

Creationism does not meet the requirements of a scientific theory

Aug 2000

This is Essay2a in a series of debate topics between CSFNM and NMSR.

Arguing against the resolution, on behalf of CSFNM: Roger X. Lenard, Board Member

It's generally accepted that despite its legally protected status, evolution is not really a scientific paradigm in the technical sense, but a naturalistic philosophy that unsuccessfully attempts to explain the existence of order, complexity, information and life. It's a belief system inasmuch as creation scientists have a belief system; they are fundamentally different. Ultimately, both employ science to provide a framework explaining the physical world. To provide a basis for comparison, it's necessary to establish some terms.

There exist three forms of truth: revealed (1), self-evident (2), and deterministic (3). Creation scientists employ all three; naturalistic philosophy denies revealed truth from an omniscient, omnipotent Creator. Post-modernism rejects existence of self-evident truth. Thus, naturalistic progenitors play with a deck containing a third the cards; small wonder they get the wrong answers. Further by promulgating a single approach, they a priori systematically deny research into alternatives – naturalism is an article of faith. Creation scientists hold revealed Truth as supreme, other forms are subordinate; the naturalist only has determinism, based on experimentation and observation of the here-and-now.

“The present is the key to the past”, but only in a quasi-static, reversible system. However, the known cosmos is highly catastrophic; naturalism cannot accurately ascertain the historic nature of the cosmos by rejecting revelation; it's hubris in the extreme. True science is that which creates a model based on observations, experiments and available data. It employs a model that is falsifiable and predictive. It holds to a model that doesn't change on a transitory basis. Below is one fine example of excellent Creation Science.

First, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth ... the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters(4)". The model suggests the universe, rather than a singularity below the Plank size and time, had substance, extent and definition. Based on total mass considerations it would be a sphere of water ~ 2 light years in diameter with aligned nuclear spins to create a specific magnetic field (5). Through a series of oscillatory collapses where the water generates a black/white hole singularity, a concentric series of spheres of various elements are generated. What does this model predict? First, it predicts that water will be ubiquitous throughout the universe (it is). Second, there will be a quantization of red-shifting and polarization rotation (there is) (6) because the oscillatory compression/rarefaction waves sent matter out in concentric spheres, where stars and galaxies then formed. Third, it predicts Earth should be near the center of this phenomenon because the Earth was pre-existent, this is true because quantization of red-shift is not observable if located far from the center. Fourth, it predicts there should be an orientation to the cosmos, this is observed (7). Fifth, it predicts planetary magnetic

fields and their rate of decay far more accurately than Big Bang science. Sixth, it predicts an inflationary phase during formation of the universe. Seventh, it requires a period of rapid heating and cosmological adiabatic cooling.

This is a consequence of a rapid increase in the rate of radioactive decay due (our model suggests) to a directed modification in the strong force constant. The heating resulted in a great tectonic breakup (predicted by Baumgardner model), followed by rapid cooling. The seas heated by decay dramatically increased the atmospheric water vapor content, resulting in a global cooling phenomenon followed by a substantive ice age. Eighth, the model predicts the formation of the great geological features such as the Grand Canyon and the Columbia Gorge as a result of tectonic action and drainage of residual inland seas post- Deluge. Creation science not only develops these models, they are scientifically accurate and mathematically sound. Not only that, they work!

In contrast, the Big Bang model cannot explain the ubiquity of water as a consequence of post Bang nucleosynthesis. Atomic formation beyond helium prior to stellar formation is exceptionally difficult and atoms beyond Beryllium would be exceedingly rare due to exceedingly small lifetimes in nucleosynthesis (8).

The Big Bang model cannot satisfactorily explain the presence or magnitude of planetary magnetic fields; of course it must be tweaked mercilessly in order to form stars and galaxies. The Big Bang theory requires a full stage of stellar evolution to generate the heavy elements beyond iron observed in our solar system. The ersatz, but presently accepted naturalistic theory is that Earth captured the majority of the heavy elements in our solar system. There is no explanation for this distinction. If this model is correct, there should be measurable quantities of heavy elements distributed throughout our near solar neighborhood. We predict this trans-ferrous distribution won't be found, if at all, in sufficient quantities to form the core of the Earth.

Creation science, and now increasingly, secular science is discovering the distinction between inanimate matter and information. Creation scientists acknowledge that information preceded all else (9), that this information was definitive, purposeful and perfect; that it created order, complexity and life out of chaos. There is no known naturalistic law that accounts for the formation of order, information and complexity through undirected, random processes. Our model predicts that life, once formed is quite stable (10) . We observe this constancy in the fossil record - there is no verified evidence of meliorism or transitional forms. Niles Eldredge explains: "No wonder paleontologists have shied away from evolution for so long. It never seems to happen" (11). The great argument between the saltationists and uniformitarianists is whether the extant evidence doesn't point to what creation scientists would predict – essential information is lost and order decreases in species over time - that is what is observed. Michael Behe notes that "There are no detailed Darwinian accounts for the evolution of any fundamental biochemical or cellular system" (12). Honest intellectuals, some formerly atheists, acknowledge the importance of revealed truth.

Creation scientists can explain the existence of consciousness and reason. There is no explanation for this in the naturalistic materialist model (13). Creation science, is more complete, more commensurate with available data, and has a revealed model of the Truth ante facto - it is better science than naturalistic materialism.

Endnotes

1. John 17:17b, John 1, 1-14
2. Romans 1:19-20
3. Proverbs 25:2
4. Genesis 1:1
5. Humphreys, R. Starlight and Time
6. Physical Review Letters -- July 6, 1998 -- Volume 81, Issue 1, pp. 26-29
7. Science Article
8. Barrow, J., and Tipler. The Anthropic Cosmological Principle, Oxford University Press, 1986.
9. John 1:1
10. Genesis 1:24-25
11. Johnson, P.E. Defeating Darwinism by Opening Minds, InterVarsity Press, 1997.
12. Behe, M. National Review
13. Op. cit.