



In criminal trials, corroborating evidence helps confirm the testimony of a plaintiff or a defendant. It is used to verify the story of a witness or a legal team. In his book, *The Case for Christ*, Lee Strobel, a former court reporter for the Chicago Tribune, writes about this kind of evidence. He says,

Harry Aleman turned and stabbed his finger at me. “You,” he sputtered, spitting out the word with disgust. “Why do you keep writing those things about me?” Then he spun around and disappeared down a black stairwell to escape the reporters who were pursuing him through the courthouse.

Actually, it was hard to be a crime reporter in Chicago during the 1970s and *not* write about Harry Aleman. He was, after all, the quintessential crime syndicate hitman. And Chicagoans, in a perverse way, love to read about the mob.

Prosecutors desperately wanted to put Aleman in prison for one of the cold-blooded executions they suspected he had committed on behalf of his syndicate bosses. The problem, of course, was the difficulty of finding anyone willing to testify against a mobster of Aleman’s frightening reputation.

Then came their big break. One of Aleman’s former cronies, Louis Almeida, was arrested on his way to murder a labor official in Pennsylvania. Convicted of weapons charges and sentenced to a decade in prison, Almeida agreed to testify against Aleman in the unsolved slaying of a Teamsters Union shop steward in Chicago – if prosecutors agreed to show leniency toward Almeida.

This meant that Almeida had a motive to cooperate, which would undoubtedly tarnish his credibility to some degree. Prosecutors realized they would need to bolster his testimony to ensure a conviction, so they went searching for someone to corroborate Almeida’s account.

Webster’s dictionary defines *corroborate* this way: “To make more certain; confirm: He corroborated my account of the accident.”

Corroborative evidence supports other testimony; it affirms or backs up the essential elements of an eyewitness account. It can be a public record, a photograph, or additional testimony from a second or third person . . . In effect, corroborative evidence acts like the support wires that keep a tall antenna straight and unwavering. The more corroborative evidence, the stronger and more secure the case.<sup>1</sup>

Corroborating evidence is essential to verify the truth of a case. Without it, you only have the word of one man. Or you only have information from one source. But with corroborating evidence, you have testimony from several men and several different sources. And, if they are all saying the same thing, you have a strong argument for your case. The prosecution against Harry Aleman had to get some corroborating evidence to show that Louis Almeida was telling the truth about Aleman's part in a murder. With statements from a number of different sources, Almeida's testimony could be confirmed and Aleman could be locked up behind bars.

In this issue of [www.justthesimpletruth.com](http://www.justthesimpletruth.com), we are looking at the subject of creation. We are studying how God created the earth in six literal 24 hour days. The Bible says that the Lord made everything in less than a week. He formed everything out of nothing and He took very little time to do it.<sup>2</sup> But is there any corroborating evidence to back this up? Is there any proof outside of the Bible to confirm this tremendous claim? With all of the statements from secular (and Christian!) scientists promoting evolution and ridiculing creation,<sup>3</sup> it

is worth asking the question: What does the evidence say?

## I. THE EVIDENCE FOR CREATION

To look at the evidences of creation, it would be helpful to place them into two categories. The first category concerns those things that would have been impossible if a miraculous creation did not occur.

### 1. It would have been Impossible for Nothing to Create Something.

There is a Latin law of science that goes back for centuries that goes like this: *ex nihilo nihil fit*. It means "out of nothing, nothing comes."<sup>4</sup> It means that if you do not have something to start with, you did not end up with something. Organic and inorganic matter does not just pop up out of nowhere in nature. Flowers do not bloom unless there are other flowers producing seeds nearby. Animals are not born if they do not have an animal father and an animal mother. Parasites do not show up if they have nothing to live off of.

In other words, if you start with zero, you get zero. If you begin with nothing, you end up with nothing. Everything must come from something else. Every organism depends on other organisms

for survival. As C. S. Lewis put it, "It is a law of the natural universe that no being can exist on its own resources. Everyone, everything, is hopelessly indebted to everyone and everything else."<sup>5</sup> Or as John Ankerberg and John Weldon added, "Apart from theism, there could only be nothing, which is why the question is so profound for materialists."<sup>6</sup> Or, to add one more quotation to the mix, as G. K. Chesterton commented, "No one has ever observed new matter emerge out of nothing."<sup>7</sup>

Yet, some evolutionists are claiming that the opposite has happened when it comes to the origin of the earth. Nothing has created something! Nothing has created everything that exists! Physicist Arno Penzias, the Nobel Prize winner for discovering the background radiation that was supposedly found in the Big Bang, said in an interview "The universe was created out of nothing, in an instant, and continues to expand."<sup>8</sup> Victor J. Stenger, Professor of Physics and Astronomy at the University of Hawaii wrote, "The universe exploded out of nothingness."<sup>9</sup>

In other words, one of the most fundamental laws of nature has to

be broken in order to have a creation without a Creator. To take God out of the beginning, you must first break a law that has stood since the beginning of time. *Ex nihilo nihil fit* must be removed and replaced with "out of nothing, something comes." You start with zero and you get everything. But that is very poor science. No one has observed something coming from nothing and to start your theory with that is to start from a faulty premise. Therefore, this is one evidence of creation. Nothing cannot create something. Something must have been around in the beginning in order for something to be around in the end.

### 2. It would have been Impossible for Chaos to Create Order.

Not only would it have been impossible for nothing to create something, it would have been impossible for chaos to create order. It would have been impossible for something confusing or unruly to make something that is intricately detailed. Fire does not build things. Mad men do not write books on logic. Monkeys do not write Shakespeare.

And there is nothing more orderly than the earth that we live in. It has more detail than any book on logic

or any of the works of Shakespeare. The Institute for Creation Research describes the orderliness of the earth this way:

The earth is immense in size, about 8,000 miles in diameter, with a mass calculated at roughly  $6.6 \times 1,021$  tons. The earth is on average 93 million miles from the sun. If the earth traveled much faster in its 584-million-mile-long journey around the sun, its orbit would become larger and it would move farther away from the sun. If it moved too far from the narrow habitable zone, all life would cease to exist on earth. If it traveled slightly slower in its orbit, the earth would move closer to the sun, and if it moved too close, all life would likewise perish. The earth's 365-days, 6-hours, 49-minutes and 9.54-seconds trip around the sun (the sidereal year) is consistent to over a thousandth of a second!

If the yearly average temperature on earth's surface changed by only a few degrees or so, much of the life on it would eventually roast or freeze. This change would upset the water-to-ice ratio and other critical balances, with disastrous results. If the earth rotated slower on its axis, all life would die in time, either by freezing at night because of lack of heat from the sun or by burning during the day from too much heat.

Our "normal" earth processes are assuredly unique among our solar system and, according to what we *know*, in the entire universe.<sup>10</sup>

Yet evolutionists claim that this orderliness of the earth: its size, speed, distance from the sun, consistency, ability to sustain life all just "happened" by chance. In an infinite amount of time with an infinite amount of chances or possibly an infinite amount of universes, something chaotic created something orderly. A random collection of energy created our planet.<sup>11</sup> As Philip Johnson writes,

This principle starts with the existence of observers – ourselves and works backwards. If the circumstances required for life to evolve had not existed we would not be here to comment upon the matter. Those circumstances may seem very unlikely given our limited knowledge, but we have no way of knowing how many universes there are, or may have been. In an infinity of time and space even the most unlikely event must happen at least once, and we necessarily exist in the corner of reality where the particular set of coincidences necessary for our existence happened to occur.<sup>12</sup>

Our world just happened to be in the right place at the right time. With an unlimited amount of time and space, nature found a way and out of the chaotic blackness of space, this world appeared.

Not only does this idea contradict the Second Law of Thermodynamics,

which says that "ordered energy inevitably collapses into disorder or maximum 'entropy'" (energy that has some control to it never stays that way forever),<sup>13</sup> it also contradicts what has been observed in nature. No one has ever observed something chaotic producing something orderly. No one has ever seen fire build things. As one scientist put it, the chances of this happening are the same as the chances that "a tornado would sweep through a junkyard and assemble a Boeing 747."<sup>14</sup>

Albert Einstein himself said that "The most incomprehensible thing about the universe is how comprehensible it is."<sup>15</sup> Without God in the equation, it is impossible to explain how orderly and logical the universe is because, without God in the equation, there is no reason for the earth to be orderly and logical. And, therefore, this is a second evidence for creation. A logical and orderly Creator created a logical and orderly world.

### 3. It would have been Impossible for Simplicity to Create Complexity.

Not only would it have been impossible for nothing to create something and for chaos to create order, it would have been impossible for something simple to create something complex.

It would have been impossible for something small to morph or change into something large on its own without any outside interference.

It has never been seen in nature that things just improve on their own. Ants make anthills but they do not make mountains. Birds make nests but they do not make skyscrapers. While human beings have invented some amazing things, they have never changed one species into another species or observed that happen in the natural world. To take this one step further, it has never been observed that nature is working towards improving itself.

Yet the theory of evolution teaches just the opposite. Evolutionists are highly optimistic about the direction of untouched nature and they show it in their theory of natural selection. Michael Behe writes the following about natural selection:

Like many great ideas, Darwin's is elegantly simple. He observed that there is variation in all species: some members are bigger, some smaller, some faster, some lighter in color, and so forth. He reasoned that since limited food supplies could not support all organisms that are born, the ones whose chance variation gave them an advantage in the struggle for life would tend to survive and reproduce,

outcompeting the less favored ones. If the variation were inherited, then the characteristics of the species would change over time; over great periods, great chances might occur.<sup>16</sup>

Nature just improves by itself and the fittest animals survive and the weakest animals die. That is the theory of natural selection (and the survival of the fittest): nature selects which animals will live and which ones will die. God has nothing to do with the process.

The problem with this theory is that it does not account for the enormous complexity we see in the world around us and it breaks down at the most fundamental level. For example, the individual parts of a cell cannot operate by themselves. A mitochondrion cannot do its task unless it has some cytoplasm. A lysosome cannot function without a cell membrane.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, on the smallest level of life (a cell), natural selection is impossible. Everything could not have started with an individual cell because the parts of a cell cannot work independently of each other. “Nature” did not select one mitochondria over another mitochondria because there is no such thing as a mitochondria that exists all by itself. A Creator must have put all

the parts of a cell together at the exact same time.

In his book, *Darwin Retried*, Norman MacBeth constructs an imaginary conversation between theologian William Paley and Charles Darwin that echoes this idea. Here is a snippet from the conversation.

*Darwin:* I will be quite candid since there is no longer any danger of being burnt as a heretic. It is my scientific opinion that man is the result of a purposeless and materialistic process that did not have him in mind. He was not planned.

*Paley:* Do I understand you correctly, sir? You assert that to make a perfect and beautiful machine, it is not requisite to know how to make it?

*Darwin:* Quite so.

*Paley:* Sir, I confess that this is most astonishing. May I ask if you do not find your answer rather improbable?

*Darwin:* It is surely improbable that a perfect and beautiful machine could be made without foreknowledge of what was wanted; but only improbable, not impossible. It does not matter that it is *highly* improbable, for my system of natural selection is equal to the task. As R. A. Fisher has pointed out, it has a mechanism for generating improbabilities.

*Paley:* But Mr. Darwin, how can a blind and automatic sifting process like selection, operating on a blind

and undirected process like mutation, produce organs like the eye or the brain, with their almost incredible complexity and delicacy of adjustment? How can chance produce elaborate design? Are you not asking me to believe too much?<sup>18</sup>

In this make believe conversation, Darwin echoes what I mentioned earlier about an infinite amount of time creating an orderly and complex universe. For natural selection “has a mechanism for generating improbabilities.” But that is not scientific. Theories are not built on improbabilities, they are built on facts. And the facts break down with the question: “How can chance produce elaborate design?” The parts of an eye or a brain cannot function apart from each other any more than the parts of a cell can. It is impossible for simplicity to create complexity. Therefore, a Creator must have been involved. He must have put all the pieces together at the same time.

The first category of evidences for creation concerns those things that would not have been possible without a miraculous creation. This second category concerns what could only be explained if a miraculous creation did occur. And this second category involves mankind. Human beings are

the most unique creatures on the planet. There is nothing on this earth quite like us and our uniqueness points to a miraculous creation.

#### 4. Creation is the Only Explanation for Man's Ability to Reason.

Man is the only creature on the planet with the ability to reason. He is the only creature with the ability to formulate abstract, rational thought. Reason is defined as “the mental powers concerned with forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences.”<sup>19</sup> Only man makes judgments based on inferences. Only man has self-awareness and the ability to think about himself and his environment in a logical manner.

And just think about what his ability enables man to do. He can write books and read them. He can pass laws and educates his young in schools. He can build weapons and air-conditioned homes and ships and airplanes. He uses currency as recompense for employment. He eats in restaurants and wears clothes. And all of this is completely unique to mankind. No other creature on the planet does any of these things. As one scholar put it, “Men look on the starry heavens with reverence; monkeys do not.”<sup>20</sup> And all of this comes from man's ability

to reason. Which leads us to ask the question, where did this ability come from?

To be consistent, evolutionists must teach that man's reason must come from the same process that brought about all of man's abilities: natural selection. Since man does not have sharp claws or fangs or fur or tough skin or the ability to run or hide from predators, it is assumed that man developed his ability to reason in order to survive. Nature selected him to be the only creature on the planet with this particular skill.

But that is kind of like saying that natural selection is right because natural selection says it is right. Nature selects whoever it wants to and, because man is different, nature must have selected him to be different. Natural selection is not proven by this statement, it is only assumed. The assumption that man has the ability to reason because he does not have sharp claws is only an assumption and it is an assumption with no proof behind it.

Why didn't nature select man to have some skill other than reason? Why didn't nature select man to keep certain features *and* the ability to reason? It

would seem that, in order to survive best, sharp teeth *and* a sharp mind would be useful. Claws and fangs and fur and the ability to formulate abstract thought would come in handy. Why were some of those things left behind? Survival would be most optimal if we were able to run and hide. That would be the best recipe for a continued existence. Why was that passed by and the ability to reason kept? Evolutionists have no idea because the theory of natural selection is only a theory. It is an assumption that has yet to be proven.

The better explanation for man's uniqueness would be creation. Man was made in the image of God and that makes him stand apart from everything else in the universe.<sup>21</sup> Not only that, but if there was no reason behind the creation of the universe, how could there be any reason now? As Cornelius Van Til put it, "How could logic ever be said to have any bearing upon reality in a universe of Chance?"<sup>22</sup> If the beginning does not make sense, neither does the middle or the end. If there was no reason to start things, there would be none to finish it. And consequently, creation is the only explanation for man's ability to reason.

#### 5. Creation is the Only Explanation for Man's Ability to Make Moral Choices.

With man's ability to reason comes his ability to make moral choices. Morality can be defined as "conformity to the rules of right conduct."<sup>23</sup> When we make moral choices, we are conforming to some standard of right and wrong. If reason is the ability to think abstractly, then morality is the ability to think ethically. And, again, man is the only creature on the planet with this ability.

C. S. Lewis says that this is the Law of Nature or the law that every man possesses by nature. All of us have some form of right and wrong built within us. To quote from the late Cambridge professor,

I know that some people say the idea of a Law of Nature or decent behavior known to all men is unsound, because different civilizations and different ages have had quite different moralities.

But that is not true. There have been differences between their moralities, but these have never amounted to anything like a total difference. If anyone will take the trouble to compare the moral teaching of, say, the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Hindus, Chinese, Greeks and Romans, what will really strike him will be how very like they are to each other and to our own . . . Think of a country where people were admired for running away in battle, or where a man felt proud

of double-crossing all the people who had been kindest to him. You might as well try to imagine a country where two and two made five.

Men have differed as regards what people you ought to be unselfish to – whether it was only your own family, or your fellow countrymen, or every one. But they have always agreed that you ought not to put yourself first. Selfishness has never been admired. Men have differed as to whether you should have one wife or four. But they have always agreed that you must not simply have any woman you liked.<sup>24</sup>

Every man has some ethical standard that he adheres to and, while that standard is not always the same as the standard that other men have, it is very similar and every man has one. Where did it come from? And why do we have all have one? In the theory of evolution, there is no answer to this question. In fact, if natural selection is true, then there should be no Law of Nature (as C. S. Lewis defines it). If we are all fighting for survival, then there should be no social restrictions that keep us from stealing, raping, and killing. In fact, they would get in the way.

The Nazis understood this in World War II. They saw themselves as the super-race and, in order to enhance the process of natural selection, they

tried to exterminate what they believe to be the lesser race: the Jews. Adolf Eichmann, a leading executioner for the Nazi party defended his atrocities during World War II in the following way:

Both the churches in Germany, the Catholic and Protestant, believe in Theistic Evolution. Both of them believe that God's method of creation was to wipe out the handicapped and to wipe out the less fitted. And as the Jews are less fitted than our people, I have only helped God in his methods. I have only catalyzed God's way of working. And when I meet God I shall tell him so.<sup>25</sup>

Morality has no place in evolution. In fact, it flatly contradicts it. There is no reason to treat people decently when they are competing against you for survival.

But men do have a sense of morality built within them and creation has an explanation for it. The only good, loving, and righteous God created all that exists. And His law demands that we be good, loving, and righteous towards one another and He has imparted something of that standard in our conscience.<sup>26</sup> Creation is the only explanation for man's ability to make moral choices.

## II. THE "EVIDENCE" AGAINST CREATION

Even with all of this evidence, there are still a lot of objections that have been raised against creation. Here are some of the most common ones.<sup>27</sup>

### 1. The Fossil Record.

Every so often, newspapers and magazines publish an account of a skeleton that has been found that shows the intermediary link between man and primates. And, when this happens, the question is often asked, "If God created the world in six literal days and He created man on the sixth day, then how do you explain this fossil?" "How can you still believe that God created man from nothing, when skeletons are being found that show that man was creating from lower life forms?"

One example of such a skeleton is known as Java Man. In 1891, a Dutch scientist found some bones (a skullcap and a thigh bone) that had what was supposed to be shared features between apes and humans. By many in the scientific community and the media, the bones were promoted as the "missing link" between men and their monkey-like ancestors. The finder of the bones, Eugene Dubois, did much

to enhance the hype. But what was not originally told to the public (but told much later) was that the bones were found 50 feet apart and there was no geological or map work done at their initial discovery. Many scientists, evolutionist and creationist alike, have since claimed that the findings do not belong to the same creature and should be discarded.<sup>28</sup>

Java Man actually belongs to a series of 280 fossil finds that evolutionists have termed *Homo erectus*. These finds are considered to be the transitional evidence that proves the theory of macroevolution.<sup>29</sup> But, as time has gone on, there has been no uniform dating for these findings and there has been no uniform explanation as to why some of the younger fossils are less developed than the supposed older ones.<sup>30</sup> Not only that, but of the 83 sites where *Homo erectus* fossils have been found, at least 40 of them contain the remnants of stone tools. Some of those sites contain evidence that the *Homo erectus* creatures controlled fire.<sup>31</sup>

There has never been a species other than the *Homo sapien* which has used stone tools and had the capability of controlling fire. To speculate that a new species evolved and learned how

to do both of these things is far-fetched to say the least. To teach it as a proven fact is even more far-fetched but that is what is happening with many of the "findings" from the Fossil Records. Scientific "proof" is often nothing more than a hunch and it leads one to agree with David Davidheiser that "The non-scientific public has great faith in what a paleontologist can do with a single bone."<sup>32</sup>

The Fossil Record does not prove that evolution occurred; in fact it proves just the opposite. There should be millions of skeletons of primates transitioning into human beings. There should be an innumerable amount of fossils that show that man has evolved but there is not. There are only 280 fossil finds to date and those are not trustworthy.

### 2. Carbon Dating.

Carbon Dating is another issue that comes up in regards to creation. Carbon Dating refers to the extraction of carbon from fossils to determine their age. It is not used in inorganic matter such as rocks or trees but it is often employed in fossilized animals or plants and the numbers it comes up with are often rather large. In fact, it "is claimed to be a reliable dating method for determining the age of fossils up to

50,000 to 60,000 years.<sup>33</sup> Because of its rapid rate of decay, carbon cannot be used to date substances that are millions of years old. It can only be used for material that is no older than 50,000 to 60,000 years.

But how reliable is Carbon Dating? And does it shed some suspicion on the creation account? If the earth is relatively young,<sup>34</sup> then how are we to account for the large numbers found in this method of dating fossils?

Mike Riddle describes how the Carbon Dating process works and this sheds some light on how reliable it is.

Once a living thing dies, the dating process begins. As long as an organism is alive it will continue to take in C(14); however when it dies, it will stop. Since C(14) is radioactive, the amount of C(14) in a dead organism gets less and less over time. Therefore, part of the dating process involves measuring the amount of C(14) that remains after some has been lost (decayed) . . .

Since no one was there to measure the amount of C(14) when a creature died, scientists need to find a method to determine how much C(14) has decayed. To do this, scientists use the main isotope of carbon, called C(12). Because C(12) is a stable isotope of carbon, it will remain constant; however, the amount of C(14) will decrease after a creature dies. All

living things take in carbon (C(14) and C(12)) from eating and breathing. Therefore, the ratio of C(14) to C(12) in living creatures will be the same as in the atmosphere . . . Scientists can use this ratio to help determine the starting amount of C(14).<sup>35</sup>

Scientists compare the amount of C(14) in a fossil to the amount of C(12) in the atmosphere and determine the age of the creature. The C(12) helps figure out how much carbon the animal started out with and the C(14) helps figure out how much carbon the animal ended up with.

While that sounds simple enough, there are some serious flaws with the method of Carbon Dating. For one, no one knows how much C(12) was in the atmosphere 5,000 years ago or 10,000 years ago or 50,000 years ago. Scientists were not around to record that information for us. So the amount of carbon in the atmosphere when the animal originally died is unknown and there is nothing to compare its rate of decay to.

Not only that but the ozone layer around the earth is weakening,<sup>36</sup> meaning that there is more radiation coming into the earth today than there was yesterday. In other words,

organisms today are taking in more C(12) than they did thousands of years ago and they are ending up with more C(14) in their bodies after they die. Since scientists do not know how much C(12) was in the atmosphere in the past, they have no objective standard when employing the Carbon Dating method. They assume that the same amount of carbon has always been in the atmosphere and, based on that assumption, employ Carbon Dating but that assumption flies in the face of what we know to be true. As Riddle puts it,

All radiometric [carbon] dating methods are based on assumptions of events that happened in the past [that no one was around to see]. If the assumptions are accepted as true (as is typically done in the evolutionary dating processes), results can be biased towards a desired age.<sup>37</sup>

Science should not confuse a truth with an assumption but that is exactly what it does with the method of Carbon Dating and, therefore, the conclusions of this method should be rejected.

### 3. The Big Bang.

According to the *World Book Encyclopedia*, the Big Bang teaches that

The universe began as the result of an explosion – called the big bang – 10 billion to 20 billion years ago. Immediately after the explosion, the universe consisted chiefly of strong radiation. This radiation formed a rapidly expanding region called the *primordial fireball*. After a few hundred years, the main part of the fireball was matter, chiefly hydrogen . . . Like the radiation, the matter continued to decrease in density after the explosion. In time, the matter broke apart in huge clumps. The clumps became galaxies. Smaller clumps within the galaxies formed stars. Part of at least one clump became a group of planets – the solar system.<sup>38</sup>

While it is not possible to critique the Big Bang in detail, a few things can be mentioned here. One is that the proof for the Big Bang is inconclusive. In the early 1900's, astronomers observed that light from stars in distant galaxies was shifting away from the light from stars in other distant galaxies (this was called the red shift). Based on that observation, those scientists concluded that the universe is growing bigger. And, by studying the speed of the galaxies' motion, these same scientists determined that the universe began moving away from itself around 10 to 20 billion years ago when an explosion pushed them all apart.<sup>39</sup>

The problem with this theory is that

it must mean that bigger galaxies are always older galaxies. The older the galaxy, the bigger it is because age has given it the opportunity to spread out. But that goes against the findings of science. For years, evolutionary astrophysicists have noticed that many “young” galaxies are much, much larger than “old” galaxies.<sup>40</sup> How could this be if the universe is growing apart from itself? How could the younger galaxies be bigger than the older ones?

In 1965, astronomers detected faint radio waves coming from every direction in space. They noticed that, wherever they turned their satellites, they picked up radio waves. Radio waves are formed by heat and, since they came from parts of space where there were no stars, the scientists postulated that all of the objects in space must be moving apart from each other (hence the heat). The waves proved that the galaxy was expanding.<sup>41</sup>

The problem with this theory is that the Big Bang is not the only explanation for the existence of radio waves in space. Another explanation could be that the objects in space are spinning. Every object in a galaxy is under the gravitational pull of some other object

in the galaxy and, therefore, they spin and that motion makes them hot. This would fit what we know from our observations. The earth spins. Venus spins. Mars spins. Jupiter spins. Why wouldn't the other objects in space spin and create radio waves?

But not only is the proof for the Big Bang inconclusive, the idea itself is inadequate to explain the beginning of the universe. The Big Bang tells us what happened after energy appeared. It does not tell us where the energy came from. And, according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics, “ordered energy inevitable collapses into disorder.”<sup>42</sup> Energy that has some control to it always moves towards disorder. Given enough time, controlled energy will become chaotic. It will not keep producing something as intricately arranged as the universe we see today. As Profess James Trefil wrote,

There shouldn't be galaxies out there at all, and even if there are galaxies, they shouldn't be grouped together the way they are . . . The problem of explaining the existence of galaxies has proved to be one of the thorniest in cosmology. By all rights, they just shouldn't be there, yet there they sit. It's hard to convey the depth of the frustration that this simple fact induces among scientists.<sup>43</sup>

### III. THE INTERPRETATION OF THE EVIDENCE

The Big Bang and other evolutionary theories are not scientific. “Science covers the broad field of knowledge that deals with observed facts and the relationships among those facts.”<sup>44</sup> Science deals with what can be seen or observed. Science deals with empirical evidence. The Big Bang does not fall into that category. It cannot be seen or observed. It occurred long before scientists were around to record the facts about it.

In fact, a lot of the assumptions found in the Fossil Records or Carbon Dating face the same dilemma. They are not observable. They are not based on fact. They are based on assumptions. And with all of the evolutionary hype surrounding these fields of research, it leads one to ask the question, “Why are scientists so convinced of evolution?” “Why are the media and college professors and famous scholars dogmatic about these methods that are so subjective?”

Consider the following statements by some leading proponents of evolution. H. G. Wells wrote that “no rational mind can question the invincible

nature of the evolutionary cause.”<sup>45</sup> Theodosius Dobzhansky echoed that “the proofs of evolution are now a matter of evolutionary biology . . . In Lamark's and Darwin's times evolution was a hypothesis; in our day it is proven.”<sup>46</sup> The American Geological Institute proudly asserted:

Scientific evidence indicates beyond any doubt that life has existed on Earth for billions of years. This life has evolved through time producing vast numbers of species of plants and animals.<sup>47</sup>

The Society for Amateur Scientists also concluded, “That life has adapted and changed through time is as well established as the fact that the earth goes around the sun.”<sup>48</sup> Michael Ruse wrote that, “Evolution is a fact, fact, FACT!”<sup>49</sup>

Why do men say such things? No rational mind can question evolution? The adaptation of life is as proven as the fact that the earth moves around the sun? Evolution is a fact, fact, FACT? One reason scholars are saying this is because they are, unfortunately, misunderstanding the role of science. It is the function of science to observe and record evidence, not to interpret it. In the words of the famous medical doctor



turned preacher, Martyn Lloyd-Jones,

The true realm of science is that of phenomena which can be seen and touched, felt and handled; and the moment the scientist moves out of the realm of the tangible, he becomes a philosopher with no more authority than any other thinker.<sup>50</sup>

As has been shown with the Fossil Records and Carbon Dating, there are numerous unobserved assumptions that are made in evolutionary science. And, because of this, evolution as a theory or a system is not science. It is philosophy. It is an interpretation of data. It is not the data itself.

Interestingly, creationists and scientists look at the same data (facts) when they study the earth. They observe the same rocks, the same fossils, the same amounts of carbon, the same movements of galaxies. They just interpret those observations in a different way and come to different conclusions. Does this mean that the search for the origins of the earth is hopelessly subjective? No! The question is not, is it okay to interpret the data? The question is, do our interpretations of the data square with the facts of science?

Those who hold to a miraculous creation of the earth can say “Yes.” Creationists interpret the evidence to mean that God created the earth and that interpretation squares with the facts. Something (God) created everything. An orderly Being (God) created an orderly universe. A Person with immense complexity (God) formed an immensely complex world. And He made man as a reasonable, moral creature.

That interpretation squares with the facts. And, therefore, a Christian can be consistent as a scientist and as a philosopher. He can be consistent with what he sees and with how he explains what he sees. The evolutionist, unfortunately, cannot be. In the words of Harry Rimmer,

I fail to see how the natural man can scoff at the faith of a Christian who believes in one miracle of creation, when the unbeliever accepts multiplied millions of miracles to justify his violation of every known law of biology and every evidence of paleontology, and to cling to the exploded myth of evolution.<sup>51</sup>

Evolution is much more miraculous than creation (if by “miraculous” we mean rejecting or contradicting empirical facts). There is no objective

evidence that human beings have descended from lower life forms. And there is no evidence that everything started with a Big Bang. The Big Bang is only an interpretation of the evidence. And it is an interpretation that does not square with the facts.

But why are evolutionists so quick and so sure of their interpretations? Why is it so important to them? That answer belongs to the next section.

#### IV. THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE EVIDENCE

There is another reason that men interpret the facts to exclude God. And that is that, if there is a God, certain conclusions are unavoidable. And those conclusions are very uncomfortable for those who do not know Him.

##### 1. There is a Creator.

Man is not alone in the universe. He is not the only creature able to think rational and moral thoughts. If we are to follow the evidence wherever it leads us, we must conclude that there is a Creator. As John MacArthur writes,

To put it simply, evolution was invented to eliminate the God of Genesis and thereby to oust the Lawgiver and obliterate the inviolability of His law . . . By embracing

evolution, modern society aims to do away with morality, responsibility, and guilt. Society has embraced evolution with such enthusiasm because people imagine that it eliminates the Judge and leaves them free to do whatever they want without guilt and without consequences.<sup>52</sup>

With all of the passion that scientists use in their propagation for evolution and with all of their disregard for the distinction between observation and interpretation, it leads one to think that they must have an ulterior motive behind their research. It seems that there must be something driving their efforts. And that something is a denial of their Creator. That something is a quest to prove that God is not there. But, try as they might, “The heavens are telling of the glory of God; and their expanse is declaring the work of His hands.”<sup>53</sup> God has made Himself known and He cannot be silenced. We are not alone. We did not evolve. We were created, which leads us to the second conclusion.

##### 2. Man is a Created Being.

If there is a Creator and there is no conclusive evidence that macroevolution occurred,<sup>54</sup> then man must have been created. He must have been formed

by a hand bigger than his own, which is exactly what the Bible says. Genesis 1:26-27 says,

Then God said, "Let us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and over the cattle and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth."

Man has been created in the image of God and has been given rulership over everything in creation. The reason you do not see horses riding on the backs of men is because men have been given authority over horses. The reason you do not see dogs having people for pets is because men have been given authority over dogs. God gave man a special place in creation. One commentator describes it this way,

And yet man was to be more than simply a very complex and highly organized animal. There was to be something in man which was not only quantitatively greater, but qualitatively distinctive, something not possessed in any degree by the animals.

Man was to be in the image and likeness of God Himself! Therefore, he was also "created" in God's image. He was both made and created in the image of God.<sup>55</sup>

Man was made to bear the image of God to creation. As God rules over

man, man is to rule over the plants and animals of the earth. Which is very significant because it leads us to our third conclusion.

### 3. Man is Responsible to His Creator.

With great privilege comes great responsibility. Since God gave man His own image and gave him charge of creation, God expects man to act accordingly. Man does not have the right to do whatever he wants to whenever he wants to do it. He is not a completely free being. He is not autonomous. He is under orders. He must behave himself in a way that is pleasing to his Maker or he will suffer the consequences.

Romans 2:5 says that those men who refuse to live in a God-honoring way are storing up wrath against themselves for the day of God's wrath. Psalm 5:5 says that God hates all who do iniquity and Revelation 21:8 says that those who sin against God will burn forever in a lake that burns with fire and brimstone. We should all suffer in eternity for our rebellion against God's laws for we have all taken God's image and abused it horrendously.

But there is good news. God has not left us to die in our sins. The Son of God, Jesus Christ Himself, has come to

this earth to live a righteous life<sup>56</sup> and to die as a sin offering<sup>57</sup> and rise from the dead<sup>58</sup> for those who would believe in Him.<sup>59</sup> Just as we have tarnished the image of God, Jesus has kept it spotless and clean and earned an eternal reward that He now offers to us.

If you would just follow the evidence, you can know your Creator. If you would acknowledge that you were created in His image and that you have failed Him . . . If you would acknowledge that He has sent you a Savior Who has satisfied His law and suffered His wrath once-and-for-all . . . If you would acknowledge that He is your Lord and give your life over to Him . . . you can know the One Who made you. And you can have peace with God.

Follow the evidence and the evidence will lead you to Jesus Christ.

### End Notes

- 1 *The Case for Christ: A Journalist's Personal Investigation of the Evidence for Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1998) 74-75.
- 2 See Charlie Frederico's article "The Scriptures and Creation" and my article "Why is Creation So Important?"
- 3 W. R. Bird, *The Origin of Species Revisited*

(New York: Philosophical Library, 1991), 172-173. One example of such a statement is from Evolutionary Scientist, H. Newman: "There is no rival hypothesis (to evolution) except the outworn and completely refuted idea of special creation, now retained only by the ignorant, the dogmatic and the prejudiced."

- 4 [www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/ex+nihilo+nihil+fit](http://www.dictionary.reference.com/browse/ex+nihilo+nihil+fit) as of 5/10/11.
- 5 *God in the Dock: Essays on Theology and Ethics*, ed. By Walter Hooper (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970) 85.
- 6 *Darwin's Leap of Faith: Exposing the False Religion of Evolution* (Eugene, Ore.: Harvest House Publishers, 1988) 248.
- 7 Quoted in: John Warwick Montgomery, *Evidence for Faith: Deciding the God Question* (Dallas, Tex.: Probe Books, 1991), 344-345.
- 8 Quoted in Fred Hereen's *Show Me God: What the Message from Space is Telling Us About God* (Wheeling, Il.: Daystar Publications, 1997) 156.
- 9 Quoted in *Show Me God*, 118.
- 10 "The Earth Itself" from [www.icr.org](http://www.icr.org) as of 5/7/11.
- 11 See Section II, Point 3, "What about the Big Bang?"
- 12 *Darwin on Trial* (Downers Grove, Il.: InterVarsity Press, 1993) 106. Philip Johnson is not an evolutionist and he does not hold to this theory but he gives an excellent explanation of it and is therefore quoted here.
- 13 Ibid., 109.

- 14 Sir Fred Hoyle, quoted in *Darwin's Leap of Faith*, 332.
- 15 Quoted from "The Privileged Planet: The Search for Purpose in the Universe" video. Available at <http://www.theprivilegedplanet.com/> as of 5/10/11.
- 16 *Darwin's Black Box: The Biochemical Challenge to Evolution* (New York: Free Press, 2006 ed.) 3-4.
- 17 For more information about this, see Michael Behe's highly technical book, *Darwin's Black Box*.
- 18 *Darwin Retried* (Harvard and Boston, Mass.: The Harvard Common Press, 1971) 89.
- 19 <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reason> as of 5/10/11.
- 20 C. S. Lewis in *God in the Dock*, 41.
- 21 See Section III, Point 2, "Man is a Created Being."
- 22 *The Defense of the Faith* (Philipsburg, N. J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1967 ed.) 169.
- 23 <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/morality> as of 5/10/11. 24 Mere Christianity (New York: Harper Collins 2001 ed.) 5-6. 25 Quoted in Marvin L. Lubenow's *Bones of Contention: A Creationist Assessment of Human Fossils* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2004 ed.) 153. This quotation is by no means to imply that all evolutionists are racist or that they all share the Nazi's hatred for people of other races. It is simply to point out that morality has no place in evolution and that Adolf Eichmann was simply being consistent – albeit evil – in his thinking.
- 26 Rom 2:14-15.
- 27 Other questions that come up in regards to creation are "What about distant star light?" and "What about the dinosaurs?" and "Couldn't God have used evolution to help Him create the earth?" For answers to these questions, I recommend *The New Answers Book: 25 Top Questions on Creation/Evolution and the Bible*, ed. by Ken Ham (Green Forrest, Ariz.: Master Books, 2006).
- 28 Lubenow, 86-97.
- 29 Macroevolution is evolution on a large "macro" scale. It is the change from one species into another. This is opposed to microevolution or evolution on a small "micro" scale. Microevolution refers to a species changing but staying within the same species. To understand the difference between the two, macroevolution refers to apes evolving into men (one species changing into another). Microevolution refers to men getting physically taller or stronger (changing but staying within the same species). Microevolution has been observed in nature. Macroevolution has not. An interesting discussion of macroevolution can be found in Luther Sunderland's book, *Darwin's Enigma: Ebbing the Tide of Naturalism* (Green Forrest, Ariz.: Maser Books, 1998) 116-120.
- 30 Lubenow, 115-134.
- 31 Ibid., 130.
- 32 David Davidheiser quoted in: Bolton Davidheiser, *Evolution and the Christian Faith* (Nutley, N. J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1969), 326.
- 33 Mike Riddle in *The New Answers Book*, 78.
- 34 Many creationists, including myself, believe that the earth is young. While an exact number is unknown, the age of the earth is in the thousands, not the billions. There is not enough space here for an in-depth discussion of the reasons for this but an excellent book that discusses it is Don DeYoung's *Thousands . . . Not Billions: Challenging an Icon of Evolution, Questioning the Age of the Earth* (Green Forrest, Ariz.: Master Books, 2005).
- 35 *The New Answers Book*, 81-82.
- 36 For an explanation of this, see Joe Heimlich's article at [www.ohioline.osu.edu](http://www.ohioline.osu.edu) entitled "The Ozone Layer."
- 37 Ibid., 87.
- 38 *The World Book Encyclopedia*, Volume 4 (Chicago, Ill.: World Book, Inc., 1994) 1078.
- 39 *The New Answers Book*, 87.
- 40 "A Billion Problems with the Big Bang" from [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org) as of 5/9/11.
- 41 *The World Book Encyclopedia*, Volume 4, 1078.
- 42 See Footnote 15.
- 43 Quoted in "What about the Big Bang" from [www.answersingenesis.org](http://www.answersingenesis.org) as of 5/9/11.
- 44 *The World Book Encyclopedia*, Volume 17 (Chicago, Ill.: World Book, Inc., 1994) 191.
- 45 Quoted in: Robert T. Clark and James Bales, *Why Scientists Accept Evolution* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1976), 5.
- 46 Theodosius Dobzhansky, *Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species* (New York: Batnam, 1970), 5-6.
- 47 National Center for Science Education, 31.
- 48 Ibid., 74.
- 49 Quoted *The Origin of Species Revisited*, 128.
- 50 *Truth Unchanged, Unchanging* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1993 ed.) 111-112.
- 51 Harry Rimmer, *The Magnificence of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1943), 116.
- 52 *The Battle for the Beginning: Creation, Evolution, and the Bible* (Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2001) 25.
- 53 Ps 19:1.
- 54 See footnote 28.
- 55 Henry Morris, *The Genesis Record: A Scientific & Devotional Commentary on the Book of Beginnings* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1976) 73.
- 56 Matt 5:17-18; Heb 4:15-16.
- 57 Rom 3:25-26; 2 Cor 5:21.
- 58 Rom 4:25; 1 Cor 15:3-8.
- 59 Jn 3:26; Rom 10:9-10.