The Scientific Case For Creation #1

Introduction. There are two fundamentally different, and diametrically opposed, explanations for the origin of the Universe, the origin of life in that Universe and the origin of new types of varying life forms. Each of these explanations is a "cosmogony" -- an entire philosophy of the origin, structure and meaning of the Universe. Hence, "cosmology" is the study of the origin and nature of the Universe.

One of these world views is the concept of evolution. According to the theory of evolution, the Universe is self-contained. Everything in the Universe has come into being through mechanistic processes without any kind of supernatural intervention. This view asserts that the origin and development of the Universe and all of its systems (the Universe itself, living non-human organisms, man, etc.) can be explained solely on the basis of time, chance and continuing natural processes innate in the structure of matter and energy.

According to this particular theory, all living things have arisen from a single-celled organism, which in turn had arisen from an inanimate, inorganic world. This theory may be called the "General Theory of Evolution," "vertical evolution" or "macroevolution."

The second alternate and opposing world view is the concept of creation. According to the theory of creation, the Universe is not self-contained. Everything in the Universe, and in fact, the Universe itself, has come into being through the design, purpose and deliberate acts of a supernatural Creator who, using processes that are not continuing as natural processes in the present, created the Universe and all it contains (Genesis 1:1-2:25; 5:1-2; 6:7; Deuteronomy 4:32; Nehemiah 9:6; Job 26:7, 13; 33:4; Psalm 8:5; 19:1-4; 33:6, 9; 100:3; 102:25; 104:30; 148:5; Ecclesiastes 12:7; Isaiah 40:26; 42:5; 43:1, 7; 45:7-8, 12, 18; 51:13; 54:16; Ezekiel 28:13, 15; Amos 4:13; Malachi 2:10; Mark 13:39; John 1:1-3; Acts 14:15; 17:28; 1 Corinthians 11:9; Ephesians 3:9; Colossians 1:16; 3:10; 1 Timothy 4:3; Hebrews 11:3; Revelation 4:11; 10:6).

For the sake of clarity, people who believe that God created the Universe reject "macroevolution" (the emergence of the complex from the simple, and change between kinds), but do not challenge "microevolution" (the formation of species or subspecies within created kinds, or genetic variation). In these three lessons, we will examine the scientific evidence for creation.

I. ***The Big Bang Theory***

A. The Big Bang theory really came into its own in the late 1940s, replacing the Steady State Theory as the prominent theory of the origin of the Universe. In 1967, three scientists demonstrated that the propor-

tions of certain lighter-weight elements produced during the Big Bang matched almost exactly the proportions thought to exist in the solar system. This result convinced many astronomers that the Big Bang was the correct description of the Universe's origin.

B. The Big Bang states that around 15 billion years ago, all matter in the Universe was compressed into an infinitely dense and hot mass that exploded. Then, over the many eons that followed the primordial cloud of the Universe expanded and cooled, stars were born and died, the sun and earth were formed, and life arose on the earth. Bill Bryson wrote, "In three minutes, ninety-eight percent of all the matter there is or will ever be has been produced ... And it was all done in about the time it takes to make a sandwich."

C. One scientist, writing under the title of "The Bursting of the Big Bang" in 2001, admitted that "while few people have seen the obituary ... the reality is that the immensely popular Big Bang theory is dead.... The Big Bang cannot explain the nature of the universe as we know it."
   1. When one steps away from all the Big Bang propaganda, and carefully examines the foundation on which the concept itself rests, there is legitimate reason for concern. The theory teeters on the brink of some incredible assumptions -- "incredible" in that each unstable assumption is built on top of another equally volatile supposition.
   2. Each subsequent assumption casts a shadow that hides from public view the visible uncertainties of the preceding one. Like an onion, as each layer is stripped back, it leaves only another layer to be viewed. The time has come to peel back several of those layers, and expose what lies beneath. The Big Bang, as it turns out, is scientifically flawed.

D. Evidences for the Big Bang Theory.
   1. Redshift measurements.
      a) In the minds of some, one of the most significant problems facing Big Bang cosmology today has to do with the concept of redshift. Perhaps the easiest way to understand redshift is to imagine the sound coming from a siren on a fire engine. Once that fire engine passes, the pitch drops. The siren does not actually change pitch; rather, the sound waves of an approaching fire engine are made shorter by the approach of the sound source, where the waves of the departing fire engine are made longer by the receding of the sound source.
      b) Light (or electromagnetic radiation) from stars or galaxies behaves in exactly the same manner. An approaching source of light or radiation emits shorter waves (relative to an observer). A receding source emits longer waves (again, relative to the ob-

server). Thus, the radiation or light of a source moving toward an observer will be "shifted" toward the blue end of the wavelength scale. The radiation or light of a source moving away from the observer "shifts" toward the red end of the light spectrum. The amount of shift is a function of the relative speed. A body approaching or receding at a high speed will show a greater shift than one approaching or receding at a low speed.

(1) One scientist has found "enigmatic and disturbing cases" where two apparently connected objects that seem to be the same distance away, actually have significantly different redshift values.

(2) What all of this means is that the redshift may be virtually useless for calculating the recession speed of distant galaxies, and would completely destroy one of the main pillars of the expanding Universe idea. In 2002, Fox stated, "Redshifts are not, in and of themselves, a sign of a star's age or distance, and yet redshifts have become intrinsically entwined with how we determine not just the speed of any given object, but also how old and how far away it is. If the interpretation of redshift is wrong, then all the proof that the Universe is expanding will disappear. It would undermine everything that's been mapped out about the heavens. Not only would the Big Bang theory come crashing down, but scientists wouldn't be able to determine how the nearest galaxy is moving, much less how the whole universe behaves."

c) An expanding Universe is absolutely critical to the Big Bang theory. Fox stated the relationship well when she wrote, "Many ... people strike at the very heart of the Big Bang theory: expansion. While, as mentioned earlier, an expanding universe doesn't require that the Universe began with a bang, the Big Bang theory certainly requires an expanding Universe. If it turns out that galaxies and stars aren't receding from each other, then the entire theory would fall apart."

(1) In its standard form, the Big Bang theory assumes that all parts of the Universe began expanding simultaneously.

(2) But how could the different parts of the Universe synchronize the beginning of their expansion? Who gave the command? What is in dispute is the explanation for the phenomenon.

2. Microwave background radiation.

a) In June 1964, two scientists stumbled upon the phenomenon of cosmic microwave background radiation. The Big Bang theory predicts that the early Universe was a very hot place and that as it expands, the gas within it cools. Thus the Universe should be

filled with radiation that is literally the remnant heat left over from the Big Bang, called the "cosmic microwave background radiation."

b) But some scientists are saying that this phenomenon was not due to some ancient explosion, but rather was simply the background radiation from all of the heat sources that occupy the Universe. Van Flandern noted, "This argument alone implies that the microwaves could not be coming directly to us from a distance beyond all the galaxies, and therefore that the Big Bang theory cannot be correct."

c) Matter, whether on Earth or in space, absorbs radiation, and this radiation is very likely the result of that absorption. Space is not an "empty" place, as some once thought, but is filled with stars, planets, nebulae, comets, asteroids, interstellar particles of dust and gas and galaxies, all of which both absorb and emit varying amounts of radiation.

3. The homogeneity of the Universe.

a) The Big Bang model absolutely requires a uniform, homogeneous Universe. Isotropy (matter being spread out evenly in all directions) and homogeneity (matter being spread out uniformly) are two foundational components of the Big Bang theory.

b) Under the idea of homogeneity, cosmologists make the assumption that the matter of the Universe is a great but uniform and homogeneous cloud covering the cosmos equitably. There is no way to deal with the Universe object by object; the equations would be impossible to solve. Having simplified the contents of the Universe, the cosmologist must, for the same reason, hypothesize that the matter in the Universe is evenly distributed in all directions. The Universe, he must assume, is isotropic. It has no center whatsoever, no place toward which things tend, and no special direction of coordination. These two assumptions, homogeneity and isotropy, are absolutely necessary for any mathematical calculations.

c) As it turns out, there are at least two serious problems with any suggestion that the Universe exhibits homogeneity.

(1) First, homogeneity can be defended only if one considers the matter present in the Universe at distances greater than 150 million light-years. At anything less than these distances, the concept of homogeneity collapses completely.

(2) Second, a serious problem arises even when considering the matter of the Universe at distances greater than 150-million-light-years. A report based on data from the Infrared Astronomical Satellite (IRAS) documented beyond doubt that the

distribution of matter in the universe is not homogeneous at all. All galaxies within one billion light years of Earth are concentrated into huge ribbons of matter about a billion light years long, 300 million light years wide and 100 million light years thick. This contradicted the concept of homogeneity on the grandest of scales and led the entire group of ten authors who performed the research and wrote the report to disavow completely the standard Big Bang theory.

4. Dark matter and dark energy.
   a) In any Big Bang scenario -- according to evolutionists' assumptions about the initial conditions -- the Universe can contain no more than 10% protons, neutrons, and other ordinary matter found in stars, planets, galaxies, etc. What makes up the rest of the matter, referred to as "cold dark matter," is still a mystery.
   b) Cosmologists do not know what the mysterious material is that composes the bulk of the entire Universe. Nor have they found any credible, direct evidence of its existence. So, "cold dark matter" is an unknown, unseen substance that is, nonetheless, essential to the process of self-creation. Unfortunately, 90-99% of this matter is missing from the Universe.
   c) "Dark energy" is spread uniformly through space, exerts a negative pressure and causes the expansion of the universe to accelerate. Scientists believe in this phantom force "fudge factor" for which there is no explanation because the Big Bang theory is not "lining up" with observation.

E. Was the Universe created?
   1. Despite a tremendous investment made by the scientific community and the general public in cosmology, matters do not add up as they should. Cosmologists write as if they are quite certain of the Big Bang, yet, within the last decade, they have found it necessary to augment the standard view by means of various new theories.
   2. A new theory is the inflationary theory or the idea of a self-created Universe. In the past, it would have been practically impossible to find any reputable scientist who would have been willing to advocate a self-created Universe. To hold such a view would have been professional suicide.
   3. In the May 1984 issue of *Scientific American*, an article titled, "The Inflationary Universe," suggested the notion that all the matter and energy in the observable universe may have emerged from almost nothing. Although this theory has been in vogue for several years, scientists are admitting that it is speculative and no empirical or observational tests exist to test the idea of an accidental origin. Furthermore, how does nothing explode? How does this not violate the

first law of thermodynamics which states that neither matter nor energy may be created or destroyed in nature?

4. The fact is, the Universe is fine-tuned in such a way that it is more and more unlikely to suggest logically that it popped into existence out of nothing. Murphy and Ellis noted, "The symmetries and delicate balances we observe in the universe require an extraordinary coherence of conditions and cooperation of laws and effects, suggesting that in some sense they have been purposely designed. That is, they give evidence of intention, realized both in the setting of the laws of physics and in the choice of boundary conditions for the universe." This highly sophisticated fine-tuning cries out for a Designer.

F. Scientists have been extremely successful, thus far, at diverting attention away from the obvious question: Where did the original material for the Big Bang come from? That is to say, what came before the Big Bang? But more and more are realizing that the only principle powerful enough to explain the high degree of organization of our universe -- compared to a universe where the particles and forces are chosen randomly -- is the one which includes an intelligent Designer.

G. One scientist lamented, "For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries."

II. ***The Law Of Cause And Effect***

A. Indisputably, the most universal, and most certain, of all scientific laws is the Law of Cause and Effect, or as it is commonly known, the Law of Causality. Kant, in the first edition of *Critique of Pure Reason*, stated that "everything that happens (begins to be) presupposes something which it follows according to a rule."

B. The Law of Causality is not just important to science. Richard von Mises observed: "We may only add that almost all philosophers regard the Law of Causality as the most important, the most far-reaching, and the most firmly founded of all principles of epistemology" (the philosophical theory of knowledge). This is a principle that is constantly confirmed and never falsified. We never see things coming into being without a cause.

C. While the Law of Cause and Effect crosses strictly scientific boundaries and impacts all other disciplines as well, the scientific implications it presents are among the most serious ever discovered. Obviously, if every material effect has an adequate antecedent cause, and if the Universe is a material effect, then the Universe had a cause.

1. Robert Jastrow wrote, "The Universe, and everything that has happened in it since the beginning of time, are a grand effect without a known cause. An effect without a cause? That is not the world of science; it is a world of witchcraft, of wild events and the whims of demons, a medieval world that science has tried to banish. As scientists, what are we to make of this picture? I do not know. I would only like to present the evidence for the statement that the Universe, and man himself, originated in a moment when time began."
2. Furthermore, the effect never is quantitatively greater than, or qualitatively superior to, the cause. For instance, the river did not turn muddy because the frog jumped in; the book did not fall from the table because the fly landed on it; these are not adequate causes. For whatever effects we observe, we must postulate adequate causes.
3. No matter what theory of origins one ascribes to, you need something transcendent that is beyond that domain in order to explain how the entire domain came into being.

D. Scientists and philosophers alike admit that there is no natural cause sufficient to explain the origin of matter, and thus the Universe.
   1. Some years ago, scientists from Great Britain studied the orderly patterns of concentric rocks and holes at Stonehenge. As studies progressed, it became apparent that these patterns had been designed specifically to allow certain astronomical predictions. Many questions surrounding Stonehenge remain unsolved. But one thing is clear: the cause of Stonehenge was intelligent design.
   2. The Stonehenge situation parallels the origin of life. We study life, observe its various functions, contemplate its complexity (which admittedly defies duplication even by intelligent men with the most advanced methodology and technology) -- and what is our conclusion? Theoretically, Stonehenge might have been produced by the erosion of a mountain, or by catastrophic natural forces. But what person with any common sense would ever seriously entertain such a ridiculous idea? And who would believe such a suggestion?
   3. The Universe appears to have been fine-tuned for the existence of intelligent life with a complexity and precision that literally defies human comprehension.

E. Try as they might, skeptics are unable to circumvent this basic law of science. The Universe is here. Life in our magnificent Universe is here. Intelligence is here. Morality is here. What is their ultimate cause? Since the effect never is prior, or superior, to the cause, it stands to reason that the Cause of life must be both antecedent to, and more powerful than, the Universe -- a living Intelligence that is It-

self of a moral nature. While the evolutionist is forced to concede that the Universe is an effect without a known cause, the creationist postulates an adequate Cause -- a transcendent Creator -- that is in keeping with the known facts and the implications accompanying those facts.

F. The simple fact is, to quote R.C. Sproul, "Every effect must have a cause. That is true by definition.... It is impossible for something to create itself. The concept of self-creation is a contradiction in terms, a nonsense statement.... Self-creation is irrational."

Conclusion. The fool has said in his heart there is no God (Psalm 14:1). The creation model not only is plausible, but also is the only one that postulates an adequate cause for the Universe and life in that Universe. The evolution model cannot, and does not. The evidence speaks clearly of the existence of an eternal, self-existent Mind that created this Universe and everything within it. The scientific evidence has accumulated to the extent that atheists are finding it difficult to deny that the Universe had a supernatural beginning. Perhaps there has never been a time in modern history when the hard evidence of science was more confirmatory of belief in God than today. By faith, the Christian knows that the worlds were framed by the word of God (Hebrews 11:3). The beauty of the night skies are important pointers to the origins and the ultimate fulfillment of our heart's deepest desires.

I am heavily indebted to Bert Thompson and Lee Stroebel for this material.