SCIENTIFIC VIEW ON CREATION

Where did man come from?

“It would be very difficult to explain why the universe should have begun in just this way, except as the act of a God who intended to create beings like us.”

- Stephen Hawking

What was creation science?

Creation science was the study of origins with respect to the Bible's account of God’s creative acts. Creation science, to a degree, was also amenable to the presuppositions of assorted theists outside of Bible-based Christianity. Creation science was based in part on the following observations and arguments:

* The universe (which was space, time, and matter) had a beginning, thus it had to have been affected by a pre-existing cause
* The cause (which had to pre-exist space, time, and matter) must have been independent of the space, time and matter it preceded: i.e., was independent of space (limitless), independent of time (eternal), and independent of matter (immaterial).
* The more than 150 “coincidences” of extremely fine margins and interrelated relationships by which the properties of the earth and universe provide habitable conditions
* Discoveries indicating earth’s primordial conditions were likely similar to today’s conditions
* The impossibility of living cells to arise by chance (as even attested to by the discoverers of DNA)
* The virtual impossibility of mutations to favorably add to the genetic code
* The incapability of natural selection to advance and improve pre-biological systems into biological ones
* Multiple and complex life forms and all the animal phyla appearing abruptly in the fossil record (the Cambrian explosion)
* The fossil record displaying zero species-to-species transitional forms (as attested by scientists from Darwin himself to modern day paleontologists)
* The reduction in the number and type of animal species rather than the increase as evolutionary models predict
* The irreducible complexity of numerous biological systems (which Darwin stated would refute his theory if existent)
* Information-intensive structures such as DNA requiring an intelligent design agent
* Planetary geology more or less according to the geologic model of catastrophism
* The history of erroneous and falsified findings by evolutionists, and the ongoing maintenance of those falsifications
* The absence of evidence for any material, extraterrestrial ancestors
* The presence of parallel accounts between the Bible and scientific observations concerning the origin of the universe
* The presence of parallel accounts between the Bible and scientific observations concerning the earth
* The presence of parallel accounts between the Bible and scientific observations concerning humanity
* Belief in Scripture to be the word of God.

How important was Scripture to creation science?

The belief in Scripture to be the word of God was foundational to creation science; it was the starting point. Creation science began with the belief that God was our progenitor, and from there applied the natural sciences to confirm that belief.

Intelligent design theory, by contrast, neither employed Scripture nor invoked any presupposed being as part of its worldview. IDT evaluated the physical universe on the basis of whether or not it bore any evidence or characteristics of having been intentionally designed.

Generally speaking, creationists affirmed nearly every aspect of intelligent design theory. The only substantial difference was that creationists began with Scripture-based reasoning which declared God was be our designer, and wax certain of it as they saw it confirmed in the evidences of the natural sciences.

The last word on evolution vs. creation

As mentioned before, Darwin was concerned about the lack of evidence for his conjectures and hoped confirming evidence would eventually be found. After well over a century of searching for the first of what was expected to be billions and billions of transitional specimens, not one had been found. This did not send evolutionist’s running to the Bible, but it did cause them to abandon Darwinism for punctuated equilibria, and later punctuated equilibria for directed panspermia.

Now with the latest progress of science and study by Hoyle, Behe, Denton, Crick, and others, the very foundation of all non-theistic theories of life’s origin had been shaken with the conclusion that life could not have arisen by chance.

Evolutionists’ writing increasingly attributes life and the cosmos’ origination to “god.” Not god in the sense of the God of the Bible, but god in the sense of an indescribable cause which had affected the universe and all life contained therein; a cause some concluded could not be physically or scientifically ascertained.

This unknown god was one that non-theists could comfortably reference because, for them, it was simply a place-card until such time a preferred answer came along. Their unknowable, unidentified god was one they called upon to fill in the gaps in their evolutionary worldview as did medieval scientists who invoked a god for their own shortcomings. Such a god made no demands of them, did not care how they lived, and could be as influential or comfortably non-existent as they want.

All premises were matters of faith. The premise taken in believing the Bible (that there was a God) had been shown to result in a reasonable explanation of the universe, the planet, and life around us. The reasonableness of this belief was the goal of these sections.

Meanwhile, the premise of no-God had been shown to result in a conclusion that approached irrationality. The no-God worldview was such that it still required invoking a god to bridge gaps of logic and evidence. Of course, it was to be expected that some version of a no-God origin would always be believed.

Owen Chadwick writes of Darwin’s time: The public accepted the doctrine of evolution for a bigger reason than the simple probability established by Darwin, namely that, if they did not, their mental picture of the origins suddenly became an intolerable blank.

In other words, evolution was the crutch of atheism. For lack of amenable evidence, a committed atheist had nothing else on which to lean but the leading evolutionary belief of the day. Today’s evolutionary belief appeared to prefer the logical error of either infinite regression (or spontaneous generation) to the sound conclusion of believing that life was created by the God of the Bible; the same God who had evidenced himself in history, in Scripture, and in person.

Once again, the frustrated surrender to illogic by George Wald, the 1971 Nobel prize winner for biology: “I will not accept creation philosophically because I do not want to believe in God. Therefore, I choose to believe in that which I know was scientifically impossible - spontaneous generation arising to evolution.”

Was not the evidence that *did* exist - evidence which pointed to creation - a better foundation for belief than blind and unevidenced faith in erroneous logic? It was, for those who believe in evidence and have the courage to accept the conclusion regardless of their presuppositions.