Fred Hoyle was destroyed by the First Law of Thermodynamics.

It is indeed a challenge to keep up with changing ideas regarding the Big Bang Theory. Since the publication of *What Is Creation Science?*, an "inflationary universe" has been popularized by Alan Guth of M.I.T. This proposed cosmogony begins with an extreme expansion of the early universe. One early form of the model results in the present universe coming into existence within "just" 30,000 years of the alleged explosion (cf. *Science News* 123 [Feb 12, 1983] 108). This model is of current interest because it solves some of the problems pointed out by Morris. Unfortunately, the model also results in a whole new set of problems.

By infinite contrast, "the Creation Model is supported by three obvious facts: (1) the universe is immensely vast and complex; (2) as long as men have been observing the stars and galaxies, they have been stable with no evolutionary changes ever observed since the beginning of recorded history; (3) all *observed* changes (e.g., novas, meteorites, etc.) represent disintegration processes, not evolutionary processes" (p. 228). Thus, the immensity, complexity, variety, stability and disintegration of the stellar heavens all point to a Creator.

Our solar system is seen to be so complex that no unified evolutionary theory can remotely begin to explain it. In fact, as one frustrated evolutionist exclaimed, "The conclusion in the present state of the subject would be that the system cannot exist"! (p. 231, quoting Harold Jeffreys). The probability of life evolving on this earth by chance is zero (pp. 235, 238); and there is "not one iota of real scientific evidence for biological life anywhere in the universe except on earth" (p. 233), thus confirming the suspicions of many that radio telescopes, designed at great expense to listen for messages from outer space, have been "a complete exercise in futility" (p. 234).

Morris briefly discusses the so-called "anthropic principle" (p. 235), but much more should now be said concerning this. The term describes the fact that the universe is filled with exceedingly improbable "coincidences." If any one of a large number of constants or laws were slightly varied, neither life nor stability of matter would occur in the physical universe. The secular reaction to the anthropic principle shows the extremes to which men will go in denying the Creator: it has been proposed that there are actually an infinite number of universes. We just happen to live in the particular universe in which the natural laws are accidentally balanced!

Finally, in preparation for his spectacular list of sixty-eight independent calculations applying to the entire earth that demonstrate its comparatively recent origin, Morris explains that (1) decay curves are exponential, not linear; (2) decay curves may include catastrophic interludes which radically speed the decay; and (3) decay curves may cover an ever shorter time period if we do not know the initial conditions (pp. 242-52).

The powerful force of Morris' argumentation leaves the reviewer incapable of understanding how any completely unprejudiced mind can avoid his conclusion: "the weight of all the scientific evidence favors the view that the earth is quite young, far too young for life and man to have arisen by an evolutionary process. The origin of all things by direct creation—already necessitated by many other scientific considerations—is therefore also indicated by chronometric data" (p. 252).

A THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

But this brings us to the ultimate issue in the creation/evolution debate: does anyone in this world's system of thinking have a completely unprejudiced and unbiased mind to look objectively at all the data and the logical implications of the data? The reviewer is convinced that no one is thus qualified. Even more serious, the scientific, mathematical, and logical consistency of creationism is being continually suppressed by man's depraved will under Satanic dominion (Rom 8:7; 1 Cor 2:14; 2 Cor 3:4-5; Eph 2:1-3; 4:18, 6:12). The problem, therefore, is not with the evidences, but with man's spiritual response to evidences that speak clearly of the Creator. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because that which is known about God is evident within them; for God made it evident to them" (Rom 1:18-19).

Can scientific creationism be detached from biblical and theological creationism and made to function effectively in the hearts of men on its own strength? That is a major question that creationists must face today. Morris and Parker are convinced that "scientific creationism is *not* based on Genesis or any other religious teaching" (p. 263).

Two serious limitations must be faced. First, when creationism is isolated from biblical theology it is reduced to a mere scientific theory which, in the very nature of science, offers no ultimately authoritative answers or assurances to men. Parker states that "science is prohibited by its own methodology from making any statements about ultimate purpose. . . . We are so humbly limited in both space and time that we can never finally prove or disprove either of these two ultimate models" (pp. 149, 157, 162).

Thus, "the creation/evolution debate can never be completely settled by scientific evidence alone. There will always be new evidence to investigate and new concepts to apply. Each generation will have to reevaluate its concept of origins in terms of current knowledge. 'The debate goes on.'" (p. 143; cf. pp. 42, 107, 141, 144-45). Probability, not certainty, is all that can be hoped for (p. 157). Purely scientific cosmogony and cosmology would therefore seem to be locked forever into the ultimate frustration of "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth" (2 Tim 3:7).

Second, creation science, when isolated from the wider context of special revelation in Scripture, is devoid of theological identity from a Christian perspective. One might just as well be a Jewish or even a Muslim creation scientist as far as this model is concerned (pp. 156, 265), for such questions as creation or evolution, catastrophism or uniformitarianism, and recent or ancient origin "can be evaluated strictly as scientific models, without reference to their theological, philosophical, or moral implications" (p. 220). Thus, some people who are "without religion see creation [as being] compatible with science" (p. 149). In fact, "not all creationists believe in a personal God" (p. xii).

The reviewer suspects that many Bible-believing Christians who devote much time and effort to creation-science activities have not carefully pondered the implications of such statements as these. Can creationism retain its full power and beauty if it sheds its theological garments? By avoiding any mention of the Bible, or of Christ as the Creator, we may be able to gain equal time in some public school classrooms. But the cost would seem to be exceedingly high, for absolute certainty is lost and the spiritual impact that only the living and powerful Word of God can give (Heb 4:12) is blunted. Granted, "*Biblical* creationism [as well as biblical prayer and worship] should be taught in churches" (p. 264) and church-related schools. But does this mean that Christians in public schools have fulfilled their God-given responsibility as witnesses to Him when they promote and endorse a religionless two-model approach in the science classroom? Is this a truly spiritual achievement?

It is not essentially a question of biblical orthodoxy. Morris and Parker have not compromised Christian doctrines, such as the absolute inerrancy and perspicuity of Scripture. The issue is not theological compromise but rather evangelistic methodology. Should our theological convictions be obscured temporarily and thus compartmentalized in order to reach the millions

of students who are being systematically brainwashed in evolutionary humanism in public schools and universities and who would otherwise be deprived of any exposure to creationism?

Or, should we rather view this tax-supported educational system as a vast mission field to be approached from the perspective and with the guaranteed resources of the Great Commission (Matt 28:18–20)? Can we really “reach” such an unregenerate community, a significant segment of Satan’s kingdom, without the impact of the whole counsel of God (Acts 20:27)? Are we wrestling here against mere “flesh and blood,” or, rather, “against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places” (Eph 6:12)?

Throughout the book, the reviewer senses the opposite pull of pure scientific objectivity on the one hand, and a moral, even spiritual, appeal to the evolutionist on the other hand. “He should ask himself whether something other than the facts of nature is influencing his thinking about origins” (p. v). It is “bigoted for certain scientists to exclude [creation] from the domain of science” (p. xiii). “Sooner or later, *everyone* will need to know these evidences and arguments” (p. xvi). All scientists “must be willing to follow the evidence wherever it might lead” (pp. 18, 144). Is creation superior to evolution? “The concept of a creator as the explanation of the scientific evidence” is “eminently satisfying, both intellectually and emotionally” (p. 155). Furthermore, science “can help us with this ultimately very personal decision. But, as finite beings, we must look at the world with eyes wide open . . . and a heart that listens to the other fellow. *Think about it!*” (p. 150).

When the unbeliever is challenged simply to “think” about the natural universe, with no Christ-centered and redemptive perspective being provided through special revelation in Scripture, the result is always negative. As a former unregenerate evolutionist, the reviewer bears personal testimony to the force of God’s analysis of the dilemma of human depravity: “The wicked, in the haughtiness of his countenance, does not seek Him. All his thoughts are, ‘There is no God’” (Ps 10:4).

Man’s problem, then, is not a lack of thinking, but a rejection of Christ-centered thinking in response to his grace. “The Gentiles also walk in the futility of their mind, being darkened in their understanding, excluded from the life of God, because of the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardness of their heart” (Eph 4:17–18). “And this is the judgment, that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their deeds were evil” (John 3:19).

The brilliantly illuminating creation message is a vital part of Biblical revelation—but it is an incomplete part in and of itself. Men desperately need the good news, not just more light. Without the gospel of the completed work of Christ upon the cross, the creation witness can only condemn sinful man, for he will always “suppress the truth [of the Creator God] in unrighteousness” and thus remain “without excuse” under “the wrath of God” (Rom 1:18–20).

Ultimately, ethical decisions in science, as in interpersonal decisions (such as a mother deciding whether or not to abort the unborn person within her womb), must rest upon the presupposition of God’s design of the universe, not only physically, but especially morally and spiritually. Science and

divinely-revealed religion/ethics cannot be isolated without inviting long-range disaster (e.g., Nazi Germany, Communist Russia). God has commanded us to do everything (including our science) "to the glory of God" (1 Cor 10:31). We are indeed commanded to conduct ourselves harmlessly (Matt 10:16), graciously (Col 4:6), and "with wisdom toward outsiders" (Col 4:5), not unnecessarily offending men with our manner and methods of presenting Christ's Gospel. Nevertheless, we are also commanded to "proclaim Him, admonishing every man and teaching every man with all wisdom, that we may present every man complete in Christ" (Col 1:28).

Biblical theology, then, so far from being a hindrance and an embarrassment to scientific creationism (e.g., "many have considered it to be simply religion in disguise" [p. iii; cf. 264]), is actually its only source of final authority, power, and victory.

What is Creation Science? is, in this reviewer's opinion, the finest *scientific* critique of evolutionism now available. Henry Morris and Gary Parker are men of deep Christian conviction and commitment. They have written other books which testify eloquently to this fact (cf. Morris, *King of Creation*, chap. five). It may be hoped, therefore, that they will some day be led to produce a volume that combines special and general revelation into one balanced unit, for the glory of Christ our Creator, who is also our Lord, Saviour, and Coming King.