

Scientific Creationism



Henry M. Morris

Twenty-fourth printing: July 2006

Copyright ©1974, 1985 by Master Books. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations in articles and reviews. For information write: Master Books, Inc., P.O. Box 726, Green Forest, AR 72638.

ISBN-13: 978-0-89051-003-2

ISBN-10: 0-89051-003-2

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 74-14160

Cataloging in Publication Data

Institute for Creation Research

Prepared by the technical staff and consultants of the Institute for Creation Research; edited by Henry M. Morris.

1. Creation. 2. Bible and evolution

I. Morris, Henry Madison, 1918-2006 II. Title

213 74-14160

Printed in the United States of America.

Please visit our website for other great titles:
www.masterbooks.net

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| <i>Foreword</i> | iii |
| <i>Chapter I. Evolution or Creation?</i> | |
| The Importance of Origins | 1 |
| Impossibility of Scientific Proof of Origins | 4 |
| The Two Scientific Models of Origins | 8 |
| Pedagogical Advantages of the Creation Model | 13 |
| <i>Chapter II. Chaos or Cosmos?</i> | |
| Origin of Matter, Energy, and Natural Law | 17 |
| The Beginning of the Universe | 24 |
| Origin of the Solar System | 29 |
| Purpose in Creation | 32 |
| <i>Chapter III. Uphill or Downhill?</i> | |
| The Laws of Thermodynamics | 37 |
| The Origin of Life | 46 |
| Variation and Selection | 51 |
| Genetic Mutations | 54 |
| <i>Chapter IV. Accident or Plan?</i> | |
| The Complexity of Living Systems | 59 |
| Similarities and Differences | 69 |
| Vestiges and Recapitulations | 75 |
| Systematic Gaps in the Fossil Record | 78 |
| <i>Chapter V. Uniformitarianism or Catastrophism?</i> | |
| The Testimony of the Fossils | 91 |
| Rapid Formation of Geologic Deposits | 101 |
| Contemporaneity of the Fossil World | 111 |
| Residual Catastrophism | 123 |
| <i>Chapter VI. Old or Young?</i> | |
| How to Date a Rock | 131 |
| Radiometric Dating | 137 |
| Evidence for a Young Earth | 149 |
| The Antiquity of Man | 160 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Chapter VII. Apes or Men?</i> | |
| The Origin of Man | 171 |
| Languages and Races | 178 |
| Ancient Civilizations | 185 |
| The Origin of Religion | 196 |
| <i>Chapter VIII. Creation According to Scripture</i> | |
| Historicity of the Genesis Record | 203 |
| Divisions of Genesis | 204 |
| Fall, Curse and Laws of Thermodynamics | 211 |
| Overflowed with Water | 213 |
| Summary of the Biblical Model | 214 |
| Theistic Evolution | 215 |
| Progressive Creation | 220 |
| Day-Age Theory | 221 |
| The Gap Theory | 231 |
| The Framework Hypothesis | 243 |
| Gaps in Human Chronology | 247 |
| Local Flood Theory | 250 |
| Tranquil Flood Theory | 254 |
| Summary and Conclusion | 255 |
| <i>Appendix. Bibliography on Creationism</i> | 257 |
| <i>Index of Subjects</i> | 265 |
| <i>Index of Names</i> | 275 |
| <i>Index of Scriptures</i> | 279 |

CHAPTER I

EVOLUTION OR CREATION?

The Importance of Origins

Both parents and teachers know that children are curious creatures. That is, they are insatiably curious about the why's and whences of things. This inborn intellectual alertness, if encouraged and cultivated, leads in adult life to a mature scientific attitude toward the world and the ability to think creatively in solving technological, sociological and personal problems.

Regardless of the subject matter of a particular course of study, it is vital that the student be made aware of origins. If he studies chemistry, he should have an interest in the origin of the elements and the laws that govern chemical reactions. The study of English should give him a sense of the origin of his own language and even of language itself. Biology, of course, should discuss the origin of life and of the various kinds of organisms. A course in government should include discussion of the origin of his own nation and its legal structure, as well as of the origin of nations and laws in general. And so on.

A course of study which does *not* do this may avoid a measure of controversy, but only at the cost of stifling curiosity and inventiveness. Description and techniques are vital in any good course, certainly, but these will only produce skills, not real understanding. This type of instruction, valuable though it is for the immediate goal of making a living, is barren in achieving the broader goal of real *meaning* in living. It is like a bridge without abutments, spanning from nowhere to nowhere, without roots in the past or hope in the future.

The following is a summary of cogent reasons why the study of origins is important in any course:

A. *Scientific Reasons*

1. Science (i.e., "knowledge") must seek to answer the question "Whence?" as well as "What?"

2. Science is based on cause-and-effect reasoning. Inevitably, therefore, as one assimilates effects to their immediate causes and those causes to *their* causes, one eventually confronts the question of a First Cause.
 3. A knowledge of natural laws and processes, without an appreciation of at least the problems associated with their origin, is stultifying to the discovery and comprehension of new scientific principles.
- B. *Sociological Reasons*
1. Science has innumerable social implications and applications. Solutions to social problems require a real understanding of the origin of the physical processes which affect them (e.g., nuclear energy, fossil fuels, ecology, genetic engineering, hallucinogenic drugs, etc.).
 2. The so-called social sciences themselves require an understanding of the origin of the sociological entities with which they deal (e.g., races, cultures, crime, war, etc.).
 3. The milieu of political thought is constantly changing in emphasis. Sociological instruction which emphasizes only the current fad in political activism or social theory, with no foundation in history, will be useless to the student when a new emphasis appears.
- C. *Personal Reasons*
1. Each person needs, more than anything, a sense of his own identity and personal goals, and this is impossible without some sense of his origin. What a person comes to believe about his origin will inevitably condition what he believes about his destiny.
 2. Lack of a sound scientific understanding of origins and meanings among modern young people has impelled them to seek help in such anti-scientific solutions as "mind-expanding" drugs, witchcraft, astrology, and the like.
 3. True mental health, such as teachers desire for their pupils, requires a solid and satisfying philosophy of life, and this certainly demands a mentally-satisfying concept of their personal origin and future.

However, if teachers are to teach creation as a scientifically sound alternative to evolution, they must have available resource information on how to do so. Unfortunately, prac-

tically every textbook now available is biased in favor of evolution. A large percentage of teachers, as well as the scientific public, have themselves also been indoctrinated with the evolutionary point of view in their studies in college.

Furthermore, most creationist books treat the subject of origins from the Biblical point of view, as well as the scientific, and, therefore, are not appropriate for instructional purposes in the public schools. There are indeed a number of creationist books which are strictly scientific in their content, but most of these deal with only a few of the relevant topics.

The purpose of *Scientific Creationism* is, first, to treat all of the more pertinent aspects of the subject of origins and to do this solely on a scientific basis, with no references to the Bible or to religious doctrine. The treatment is positive, rather than negative, showing that the creation model of origins and history may be used to correlate the facts of science at least as effectively as the evolution model. Although the book necessarily deals with scientific data, it is written for the non-specialist, and we believe it can be adequately understood and used by most intelligent laymen. It is necessary to use scientific concepts and terminology, but they are all explained as needed, so that the reader should, with at least a little effort on his part, have no great difficulty understanding and using them.

It is our suggestion that every teacher be provided with a copy of *Scientific Creationism* for personal study, and asked to read it in its entirety. If feasible, workshops should be set up by individual school districts to equip their teachers for its use.

Whatever the course being taught, and regardless of the grade level, the teacher will find that the assigned textbook and prescribed supplementary reading are premised on evolution and affected by it in various ways. Whenever a particular subject is encountered which involves origins (e.g., the origin of the solar system, the beginning of the "cave-men," etc.) or the pre-history of the earth and its inhabitants (e.g., the meaning of the dinosaurs, the formation of coal beds, the discovery of the first metals, etc.), the teacher should present the creationist interpretation (as well as the textbook evolutionary interpretation) and, in so far as practicable for the age level involved, the evidence favoring *both* models. The book is conveniently organized and well-

indexed to facilitate such use.

Experience has indicated that this approach is more exciting, both to students and teachers, than the one-sided indoctrination in evolutionism which is common today. Teachers and school administrators are urged to give it a fair trial.

This book itself is intended to serve primarily as a source for background information needed by the teacher, rather than as an actual textbook to be used in elementary or secondary school classes. It can thus be adapted as needed, in accordance with the teacher's own preferences, to whatever subject or grade level may be involved. It can also be used, of course, as an actual textbook in formal courses on origins, in either high school or college.

In general, whether as a textbook or as a book for personal study and reference, it is believed that this book will fill the need for a scholarly, yet simple, presentation of all the major evidence and arguments for special creation, as well as the related evidence for a young earth and worldwide flood.

Impossibility of Scientific Proof of Origins

The preceding section has stressed the vital importance of studying the subject of origins. At the same time, it must also be emphasized that it is impossible to *prove* scientifically any particular concept of origins to be true. This is obvious from the fact that the essence of the scientific method is experimental observation and repeatability. A scientific investigator, be he ever so resourceful and brilliant, can neither observe nor repeat *origins*!

This means that, though it is important to have a philosophy of origins, it can only be achieved by faith, not by sight. That is no argument against it, however. Every step we take in life is a step of faith. Even the pragmatist who insists he will only believe what he can see, *believes* that his pragmatism is the best philosophy, though he can't prove it! He also believes in invisible atoms and in such abstractions as the future.

As a matter of observation, belief in something is necessary for true mental health. A philosophy of life is a philosophy, not a scientific experiment. A life based on the whim of

the moment, with no rationale, is "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Thus, one must *believe*, at least with respect to ultimate origins. However, for optimally beneficial application of that belief, his faith should be a reasoned faith, not a credulous faith or a prescribed faith.

To illustrate more exactly what we mean when we say origins cannot be proved, a brief discussion is given below on each of the two basic concepts of origins, creation and evolution:

A. *Creation cannot be proved*

1. Creation is not taking place now, so far as can be observed. Therefore, it was accomplished sometime in the past, if at all, and thus is inaccessible to the scientific method.
2. It is impossible to devise a scientific experiment to describe the creation process, or even to ascertain whether such a process *can* take place. The Creator does not create at the whim of a scientist.

B. *Evolution cannot be proved*

1. If evolution is taking place today, it operates too slowly to be measurable, and, therefore, is outside the realm of empirical science. To transmute one kind of organism into a higher kind of organism would presumably take millions of years, and no team of scientific observers is available to make measurements on any such experiment.
2. The small variations in organisms which are observed to take place today (see pp. 51-58) are irrelevant to this question, since there is no way to prove that these changes within present kinds eventually change the kinds into different, higher kinds. Since small variations (including mutations) are as much to be expected in the creation model as in the evolution model, they are of no value in discriminating between the two models.
3. Even if modern scientists should ever actually achieve the artificial creation of life from non-life, or of higher kinds from lower kinds, in the laboratory, this would not *prove* in any way that such changes did, or even

could, take place in the past by random natural processes.

Since it is often maintained by evolutionists that evolution is scientific, whereas creationism is religious, it will be well at this point to cite several leading evolutionists who have recognized that evolution also is incapable of being proved.¹

Evolution operates too slowly for scientific observation

One of the nation's leading evolutionists, Theodosius Dobzhansky, has admitted:

"The applicability of the experimental method to the study of such unique historical processes is severely restricted before all else by the time intervals involved, which far exceed the lifetime of any human experimenter. And yet, it is just such impossibility that is demanded by anti-evolutionists when they ask for 'proofs' of evolution which they would magnanimously accept as satisfactory."²

Note the tacit admission that "the experimental method" is an "impossibility" when applied to evolution.

Evolution is a dogma incapable of refutation

Two leading modern biologists have pointed out the fact that, since evolution cannot in any conceivable way be disproved, therefore, neither can it be proved.

"Our theory of evolution has become . . . one which cannot be refuted by any possible observations. It is thus 'outside of empirical science,' but not necessarily false.

¹ It is interesting and encouraging to note that, in the Foreword to the most recent edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, a leading British evolutionary biologist, Professor L. Harrison Matthews, F.R.S., recognizes that "Belief in evolution is thus exactly parallel to belief in special creation — both are concepts which believers know to be true but neither, up to the present, has been capable of proof." (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1971), p. x.

² Theodosius Dobzhansky, "On Methods of Evolutionary Biology and Anthropology," *American Scientist*, Vol. 45 (December, 1957), p. 388.

No one can think of ways in which to test it. . . . (Evolutionary ideas) have become part of an evolutionary dogma accepted by most of us as part of our training."¹

Similarly, Peter Medawar recognized the problem entailed by the fact that no way exists by which to test evolution.

"There are philosophical or methodological objections to evolutionary theory. . . . It is too difficult to imagine or envisage an evolutionary episode which could not be explained by the formulae of neo-Darwinism."²

In other words, both the long neck of the giraffe and the short neck of the hippopotamus can presumably be explained by natural selection. A theory which incorporates everything really *explains* nothing! It is tautologous. Those who survive in the struggle for existence are the fittest because the fittest are the ones who survive.

Evolution is an authoritarian system to be believed

"It seems at times as if many of our modern writers on evolution have had their views by some sort of revelation and they base their opinions on the evolution of life, from the simplest form to the complex, entirely on the nature of specific and intra-specific evolution. . . . It is premature, not to say arrogant, on our part if we make any dogmatic assertion as to the mode of evolution of the major branches of the animal kingdom."³

"But the facts of paleontology conform equally well with other interpretations. . . . e.g., divine creation, etc., and paleontology by itself can neither prove nor refute such ideas."⁴

Thomas Huxley, probably more responsible than any other one man for the acceptance of Darwinian philosophy, nevertheless recognized that:

¹Paul Ehrlich and L.C. Birch, "Evolutionary History and Population Biology," *Nature*, Vol. 214 (1967), p. 352.

²Peter Medawar, *Mathematical Challenges to the Neo-Darwinism Interpretation of Evolution*, (Philadelphia: Wistar Institute Press, 1967), p. xi.

³G. A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution*, (London: Pergamon, 1965), p. 155.

⁴D. Dwight Davis, "Comparative Anatomy and the Evolution of Vertebrates," in *Genetics, Paleontology and Evolution*, (ed. by Jepsen, Mayr and Simpson, Princeton University Press, 1949), p. 74.

“. . . 'creation' in the ordinary sense of the word, is perfectly conceivable. I find no difficulty in conceiving that, at some former period, this universe was not in existence; and that it made its appearance in six days . . . in consequence of the volition of some pre-existing Being."¹

The reason for favoring evolution is not because of the scientific evidence

An outstanding British biologist of a number of years ago made the following remarkable observation:

"If so, it will present a parallel to the theory of evolution itself, a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible."²

The only reason for saying that special creation is incredible would be if one had certain knowledge that there was no God. Obviously, if no Creator exists, then special creation is incredible. But since a universal negative can only be proved if one has universal knowledge, such a statement requires omniscience. Thus, by denying God, Dr. Watson is claiming the attributes of God himself.

There are some scientists, at least, who find it easier to believe in the deity of an omnipotent Creator than in the deity of Professor Watson.

The Two Models of Origins

It is, as shown in the previous section, impossible to demonstrate scientifically which of the two concepts of origins is really true. Although many people teach evolution as though it were a proven fact of science, it is obvious that this is false teaching. There are literally thousands of scientists³ and other educated intellectuals today who reject evolution, and this would certainly not be the case if evolution were as obvious as many scientists say it is.

¹Leonard Huxley, *Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley*, (London: Macmillan, Vol II, 1903), p. 429.

²D.M.S. Watson, "Adaptation," *Nature*, Vol. 123 (1929), p. 233.

³The Creation Research Society, for example, numbers over 700 M.S. and Ph.D. scientists on its rolls.

The same is true of creation, of course. Although many believe special creation to be an absolute fact of history, they must believe this for theological, rather than scientific reasons. Neither evolution nor creation can be either confirmed or falsified scientifically.¹

Furthermore, it is clear that neither evolution nor creation is, in the proper sense, either a scientific theory or a scientific hypothesis. Though people might speak of the "theory of evolution" or of the "theory of creation," such terminology is imprecise. This is because neither can be *tested*. A valid scientific hypothesis must be capable of being formulated experimentally, such that the experimental results either confirm or reject its validity.

As noted in the statement by Ehrlich and Birch cited previously, however, there is no conceivable way to do this. Ideally, we might like to set up an experiment, the results of which would demonstrate either evolution or creation to have been true. But there is no one test, nor any series of tests, which can do this scientifically.

All of these strictures do not mean, however, that we cannot discuss this question scientifically and objectively. Indeed, it is extremely important that we do so, if we are really to understand this vital question of origins and to arrive at a satisfactory basis for the faith we must ultimately exercise in one or the other.

A more proper approach is to think in terms of two scientific models, the *evolution model* and the *creation model*. A "model" is a conceptual framework, an orderly system of thought, within which one tries to correlate observable data, and even to predict data. When alternative models exist, they can be compared as to their respective capacities for correlating such data. When, as in this case, neither can be proved, the decision between the two cannot be solely objective. Normally, in such a case, the model which correlates the greater number of data, with the smallest number of unresolved contradictory data, would be accepted as the more probably correct model.

¹Dr. N. Heribert-Nilsson, Director of the Botanical Institute at Lund University, Sweden, said "My attempt to demonstrate evolution by an experiment carried on for more than 40 years has completely failed. . . . The idea of an evolution rests on pure belief." (*Synthetische Artbildung*, 1953).

When particular facts do show up which seem to contradict the predictions of the model, it may still be possible to assimilate the data by a slight modification of the original model. As a matter of fact, in the case of the evolution model, as Ehrlich and Birch said: "Every conceivable observation can be fitted into it."

The same generalization, of course, is true of the creation model. There is no observational fact imaginable which cannot, one way or another, be made to fit the creation model. The only way to decide objectively between them, therefore, is to note which model fits the facts and predictions with the smallest number of these secondary assumptions.

Creationists are convinced that, when this procedure is carefully followed, the creation model will always fit the facts as well as or better than will the evolution model. Evolutionists may, of course, believe otherwise. In either case, it is important that everyone have the facts at hand with which to consider *both* models, rather than one only. The latter is brainwashing, not brain-using!

Since the rest of this book is devoted primarily to a comparison of these two models, it is important that everyone using it, both teachers and students, clearly understand the formulation of the two models and their implications.

A. *The Evolution Model*

The evolutionary system attempts to explain the origin, development, and meaning of all things in terms of natural laws and processes which operate today as they have in the past. No extraneous processes, requiring the special activity of an external agent, or Creator, are permitted. The universe, in all its aspects, evolves itself into higher levels of order (particles to people) by means of its innate properties.

To confirm that this is the essential nature of the evolution model, several recognized authorities are cited below, giving their own concepts of evolution.

"Most enlightened persons now accept as a fact that everything in the cosmos—from heavenly bodies to human beings—has developed and continues to develop through evolutionary processes."¹

¹Rene Dubos, "Humanistic Biology," *American Scientist*, Vol. 53 (March 1965), p. 6.

"Evolution comprises all the stages of the development of the universe: the cosmic, biological, and human or cultural developments. . . . Life is a product of the evolution of inorganic nature, and man is a product of the evolution of life."¹

"Evolution in the extended sense can be defined as a directional and essentially irreversible process occurring in time, which in its course gives rise to an increase of variety and an increasingly high level of organization in its products. Our present knowledge indeed forces us to the view that the whole of reality is evolution — a single process of self-transformation."²

"Biological evolution can, however, be explained without recourse to a Creator or a planning agent external to the organisms themselves. There is no evidence, either, of any vital force or immanent energy directing the evolutionary process toward the production of specified kinds of organisms."³

Thus evolution entails a self-contained universe, in which its innate laws develop everything into higher levels of organization. Particles evolve into elements, elements into complex chemicals, complex chemicals into simple living systems, simple life forms into complex life, complex animal life into man.

Summarizing, evolution is: (1) naturalistic; (2) self-contained; (3) non-purposeive; (4) directional; (5) irreversible; (6) universal; and, (7) continuing.

B. *The Creation Model*

Diametrically opposed to the evolution model, the creation model involves a process of special creation which is: (1) supernaturalistic; (2) externally directed; (3) purposive, and (4) completed. Like evolution, the creation model also applies universally. It also is irreversibly directional, but its

¹Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Changing Man," *Science*, Vol. 155 (January 27, 1967), p. 409.

²Julian Huxley, "Evolution and Genetics," Chap. 8 in *What Is Science?* Ed. J. R. Newman, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1955), p. 272.

³Francisco J. Ayala, "Biology as an Autonomous Science," *American Scientist*, Vol. 56 (Autumn 1968), p. 213.