

THEY HAVE NO EXCUSE

This short summary was taken from the book:

What is Creation Science?

Revised and Expanded

By

Henry M. Morris and Gary E. Parker

El Cajon: Master Books, 1987

Romans 1: 16-25

¹⁶ ¶ For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. ¹⁷ For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. ¹⁸ **For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold (or suppress) the truth in unrighteousness;** ¹⁹ ¶ **Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.** ²⁰ **For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:** ²¹ Because that, when they knew God, they glorified *him* not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. ²² **Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,** ²³ And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. ²⁴ Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: ²⁵ Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.

INTRODUCTION

Ungodly and unrighteous men have suppressed the truth that was revealed to them from God since the beginning of creation. They have no excuse in denying Him, because the invisible things are clearly seen and understood from the things that are made; even his eternal power and Godhead. If someone tries to tell you that they can clearly see in nature and the universe that there is no God because all of this has come about by time and chance, they are clearly suppressing the truth in exchange for a life of unrighteousness.

In the discussion of the origins of life, there are only two separate and distinct arguments: Either we were created by an Omniscient (*knowing everything; having complete or infinite knowledge*), Omnipotent (*having all power*), and Omnipresent (*present everywhere at the same time*) God or we have come about only by time, chance and the inherent properties of matter and energy. These two arguments fall under two different scientific models or theories. Creationism and Evolutionism. There are no other options to define the origin of all living and nonliving matter and energy. It was either created or happened by accident.

The reason for approaching the origins of life through a scientific model is to show that Gods word is true and His eternal power and Godhead can be "...understood by the things that are made".

WHAT IS SCIENCE?

Science, which comes from the Latin word "scientia", meaning "knowledge", has become taboo when discussing theological subjects; however, this was not always the case. Many modern scientists today claim that theology or religion cannot hold up to science. They say that the two are like oil and water, they don't

mix. However, what we call science today was called natural philosophy in times past. If one studies the works of Isaac Newton, one finds ample evidence that this was the general approach to science in those days. As his writings reveal, Isaac Newton believed that he was thinking the Creator's thoughts after Him, as he searched after scientific knowledge. In fact, that was his purpose in studying science! Newton was not alone in holding this point of view. This was a common line of scientific thought in those days. In addition such men as Lister, Faraday, Mendel, Maxwell, Fleming, etc. are all well-known scientists who were pioneers in their various fields that were creationists.

Other famous scientists in times past that were dedicated to "thinking God's thoughts after Him."

Physics (Newton, Faraday, Maxwell, Kelvin)

Chemistry (Boyle, Dalton, Pascal, Ramsay)

Biology (Ray, Linnaeus, Mendel, Pasteur)

Geology (Steno, Woodward, Brewster, Agassiz)

Astronomy (Kepler, Galileo, Herschel, Maunder)

In the philosophy of such men as Bacon and Newton, science was not divorced from theology. Actually, the latter was often referred to as the *queen of the sciences*. Also some writers on the history of science, among them Whitehead and Oppenheimer have stated that the development of modern science would not have been possible without the climate of Christianity, with its concept of a God of order. They have pointed out that the world of the ancients, populated by the gods of mythology, was a world where the possibility of formulating natural laws would have been impossible. As long as man believed that supernatural beings, subject to the same passions that ruled human beings, governed the earth in a capricious and often vengeful manner, the organized study of natural phenomena with the inclusion of laws would have been impossible.

Depending on whom you ask you could get several different definitions of science, however, the most popular definition is; *knowledge based on observed facts and tested truths arranged in an orderly system*. The definition of science can also be understood by the scientific model, which consists of the following steps:

1. The recognition of some problem or phenomenon that needs explaining,
2. The gathering of all available information or data pertaining to the problem or phenomenon,
3. The development of a propositional hypothesis from such data to explain the problem,
4. And the planning and execution of a series of experiments to test the hypothesis

As stated before there are only two scientific models, evolution and creation, to explain the origins of everything, both living and non-living matter and energy. Both evolution and creation are properly called scientific models, since they can both be used to explain and predict scientific fact. Creation does the better job of the two.

In the evolution model, the entire universe is considered to have evolved by natural processes into its present state of high organization and complexity. Since natural laws and processes are believed to operate uniformly, such evolutionary developments are interpreted in an over-all context of uniformitarianism. The creation model, on the other hand, defines at least one period of direct creation in the beginning, during which the basic systems of nature were brought into existence in completed, functioning form right from the start. Since "natural" processes do not accomplish such things at present, these creative processes must have been processes requiring a Creator for their implementation.

If evolution is true then there must be some process working within the natural world, which develops structure out of randomness and higher organization from lower. If this is so it should be measurable and observable. If creation is true then there should be 1. A conservation of energy, matter, etc. and 2. A law of decay, or things running down and moving towards chaos. If this is so it should be measurable and observable.

The creation model operates under two universal natural laws (1) a law of conservation, tending to preserve the basic categories created in the beginning (laws of nature, matter, energy, basic types of organisms, etc.),

in order to enable them to accomplish that function for which they were created; (2) a law of decay, tending to reduce the useful matter, energy, types etc., as the original organization of the created cosmos runs down to chaos. As far as changes are concerned, one would expect from the creation model that there would be “horizontal” changes within limits (that is, energy conversions, variation within biologic types, etc.), and even “vertically-downward” changes in accordance with the law of decay (for example, mutations, wear, extinction, etc.), but never any net “vertically-upward” changes, as required by evolution. These of course are the first and second Laws of Thermodynamics 1. Law of conservation of mass/energy and 2. The Law of increasing entropy (or disorder). Entropy (from a Greek word meaning “inturning”) is a measure of the lost usefulness of the system.

Entropy measures:

Deterioration of Energy in a Working System

Degree of Disorder in a Structured System

Loss of information in a Programmed System

Entropy always tends to increase in any system.

WHY EVOLUTION?

The existence of the theory of evolution dates back to about the appearance of Darwin’s *Origin of Species* (1859). Yet evolutionism, or transformism, as it is also know, is a concept that seems to have made its first documented appearance in Greece about 600 BC. There it was first promulgated in its simplest form by Thales of Miletus (640-546 BC). He was followed by a number of later Greek philosophers who continued the development of the concept in more detail. Most prominent among these were Plato (427-347 BC) and Aristotle (384-322 BC). Some of the later Greek philosophers made slight contributions to the advancement of the concept of transformism, but essentially it came to a standstill with the decline of Greek civilization.

Charles Darwin’s book *Origin of Species* written in 1859 opened up atheism to the masses as a respectable form of thought. People were looking for a reason to deny a personal God (Jesus Christ). His theory on natural selection holds true for creationists; however, natural selection is not evolutionism. Natural selection deals with variation within a species; which does occur. Evolutionism; however, extrapolates natural selection into variation from one species to another; or molecules to men; which does not occur.

T.H. Huxley and Herber Spencer took up Darwin’s theory and made it into a new philosophy, a “religion without revelation,” as Julian Huxley later called it. The real significance of the Darwinian revolution was religious and philosophic, not scientific. Actually the theory of natural selection was introduced 24 years before Darwin by Edward Blyth who was a creationist.

Again, evolution is an extrapolation from natural selection. The idea is that since we see minor changes within a species (which is observable and testable) then those minor changes must add up to larger changes (which is not observable and testable); thus it’s an extrapolation without empirical data. At this point you’ve moved away from “science proper”.

Many of the world’s religions are based on evolution in one form or another:

Buddhism	New-Age Mysticism	Liberal Islam
Hinduism	Spiritism	Liberal Christianity
Confucianism	Occultism	Unitarianism
Taoism	Satanism	Religious Science
Shintoism	Theosophy	Unity
Sikism	Bahaim	Humanism
Jainism	Mysticism	
Animism	Liberal Judaism	

However, there are only three religions that believe in a creator of all things without evolution. They are Orthodox Judaism, Orthodox Islam, and Orthodox Christianity.

PROBLEMS IN THE FOSSIL RECORD

There are several areas that could be covered in the debate between creationism and evolutionism, however, rather than pouring over numerous facts and theories its best to hear what the experts in evolution have to say.

One area that has been touted as the infallible proof for evolution has been the fossil record. However, Darwin thought that the fossil evidence was “perhaps the most obvious and serious objection which could be urged against the theory [of evolution].” Darwin’s chapter on the fossil evidence was titled “On The Imperfection of the Geologic Record.” In that chapter he dealt with “the sudden appearance” of groups of fossils in the lowest known fossil-bearing strata. When it came to intermediate links (those types of fossils supposed to show how one type of life evolved into others), Darwin wrote the following:

... intermediate links? Geology assuredly does not reveal any such finely graduated organic change, and this is perhaps the most obvious and serious objection, which can be urged against the theory [of evolution].

Darwin had hoped that, as new fossil evidence was unearthed around the world, the “missing links” would be found to support his theory. A statement from David Raup, curator of the famous Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago, which houses 20% of all fossil species known, had this to say about the fossil record:

Well, we are now about 120 years after Darwin, and knowledge of the fossil record has been greatly expanded ... ironically, we have even fewer examples of evolutionary transition than we had in Darwin’s time. By this I mean that some of the classic cases of Darwinian change in the fossil record, such as the evolution of the horse in North America, have had to be discarded or modified as a result of more detailed information.

Other quotes from famous evolutionists state similar findings (*my comments in italics*)...

“The known fossil record fails to document a single example of phyletic evolution accomplishing a major morphologic transition...”(Steven M. Stanley, 1979) – *In other words, no fossil evidence has shown a creature in transition.*

“As is now well known, most fossil species appear instantaneously in the fossil record, persist for some millions of years virtually unchanged, only to disappear abruptly...” (Tom Kemp, 1985) – *The Noahdic flood comes to mind for their disappearance*

Gould and Eldredge say that most kinds of fossilized life forms appear in the fossil sequence abruptly and distinctly as discrete types, then show relatively minor variation in their type, and finally abruptly disappear.

“In any case, no real evolutionist...uses the fossil record as evidence in favor of the theory of evolution as opposed to special creation” (Mark Ridley, 1981)

Lewontin an evolutionist said, “... natural selection operates essentially to enable the organisms to maintain their state of adaptation rather than to improve it.”

After he bemoaned the repeated failures of evolution to come to grips with the fossil evidence, paleontologist Niles Eldredge laments that the only alternative is “Special Creation.”

“I regard the failure to find a clear ‘vector of progress’ in life’s history as the most puzzling fact of the fossil record... we have sought to impose a pattern that we hoped to find on a world that does not really display it” (Stephen J. Gould, 1984)

Fossils are formed by the rapid burial under a relatively heavy load of sediment. If they die out in the open, they will rot and be eroded away without a trace. The fossil record was formed very rapidly on a massive scale (i.e. worldwide flood). Also debris from vegetation mats doesn't become coal unless it is buried under a heavy load of sediment. A million fish can be killed in red tides in the Gulf of Mexico today, but they simply decay away and do not become fossils. The fossil record shows much the same type of species that exist today; however, they also show much larger scale. Dragon flies with a wing span of 27 inches, beavers 6 feet in length, and single celled fusulinids that are .5 inch in length. The need for intermediate links in the fossil record is to show proof for the mechanism that drives lower order to higher order. However, that mechanism has yet to be discovered.

PROBLEMS IN EVOLUTIONARY MECHANISMS

The mechanism for evolution has gone through a number of different theories such as the "use or disuse" theory (giraffe that gets a longer neck) to the mutation theory or Neo-Darwinism to punctationalism (a sudden evolutionary jump – i.e. Hopeful monster) to catastrophism (world wide or local catastrophies) to a number of other different theoretical mechanisms; not necessarily in that order.

On the discussion of Neo-Darwinism, in 1967 a prestigious group of internationally known biologists and mathematicians gathered at the Wistar Institute to consider Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinian Interpretation of Evolution. All present were evolutionists, and they agreed, as the preface clearly states, that no one would be questioning evolution itself. The only question was, could mutations serve as the basis-with natural selection-as a mechanism for evolutionary change? The answer of the mathematicians: **NO**; just plain **NO**. Emotions ran high. After a particularly telling paper by Marcel Shutzenberger of the University of Paris, the chairman of the gathering, C. H. Waddington, said, "Your argument is simply that life must have come about by special creation!" The stenographer records, "Schutzenberger: NO! Voices: NO!" Dr. Waddington later called himself a "post-neo-Darwinist" – someone who believes in evolution, but who also believes that mutation-selection cannot explain how evolution can occur. There are a few problems with mutation argument:

1. Mathematical challenges.
2. Upward or downward (mutations going in the wrong way)
3. Mutations point back to creation (They can only mutate from already existing genes, if they aren't there they cannot mutate)

In October of 1980, the world's leading evolutionists met in Chicago for a conference summarized popularly by Adler and Carey in *Newsweek* for Nov. 3, 1980, and professionally by Lewin in *Science* for Nov. 21, 1980. According to the professional summary:

The central question of the Chicago conference was whether the mechanisms underlying microevolution can be extrapolated to explain the phenomena of macroevolution.

That is, the processes of mutation, selection, and sexual recombination all produce variation within type (microevolution-or creationist adaptation), but can these processes be logically extended (extrapolated) to explain the presumed evolutionary change generally from simpler to more complex types (macroevolution)?

At the risk of doing violence to the positions of some of the people at the meeting, the answer can be given as a clear, NO.

The large majority of evolutionists at the Chicago conference agreed that the neo-Darwinian mechanism of mutation-selection could no longer be regarded as a scientifically tenable explanation for the origin and diversity of living things.

Also the famous Nobel Prize winner, Albert Szent-Gyorgyi, said that the origin of complex traits by random mutation has the probability of zero. Not a slim chance, or a billion to one chance, but NO chance. Never could one species mutate from a lower order to a higher order. And again by another evolutionist, "No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has gotten near it..." (Colin Patterson, 1982)

As mentioned above, some evolutionists have given way to punctationalism or the quantum leap from one species to another. An example that was given and was even published in a children's book is called the "Hopeful monster", which portrays a dinosaur laying an egg that turns out to be the first bird. The children's book called *The Wonderful Egg* (Ipcar, 1958) achieved specific recommendation from the prestigious American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) as well as from the American Council on Education and the Association for Childhood Education International.

With the desperate search for the mechanism that drives evolution we can confidently say; There are no genetic mechanisms yet known which are capable of generating any such vertical transmutations; all changes observed are either "horizontal" (recombination's, variations) or "downward" (harmful mutations, extinction's).

PROBLEMS IN GENETICS

Molecular biologist, Dr. Michael Denton refers to the chemical evolution scenario as "simply an affront to reason," an insult to the intelligence! Dr. Denton freely admits that many of the scientific views of the early creationists have been vindicated by modern discoveries in science. Dr. Denton realizes that the random combining of chemicals in their natural state could not give rise to a complex structure such as the DNA molecule.

Harvard's Stephen Gould believes our knowledge of genetics is now sufficient to completely reject the explanation of evolution as the slow, gradual selection of small mutational changes. He prefers to believe instead that evolution occurs in giant steps, radical restructuring of whole DNA sets producing what he himself calls "hopeful monsters." But he admits that no such hopeful monster has ever been observed. His new theory, then, is not any sort of logical inference from observations, but a fantastic faith in the future of a theory that the facts have failed.

Francis Crick (1981), who shared a Nobel prize for the discovery of DNA's structure, is now convinced that life could not and did not evolve on the earth. In a new book, he argues instead for "directed panspermia," his belief that life reached earth in a rocket fired by intelligent life on some other planet. Crick admits that his view only moves the creation/evolution question back to another time and place, but he argues that different conditions might give life a chance to evolve that did not have on earth.

PROBLEMS IN THE PHYSICAL UNIVERSE

Through the centuries, theories of the origins of the physical universe have been as numerous as the mechanisms that drive evolution. For a number of years dating back to ancient times, philosophers believed in the eternal universe, which had no beginning. However, this philosophy violates the second law of thermal dynamics (the law of entropy – or the law of disorder).

Most recently, in the 1950's to the 1960's, a theory developed by Thomas Gold, Herman Bondi, and Fred Hoyle called the Steady State Theory, claimed to have the answer. Steady State claimed that at points in space called "irtrons" hydrogen was coming into existence from nothing. However, due to the violation of the first law of thermodynamics (the law of conservation of matter and/or energy; matter is neither created nor destroyed in nature) it was doomed to failure.

Next to come along was the Big Bang Theory in the 70s to 80s, and the inflationary Big Bang in the 90s. However, Sir Herman Bondi, a noted British astronomer, in an article published in the British Science Journal *New Scientist*, August 21, p.611 (1980) admitted that all such theories of a big bang have been proven wrong by scientific facts.

As many astronomers, cosmologists, and evolutionists look for the mechanism to drive the origin of all life, a few admit to that which God has manifest in them. Famous evolutionary astronomer, Fred Hoyle (1981), made the news under the heading: "There must be a God." Hoyle and his colleague, Chandra Wickramasinghe, independently reached that conclusion after their mathematical analysis showed that believing life could result from time, chance, and properties of matter was like believing that "... a tornado sweeping through a junkyard might assemble a Boeing 747 from the materials therein." Both Hoyle and Wickramasinghe believe that life was deliberate.

Astronomers have calculated there are 10^{25} stars (that is ten million billion billion). Evolutionists claim that each one of those stars had come about by time and chance. The Word of God, however, indicates that He has named them all individually. (Psalm 147:4 He telleth the number of the stars; he calleth them all by *their* names. Isaiah 40:26; Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these *things*, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that *he is* strong in power; not one faileth.)

As stated earlier about the different theories on the origin of the universe we can see their violation against the first and second law of thermodynamics. Even though some will not admit to this blatant contradiction, they will at least present the question.

"How can the forces of biological development and the forces of physical degeneration be operating at cross purposes? It would take, of course, a far greater mind than mine even to attempt to penetrate this riddle. I can only pose the question..."(Sydney Harris, 1984) – speaking about evolution and entropy – [*Double minded man*]

To put it more simply, evolution, a theory, goes completely against a law of nature, entropy. If you remember from the four steps of the scientific model, the hypothesis is changed, not the evidence.

PROBLEMS IN KEEPING THE TRUTH

To overcome the mounting weight of evidence for a God created universe, supporters of Darwin and his theory, have in times past and recently decided to do more than just hold or suppress the truth, but rather to create a new truth. In 1912, speculation about man's ancestry shifted to Piltdown Man, dignified by the scientific name *Eoanthropus dawsoni*. However, the so-called connecting link between *Homo sapiens* and prehistoric man turned out to be a deliberate hoax. But it wasn't shown to be a hoax until the 1950's. For over 40 years, the subtle message of the textbooks was clear: you can believe in creation if you want to, but the facts are all on the side of evolution. The facts in this case turned out to be a bit of ape jaw bone and human skull stained to make them look older. Over 500 PHD theses were written on the Piltdown Man (from Piltdown England) and not one of them found it to be a hoax, nor were their degrees taken from them once it was declared a hoax. Other hoaxes that were presented at the famous Scopes trial in 1925 were Piltdown Man, Java Man, Peking man, and Nebraska Man. Nebraska Man was just a tooth that was then extrapolated into a skull then a skeleton, then skin and hair, then tools, then a family. It was eventually reclassified as an extinct pig. All of the others have either been proven false or recategorized.

JUST MORE PROBLEMS IN GENERAL WITH EVOLUTION

British physicist H. S. Lipson first expresses his interest in life's origin, and his feeling – quite apart from any preference for creation – thus:

In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to “bend” their observations to fit with it. To my mind, the theory (evolution) does not stand up at all.

Colin Patterson of the British Museum in an address to leading evolutionists he gave at the American Museum of Natural History: Patterson first lamented that his topic, creation and evolution, had been forced on him, and then he acknowledged that he has recently been entertaining non-evolutionary or even antievolutionary ideas. Why? Because, he said, after twenty years of research in evolution he asked himself to name just one thing about evolution he knew for sure – and he couldn't come up with anything. When he asked other leading evolutionists, the only thing anyone could come up with was that “convergence is everywhere.” Finally, Patterson said with dismay, he was forced to conclude that evolution is an “anti-theory” that generates “anti-knowledge” – a concept full of explanatory vocabulary that actually explains nothing and that even generates a false impression of what the facts are.

In his final chapter, as he reviews his reasons for calling his book “Evolution: A Theory in Crisis,” Denton (1985) makes the following strong, sometimes harsh, statements:

“We now know, as a result of discoveries made over the past thirty years, that not only is there a distinct break between the animate (living) and inanimate (non-living) worlds, but that it is one of the most dramatic in all nature, absolutely unbridged by any series of transitional forms (“missing links”), and like so many other major gaps of nature, the transitional forms are not only empirically absent but are also conceptually impossible”.

Similarly, the sorts of scenarios conjured up by evolutionary biologists to bridge the great divisions of nature, those strange realms of ‘pro-avis’ or the ‘proto-cell’ which are so utterly unrealistic to the skeptic, are often viewed by the believers (in evolution) as further powerful confirmatory evidence of the truth of the paradigm. Evolutionary thought today provides many other instances where the priority of the paradigm (i.e., the assumption that ‘evolution is fact’) takes precedence over common sense”

“For the skeptic or indeed to anyone prepared to step out of the circle of Darwinian belief, it is not hard to find inversions of common sense in modern evolutionary thought which are strikingly reminiscent of the mental gymnastics of the phlogiston chemists or the medieval astronomers”

...“In a very real sense, therefore, advocacy of the doctrine of continuity (e.g., evolutionism) has always necessitated a retreat from pure empiricism (i.e., logic and observation), and contrary to what is widely assumed by evolutionary biologists today, it has always been the anti-evolutionists (e.g., creationists), not the evolutionists, in the scientific community who have struck rigidly to the facts and adhered to a more strictly empirical approach... It was Darwin the evolutionist who was retreating from the facts.”

NO MORE EXCUSES

Since “...that which may be know of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them”, no one can give an excuse for not knowing His eternal power and Godhead. King David said it best in Psalms 139:4 :

I will praise thee; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well.

Not as eloquent as David, yet still true, in the Scientific American book "Evolution", Harvard evolutionist, Richard Lewontin, says that "... the marvelous fit of organisms to their environment ... was [and I say is] the chief evidence of a Supreme Designer." "... Organisms appear to have been carefully and artfully designed."