

# **Without Excuse**

by  
Lee Folkman

## Introduction

What do Robert Boyle, Johannes Kepler, Isaac Newton, Michael Faraday, and George Washington Carver all have in common? Not only were they outstanding scientists who made gigantic contributions to the study of the natural world, but each one of them believed in the biblical account of creation. Is that possible? Can one practice science and be... *a creationist*? Apparently, mainstream science doesn't think so. Richard Milner, the author of *The Encyclopedia of Evolution*, assures us that the creation model "cannot lead to fruitful inquiry. It is an answer that stops all further questions" (157-158). It's a good thing no one told the fruitful inquirers mentioned above! The well-known evolutionist Richard Dawkins states that if one doesn't believe in evolution, he or she "is ignorant, stupid or insane" (qtd. in Wiker). Yet, one is hard-pressed to find any scientific discoveries made by this "well-informed genius" which compare to the "ignorant, stupid, or insane" creationists mentioned above. Michael Ruse, another evolutionist, states that it's "simply ludicrous" to think that life didn't evolve from "inorganic materials" and creationism "is an American invention of the past century." Did Mr. Ruse forget that all but one of the scientists mentioned above lived well past a century ago? Clearly, one can see a dichotomy between what is perceived and what is true. Is it really true that "all theories, all hypotheses... must... bow" to evolution (qtd. in Gish, "Scientific Creationism")? Is "evolution... as well established a fact as gravitation" (Milner 457)? On the contrary, there is nothing "fact" about evolution. As a matter of fact, an unbiased look at the scientific evidence and the Bible itself shows that the biblical account of origins is a more valid and reasonable understanding of origins than a purely naturalistic model of origins.

The biblical account of origins is presented most fully in the first two chapters of the book of Genesis. Here it is recorded that God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh day. In the six days of creation, God made light, air, vegetation, birds, fish (including swimming mammals), land animals, and as his crowning act, the first human beings. Thus, the origin of the earth, its inhabitants, and the universe itself was a result of God's creative power. "By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth... For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast" (Ps. 33.6, 9).

The naturalistic model of origins, on the other hand, excludes God entirely. This model supposes that the origin of the universe and of life is the result of natural processes under the direction of natural laws (Gish, "Scientific Creationism"). Included in this model is the theory of evolution which states that every living thing on earth "descended from a single cell, or at most a very few different cells." Changes occurred to those cells through hundreds of millions of years of "unsupervised, impersonal, unpredictable, and natural process[es]" (Lynn). Such a theory leaves no room for a divine Creator.

Some evolutionists shy away from the question of the origin of the universe and of life, stating that their theory only deals with changes in species (Pigliucci). However, the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) boldly proclaims that "evolution is a major unifying concept in science," and willingly accepts what it perceives as evidence from astronomy and physics. Furthermore, the NSTA states that "astronomy... cannot be taught with integrity if evolution is not emphasized. " One only needs to open a biology textbook to discover that the origin of the universe and the origin of life are embraced by the evolutionary community (Starr 288-295). This must be so since the basis of the theory of evolution, that natural causes explain everything, must necessarily include a natural cause for the origin of anything, not just the origin

of species. For this reason, the author of this paper considers all theories of naturalistic origins as one general theory.

When held up to the modern definition of a scientific theory, neither the biblical account nor the naturalistic model of origins qualifies as a purely scientific theory. Both accounts are explanations of the unobservable past, and neither account can be entirely disproved by any amount of evidence (Gish, "Scientific Creationism"). However, this presents more of a problem for the naturalistic model of origins as this model is based entirely on human interpretation and speculation; whereas, the biblical account of origins is a written record of one who has witnessed the creation of the world through divine inspiration. Although neither account qualifies as a theory, both the biblical account and naturalistic model can be compared to what is observed in the natural world, and one can make a decision based upon the weight of evidence.

Since space does not permit a thorough investigation of all the evidence claimed to support the naturalistic model of origins, only the most fundamental aspects will be considered. Even so, this does not pose any sort of problem. If it can be shown that the universe or life could not have happened by chance, then any evidence which must first suppose that it did occur is merely wishful thinking.

### **The Origin of the Universe**

The first consideration will be the origin of the universe itself. The naturalistic model of origins states that around 12 to 15 billion years ago, all space and matter in the entire universe were compressed together at a single point for an instant (called time zero) then exploded. This explosion hurled matter and energy throughout the universe where the matter clumped together to form hydrogen and helium. During the next billion years these gases came together to create stars, and these stars formed heavier elements. The stars exploded, releasing their elements; these elements collected together to form new stars and create even heavier elements. Through this process, all the 92 elements found in nature were formed. About five billion years ago, the sun was formed, and about a half billion years after that, the earth formed (Starr 288).

From its very inception, the naturalistic model runs into a very big problem. What happened prior to that very first instant? Since the naturalistic model confines itself only to natural explanations, it must not violate natural laws. Yet, at its very beginning, this theory violates *the first law of thermodynamics*. This law states that energy or matter can neither be created nor destroyed; it can only be transformed from one state to another. If matter or energy cannot be created, then the most reasonable assumption must be that there was nothing to begin with. Therefore, the purely naturalistic explanation must revert to a miracle since no experiment has ever demonstrated that matter can be created from nothing. In order to accept the naturalistic model of origins, one must believe without a shred of evidence that all the natural laws were violated in the instant *before* that first instant.

Some propose that the Big Bang was caused by a quantum fluctuation (which still doesn't answer the question as to *what* fluctuated). This proposition, however, runs into an insurmountable problem. When particles are formed from energy, the *Baryon number* must be conserved, meaning that there is always an equal number of matter and anti-matter. For example, when an electron, having a negative charge, is produced, a positron is also produced. Measurements show that the universe has much more matter than anti-matter. Attempts have been made to come up with a model which allows the Baryon number to be violated, but there has not been any evidence supporting this violation of physics (Wanser 105-106).

The next problem to arise is clumping the particles together to form stars. According to the theory, these particles exploded in every direction, filling the universe. Hydrogen and helium, considered to be the first elements that formed, gathered together into clouds and collapsed to form stars. The problem is that no gas will collapse to form a star unless an outside force is exerted upon it. The models necessary for the collapse of the stars include the explosion of stars in order to create shockwaves which could force the gases to collapse. The problem with this model is that stars are then necessary for stars to form (Sarfati 94). The problem of star formation is such that Dr. James Trefil, a believer in the Big Bang, admits:

“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 frustration that this simple fact induces among scientists” (qtd. in Sarfati 93).

One final problem (though more could be presented) is the necessary violation of *the law of conservation of angular momentum*. Angular momentum is equal to the mass of an object multiplied by the velocity (speed) of the object and the distance (radius) from the center of the object’s mass. The formula is  $L = mvr$ . The law of conservation of angular momentum states that the angular moment must remain constant even if a change is made to any of the three variables, so, according to the formula, if the radius is decreased, then the speed must increase. This law is witnessed when ice skaters spin much faster by bringing their arms in close to their body (thereby decreasing the radius). If the sun was the result of a collapsed gas cloud, then the speed at which it spins should be much more rapid than the speed at which the planets orbit the sun. Unfortunately for the naturalistic model of origins, this is not the case. The sun spins much slower than the orbiting planets (96). This is another law the naturalistic model of origins would have to violate during the formation of the universe.

According to the biblical account of creation mentioned above, God created the universe instantly by the word of His mouth. Is there any evidence of an instantaneous creation? As a matter of fact, there is! Robert V. Gentry, a research physicist who has been considered the world’s leading authority on radioactive halos, discovered such evidence (80). His research on the foundation rocks of the earth (granites) shows that these rocks could not have begun in a molten state and slowly cooled over millions of years but must have formed rapidly (30).

Gentry’s research involved radioactive halos (radiohalos) found in the granites. Radioactivity occurs when an unstable element, such as uranium, loses alpha and beta particles. Each time a particle is lost the element is changed into a different element. This radioactive chain reaction continues until the element becomes stable. For example, uranium eventually stabilizes into lead (18). The radiohalos found in the granites are clearly defined concentric rings surrounding the radioactive element, looking like a bull’s-eye with the element directly in the center. These rings are the result of alpha particles shooting off the radioactive element and causing damage to the area surrounding the element. The alpha particles shoot off with different amounts of energy, depending on where the radioactive element is along the chain reaction. The particles with more energy create rings further away from the element in the center, and those with less energy create rings closer to the center. By measuring the distance from the center, one can determine what the original element was and where it’s at along the reaction chain (17-20).

Of special interest in Gentry's research was the radioactive element Polonium-218 ( $^{218}\text{Po}$ ). Although this can be a daughter product in the uranium chain reaction, Gentry's research confirmed that the  $^{218}\text{Po}$  radiohalos found in the granites he was examining were not daughter products of uranium; they were formed by original  $^{218}\text{Po}$  radioactivity. What was the significance of this? The decay rate of a radioactive element is called its half-life. The half-life is the length of time necessary for half of the original radioactive element to decay. The half-life of  $^{218}\text{Po}$  is only three minutes. If the earth began as a molten mass, as the naturalistic model of origins claims, then the  $^{218}\text{Po}$  would have decayed long before the millions of years that it would have taken for the earth to solidify (30-32). A good example of this is putting Alka-Seltzer into a glass of water and placing it in the freezer. All the bubbles would escape before the water froze, and you would not see them if you examined the frozen water. In order to preserve the bubbles, the water would have to be frozen very rapidly. Likewise, the  $^{218}\text{Po}$  would not have caused radiohalos in the granites if the earth was in a molten state (197). The only way for these radiohalos to form is if the earth solidified within three minutes. This inescapable problem for the naturalistic model fits perfectly with the biblical account which declares of God, "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands" (Ps. 102.25).

In addition to the  $^{218}\text{Po}$  radiohalos, Gentry shows that slow cooling granites do not share the same characteristics as the foundation granites found in nature. The granites that solidify through slow cooling have a very fine, sometimes microscopic grain-size; whereas, the foundation granites found in nature have a very large grain-size, easily seen with the naked eye (130-131). This difference in grain-size is evidence that the foundation rocks of the earth did not form through slow cooling as the naturalistic model proposes.

Gentry's research has been published in various peer-reviewed scientific journals, beginning in 1966, and has not been discredited to this day (354-355). He even proposed a test which would prove his hypothesis of a rapid forming earth to be false. The falsification test would be to create a "hand-sized" piece of granite in the laboratory with the same texture and grain-size as the granites found in nature. If such a rock could be formed, Gentry would retract his position. Furthermore, if anyone could produce such a rock with even a single  $^{218}\text{Po}$  radiohalo contained within it, then it would "doubly" falsify his thesis (65-66). Although attempts have been made to synthesize granite, they have all failed (200-201).

As can be seen, attempts to produce a naturalistic model for the origin of the universe fail miserably. The universe could not have simply come into being without a Creator, and that Creator has given evidence for the instantaneous creation of this world in its very foundation rocks. Only the biblical account of origins provides a valid and reasonable explanation for this and the other phenomenon mentioned. Dr. Arno Penzias, Nobel Prize laureate for physics in 1978, sums it up in this statement:

"Astronomy leads us to a unique event, a universe which was created out of nothing, one with the very delicate balance needed to provide exactly the conditions required to permit life, and one which has an underlying (one might say 'supernatural') plan. Thus, the observations of modern science seem to lead to the same conclusions as centuries-old intuition" (83).

That "centuries-old intuition" is nothing more than that millennia-old truth: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. 1.1).

### The Origin of Life

The next area under consideration is the origin of life. Those who believe in the naturalistic model of origins have many different proposals for origin of life, but they all involve chance. In some unknown manner, the first amino acids were formed. These amino acids managed to bind together to form proteins which acted like weak enzymes. Somehow, these proteins began working together to replicate and form new proteins and enzymes. Another chance process occurred in which nucleotides formed, interacted with proteins, and formed RNA, which eventually led to the formation of DNA. All of this “metabolic machinery” managed to become enclosed in a sac called a *proto-cell*, the precursor for all living cells (Starr 290-291).

Stanley Miller performed an experiment in an attempt to show how what was thought to be the early atmosphere could produce the amino acids needed for life. He put together an apparatus which consisted of a chamber containing boiling water, methane, hydrogen, and ammonia. This mixture evaporated and collected in another chamber. To simulate the lightning that was thought to have provided the energy needed to create the amino acids, Miller zapped this gaseous chamber with electricity. A condenser leading down from the gas chamber allowed the evaporated gases to liquefy and collect in a U-shaped tube called a trap. This trap led back to the chamber with the boiling water. After letting the mixture circulate through this apparatus, Miller discovered that amino acids, along with some other organic compounds, had formed in less than a week (Starr 289).

Had Stanley Miller discovered the secret to life? No, he hadn't. A mountain of difficulties proves otherwise. One of those difficulties is *chirality*. Chirality is another name for “handedness.” The simplest way to understand this is to look at your left and right hands. Both hands look the same; they both have a thumb and four distinct fingers. However, you cannot make a left handprint with your right hand, or vice versa. In like manner, there are right-handed and left-handed amino acids. Just as your right hand cannot make a left handprint, right-handed amino acids cannot make the same “print” as left-handed ones. All the proteins found in nature contain only *left-handed* amino acids; a right-handed amino acid in a protein would render it unable to perform its biochemical duty. The problem with Miller's experiment is that randomly producing amino acids results in a 50/50 mixture of left- and right-handed amino acids.

To further complicate matters, chirality also holds true for the nucleotides that make up DNA. Only in this instance, the cells require *right-handed* nucleotides for DNA formation. This right-handedness of the nucleotides is what causes the DNA to form its spiral-shaped structure. A single left-handed nucleotide would disrupt this structure and the DNA could not function or replicate properly. In order for even the building blocks of life to form, billions of right-handed nucleotides and thousands of left-handed amino acids would have had to form in the same place at the same time without any molecules of the opposite chirality interfering. Otherwise, neither the DNA nor the proteins would be able to do its job (McCombs ii-iii).

Another struggle that the naturalistic model for the origin of life encounters is the proposed atmosphere of the early earth. Since free oxygen in the atmosphere would destroy all the molecules needed for life, the naturalistic model must exclude oxygen from the early atmosphere (as seen in Stanley Miller's experiment). The problem with this scenario is that an oxygen-free atmosphere would not have that protective layer of oxygen called the ozone layer which exists today. Without the ozone layer, deadly ultraviolet radiation from the sun would have bombarded the earth and destroyed any molecules that could have possibly formed.

Even if the previously mentioned obstacle could be overcome, any molecules formed would have been destroyed by the same energy that formed them. The reason Stanley Miller included a trap in his apparatus was to protect the molecules from being destroyed by the electric sparks or the boiling water. However, no such trap could have existed on the earth; even if one did exist, it would only separate the molecules from the very energy needed for further evolution (Gish, "A Few Reasons").

Moving away from Miller's experiment, problems exist even if chance succeeded in forming protein, enzymes, and DNA held together in a so-called proto-cell. One problem deals with cell replication and the DNA repair process. Replication is the process by which a cell copies its DNA during cellular division. While reading the DNA to make a copy, an enzyme will look for any errors in the DNA strand. If it finds any errors, it will call for other enzymes to make repairs. Without the replication process, the DNA could not be reproduced, and without the repair process, it could not even survive in the cell, because it is an unstable molecule. The problem with the naturalistic model is that the information (or, genes) needed for making the enzymes used for repair and replication is located within the DNA itself. In order for DNA to survive, the DNA must have had these replication and repair genes built in from the beginning (Gish, "A Few Reasons"; McCombs iv). How did the DNA know it needed such a process? If it is argued that these enzymes were formed by chance separately from the DNA, then the question is, "How did the genes necessary to create those enzymes get into the DNA?"

From what is observed and understood in the natural world, life could not have originated by chance. Even if all the molecules needed to create a living cell were together in the same place at the same time under perfect conditions, would that be enough to create life? Is life simply a bunch of enzymes bumping around in the hopes of fulfilling some useful purpose? No, the processes of a living cell are highly specific with each cell performing a specific function. Without this specificity, the cell would *not* function. It is ironic that the naturalistic model of origins must turn away from what is observed in the natural world in order to come up with its various theories on the origin of life. A more reasonable explanation for the origin of life is that a divine Creator designed the cell with all the necessary information to perform its various roles and gave it life.

### **Evidence for Creation**

In the book of Romans, it is written:

"That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. 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" (Rom. 1.19-20).

Besides all the evidence already mentioned above showing that the origin of the universe and of life could not have come about by chance, nature itself teaches us that the earth and its inhabitants are the result of the creative power of God. The following evidences of God's creative power are but a small handful compared to the thousands of examples which leave those who insist on the naturalistic model of origins "without excuse."

The first evidence for creation is the relationship between the *Heliconius* butterfly and the passionflower. The caterpillars of this particular butterfly species feed on the leaves of the passionflower (Wade). This could be disastrous for the passionflower except that it has a couple

of defense mechanisms. The first of these mechanisms is camouflage. The butterfly uses its eyes to look for the right plant to lay its eggs on. As a defense, the leaves of a passionflower will often imitate a plant which the caterpillar does not eat, and the butterfly will pass it by. Another defense mechanism is *egg-mimicry*. Some passionflowers imitate the eggs of the *Heliconius* butterfly, and not only that, they imitate the egg-laying pattern as well! The butterfly will not lay its eggs on the plant because the plant cannot support too many caterpillars. Furthermore, the caterpillars are cannibalistic and the butterfly does not want its eggs eaten by another caterpillar (Ulmer and MacDougal 12; Wade). How does the passionflower know both what a butterfly egg looks like and how the butterfly lays it? How does a plant know what the plants that caterpillars don't eat look like in order to mimic those plants? Clearly, this is an example of a Creator.

One might object to this as an example of creation stating that it involves a battle between two of God's creatures. Though it is not the scope of this paper to discuss the effect of sin upon this world, it is sufficient to say that God has designed every living thing with a certain ability to cope with sin's effect. Even so, all creation longs for the time when it, too, along with the children of God, shall be restored to its original beauty (Rom. 8.18-23).

This next evidence for creation examines the beautiful relationship between the yucca plant and the yucca moth. The yucca plant is design in such a manner that it cannot pollinate itself. The stamens, which provide the pollen, are shorter than the pistil, the part of the flower where germination occurs. The pollen itself is sticky and would be difficult for it to be caught by the wind. Furthermore, the pollen would have to make its way down into the tube-like pistil ("Yucca Moth"). The fact is that the yucca plant and the yucca moth "cannot live without the other" (Moisset).

The yucca moth has short tentacles around its mouth which are very important in its relationship with the yucca plant. This is unlike other moths which have a long proboscis used to collect nectar. The yucca moth uses these tentacles to scrap up a ball of pollen from off several stamens of the yucca plant. She then flies to a different yucca plant, pierces the ovary, and lays her eggs. After her eggs are laid, she climbs up the pistil and forces the little pollen ball down into the tube. This pollinates the flower, and the seeds provide food for the young larvae with enough seeds left over to ensure the yucca plant's survival. After feeding, the larvae drop to the ground and make cocoons in the ground. The moths emerge over a period of three seasons to ensure their survival if the yucca plant fails to bloom one year (Moisset; "Yucca Moth").

Doesn't it seem reasonable to consider that these moths were designed for their special task by a divine Creator? How else would the moth learn to pollinate the flowers, and why are its mouth parts perfect for this task? Furthermore, how do the moths know to emerge over a period of years just in case the yucca flowers don't bloom in any one particular year? This symbiotic relationship between the yucca moth and the yucca plant is an incredible evidence of the Creator.

The *Ophrys* orchid is another plant that is pollinated by an insect. This relationship, however, is one-sided. One species of the orchid mimics both the appearance and smell of the female of a particular species of wasp. The orchid has "bushy red hairs... [that] look vaguely like the wasps that pollinate them" (Milius). The smell that is produced is the result of a chemical blend containing "a rarely occurring compound" which causes the male wasps to attempt to mate with the flower (Ayasse et al. 517). As the wasp goes from flower to flower in its mating attempts, it effectively pollinates the flowers. Another species of orchids uses smell, sight, and touch to allure bees (Viegas). How a flower can know what an insect looks, smells, and feels likes—apart from the Creator—is certainly a mystery!

A final evidence for creation involves the birth of a human baby. Because a baby does not breathe in the womb, its lungs are collapsed. The heart does not need to circulate much blood through the lungs since no oxygenation is received there. In normal circulation, non-oxygenated blood enters the right atrium and travels through a valve into the right ventricle where it is pumped through the pulmonary artery into the lungs and oxygenated. From the lungs, the blood enters into the left atrium, passes through a valve, and enters into the left ventricle which pushes the blood through the aorta to be dispersed throughout the body. In fetal circulation, when the blood enters the right atrium, instead of going to the right ventricle where it gets pumped through the lungs, most of the blood goes through a hole (foramen ovale) directly into the left atrium where it can be pumped into the left ventricle and, ultimately, throughout the body. Any blood that didn't go directly into the left atrium through the foramen ovale goes into the right ventricle to the pulmonary artery. However, on its way through the pulmonary artery to the lungs, most of the blood is diverted through another hole (ductus arteriosus) leading to the aorta and can be pumped throughout the body instead (Ganong 628). The fetus needs all the oxygenated blood it can get; therefore, it doesn't waste time or energy pumping it through the lungs.

When the baby is born and takes its first gasps of breathe, the lungs expanded, reducing the pressure in the pulmonary artery. This increases the blood flow to the lungs, which in turn increases the blood flow returning from the lungs to the left atrium. This increased blood flow increases the pressure in the left atrium, causing a valve to close on the foramen ovale which eventually becomes a permanent closure. Within a few hours, the other hole, the ductus arteriosus, constricts and becomes a permanent closure due to thickening of the arterial walls which occurs during the next day or two (629). What a marvelous process!

Fetal hemoglobin is another amazing design of the human fetus. Because the oxygen levels are so low in placental blood (coming from the mother), the fetus has a special type of blood containing fetal hemoglobin. This blood has a higher affinity (oxygen-binding capability) for oxygen compared to the adult hemoglobin. If this was not true, the fetus could suffer damage from lack of oxygen! When the fetus is born, it no longer produces the fetal hemoglobin, and within four months, most of the hemoglobin is adult hemoglobin (628).

Truly, nature witnesses to the creative power of the God. If evolution was true and every living thing was the result of mutations and natural selection, then we could expect hundreds, if not thousands, of unnecessary cells, organs, or functions in the human body and in every living thing. Yet, what is found in nature is that everything performs a necessary function. Every organ in the human body is perfectly designed in both form and function to fulfill a specific purpose; and every organ works in perfect harmony with the other organs. There is nothing wasted and nothing vestigial. In fact, every structure in every created thing is created with a purpose! Those who fail to see the hand of God are, indeed, "without excuse" (Rom. 1.20).

### **Veracity of the Scriptures**

What about the Bible itself? Why should one accept the Bible as an authority on the origin of life as opposed to mainstream science or even the varied explanations from other religions? Does the Bible give any evidence that it's reliable; moreover, that it is of divine origin? The Bible states that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3.16). If this is so, then the writers of the Bible would have insights which no ordinary individuals would have. Two areas of the Bible which show this to be true are its scientific accuracy and its prophetic ability to foretell future events.

The Bible states that when God created Eve, he formed her from one of Adam's ribs (Gen. 2.21-23). The name *Adam* means "mankind." In fact, many translations of the Bible use the word *mankind* instead of "Adam" in Genesis chapter five, verse two. When God created Adam, he was creating all of mankind—that is, both male and female. What is the significance of this? Today, it is known that the male of the species carries all the genetic information to produce both a male and a female. In order to make a female, God only needed to use two X-chromosomes from Adam's rib. Eve was "bone of [Adam's] bones, and flesh of [Adam's] flesh" (Gen. 2.23), because her bones and her flesh were a genetic copy of Adam's. The creation account of Adam and Eve is scientifically accurate, written long before the discovery of sex chromosomes.

Further evidence of the scientific accuracy of the scriptures is the health laws found in the books of Moses. One such law involved the elimination of bodily wastes. When someone needed to defecate, he or she was to go outside of the camp, dig a hole, and cover his or her waste afterward (Deut. 23.12-13). This and other such laws regarding cleanliness were the means of preventing sickness throughout the camp. Though it may seem trivial now, if these laws had been followed throughout history, it would have prevented many of the diseases that plagued the early Europeans and the early Americans. Millennia before the concept of germs was discovered, the Israelite nation had laws protecting them from germs' deadly diseases.

Another area of health laws which God gave to the Israelites was dietary laws. One law stated that the Israelites were not to eat the fat or the blood of animals (Lev. 3.17). Today, it is known that saturated fat is the cause of many chronic diseases, such as type II diabetes and heart disease, and the blood is a carrier of germs which can cause infectious diseases and cancer. Could Moses have known about these things? Surely not! It was God Himself who gave Israel these laws. Moses writes,

"Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the LORD my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people" (Deut. 4.5-6).

The biblical story of the flood provides additional evidence for the veracity of the scriptures. A study was undertaken to answer the question, "How far back in time must we go to find an individual who was the ancestor of all present-day humans?" Using various statistical models, the researchers attempted to discover just when the identical ancestors lived. According to their results, "had you entered any village on Earth in around 3000 B.C., the first person you would have met would probably have been your ancestor." (Hein 518) Biblical chronology records the flood as having occurred approximately 4500 years ago, or around 2500 B.C. Only Noah, his wife, their three sons, and their sons' wives survived the flood, and they would be the ancestors of everyone living today. These two dates are very close considering the many variables that had to be considered in determining the identical ancestor. Furthermore, Noah himself would have been born around 3000 B.C. It is one more piece of evidence supporting the accuracy of the biblical model of origins.

Additional evidence supporting the flood is the universality of one particular layer in the geological column called the Cretaceous layer, meaning "chalk". The chalk deposits of this particular layer are formed from the calcium carbonate skeletons of certain marine creatures.

These chalk deposits only form in shallow water (compared to the deep oceans). The fact that this layer exists all over the world is evidence that at one time the whole world was immersed under a shallow sea (Veith 107, 133-136).

Most evolutionists claim that the geological column is the result of millions of years of erosion causing the various layers to form. Each layer is thought to be the surface of the earth during the particular era assigned to it. The problem with this view is that all the geological layers are extremely flat with very little sign of erosion. The surface of the earth today is full of erosional feature not found in those layers which supposedly represent the earth's surface exposed to millions of years of erosion (84-85).

The flood provides a better explanation. Turbidites are underwater mudflow caused by seismic events. These mudflows can flow for miles at incredible rates of speeds; furthermore, these mudflows can stack on top of each other with very little intermingling. The surface of such layers would be relatively flat, which is exactly what is seen in the geological column. Also, the grading of sediments in the layers would be from coarse (at the bottom) to fine (on the top), which is, again, exactly what is seen in the geological column. These turbidites also explain the formation of fossils, since any unfortunate animal to get caught in such a mudflow would be an instant candidate for a fossil (92-93). Much more evidence for the flood could be presented, but it's time to move on to the final area supporting the veracity of the scriptures.

In the book of Isaiah, God declares, "I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done" (Is. 46.9-10). The ability to foretell the future, with accuracy, is a prerogative held only by God. It is an area in which science must hang its lab coat on the hook and leave the room. If the Bible has accurately predicted future events, then it would be evidence of its divine inspiration, and one would be compelled to consider the biblical account of origins to be valid. Daniel and Revelation are two prophetic books which confirm the divine inspiration of the Bible.

Before presenting the prophecies of the book of Daniel, the time in which it was written must first be established. Because of the nature of the prophecies of Daniel, so-called "higher critics" attempt to place the time of Daniel's writings in the first or second century B.C. (King 19-20; Nichol 746-747). Archeological discoveries, however, have demonstrated that the book of Daniel was indeed written during the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.

One strong evidence supporting the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. as the time when Daniel was written is the fact that it states that Nebuchadnezzar built Babylon (Dan. 4:30). The historical writings of the Greeks did not attribute the building or the remaking of Babylon to Nebuchadnezzar, but rather gave credit to a certain Queen Semiramis. After the discovery of ancient cuneiform records, it is clear that Nebuchadnezzar was indeed responsible for the building up of Babylon. Semiramis was a queen mother of Assyria who was reigning in behalf of her son. Only a writer living during the time of the Babylonian empire, or shortly thereafter, could have know this information since it was lost by the time of the Greeks (Nichol 748).

Another evidence showing the time period of Daniel's writings is the mention of Belshazzar in the fifth chapter of Daniel as the reigning king when the Babylonian empire fell. All the historical accounts mentioned Nabonidus as the final king of Babylon. Beginning in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, many discoveries were made throughout the years naming Belshazzar as the coregent of the Babylonian empire with his father, Nabonidus. This information would not have been known by a writer in the first or second century B.C., or even earlier, pointing once again to the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C. as the correct time of authorship (Nichol 806-808).

The book of Daniel contains four parallel prophecies found in the second, seventh, eighth, and eleventh chapters. The full extent of these prophecies cannot be covered in a paper such as this, so only a quick synopsis will be given. The simplest of these prophecies is found in the second chapter of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, was given a dream. In his dream, he saw a great image. The image had a head of gold, chest and arms of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of iron, and feet of iron and clay mixed together. Reading further, the interpretation is given. The head of gold represented the kingdom of Babylon, the reigning kingdom at that time. The chest and arms of silver represented another kingdom which would follow after Babylon. The following two metals, brass and iron, represented two more succeeding kingdoms, and the feet of iron mingled with clay represented a kingdom that would be “partly strong, and partly broken,” which would be a mixture of kings that would “not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay” (Dan. 2.42-43).

How accurate was this prophecy given around 600 B.C.? In 539 B.C., Babylon, the head of gold, fell to the Medes and the Persians (Nichol 772). After defeating the last Persian king, Alexander the Great became ruler of the Grecian Empire in 331 B.C. only to fall to the great Roman power in the second century B.C. (Smith 52, 158). According to the prophecy, the Roman Empire was to be broken up, and this is exactly what happened. Between 351 A.D. and 476 A.D., the Roman Empire fell to barbarian tribes and was ultimately divided into ten kingdoms (Smith 58). Furthermore, these ten kingdoms “shall not cleave one to another” (Dan. 2.43). Throughout the history of Europe, many attempts have been made to unite the divided nations of the Roman Empire, but the Bible clearly states that this would not happen. Charlemagne, Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon, and Hitler all failed in their attempts to hold absolute sway, and the word of God stands true (Smith 60).

Further evidence of the accuracy of this prophecy is the type of metals used in the image. The head of gold represents perfectly the Babylonian Empire with its abundance of gold; the chest and arms of brass represents the Grecian Empire with its weapons and armor made from brass; and the legs of iron represent the “‘iron monarchy’ of Rome” (Nichol 772, 774). Divine insight alone could have foreseen this.

The parallel prophecies present even more detail concerning these historical events. For example, the eighth chapter of Daniel represents the Grecian Empire as a goat coming from the west that “touched not the ground” and “had a notable horn between his eyes” (Dan. 8.5, 21). The fact that the goat “touched not the ground” denotes the rapidity of Alexander’s conquest, also represented in Daniel chapter seven by a leopard with four wings (Dan. 7.6). The “notable horn,” representing Alexander the Great, “was broken; and for it came up four notable” horns. This happened “when he was strong” (Dan. 8.8). With pinpoint accuracy this prophecy foretold the death of Alexander at the height of his power and that his four generals would take control and rule a divided Grecian Empire (Nichol 840, 822). Daniel chapter eleven, verse three expands even further on this prophecy.

One more prophecy, found in the ninth chapter of the book of Revelation, will be considered. Although space does not permit the discussion of the details of this prophecy, it should not pass without mention. This prophecy predicted the fall of the Ottoman Empire before it happened. As the result of much study, a man named Josiah Litch wrote out this prediction in 1838, two years before it happened. In 1840, the year the empire was to fall, Litch added that it would occur in the month of August. A few days before the actual event, he concluded that it would occur on the eleventh day of the month. On August 11, 1840, the Ottoman Empire lost its power, just as Josiah Litch’s study of the prophecy predicted (Smith 512-517).

Even this short synopsis of the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation declares that the Bible is a book divinely inspired. When one considers that at the time when the prophecy first mentioned was given to Nebuchadnezzar, Persia was a satrapy under Babylonian control, Grecian was nothing more than warring tribes, and Rome was merely a village located on the Tiber River, one must carefully consider the claim that “all scripture is given by inspiration of God” (King 72, 2 Tim. 3.16). The apostle Peter in his second epistle writes, “For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty” (2 Pet. 1.16), and a few verses later he adds, “We have also a more sure word of prophecy” (2 Pet. 1.19). Why is prophecy a “more sure word” than Peter’s eyewitness account? It is because only Peter, James, and John were witnesses of the majesty of Christ when he was glorified before them (Matt. 17.1-5). The word of prophecy, on the other hand, has been written down beforehand so that anyone can look upon the events foretold, compare them with history, and witness for himself or herself the truthfulness of the Bible.

### **Conclusion**

Based upon the weight of evidence, it is clear that the biblical account of origins provides a better explanation for the natural phenomenon observed in the world today. Its view of the history of the world from its creation to the present is both reasonable and accurate. The naturalistic explanation, on the other hand, has proven to be quite *unnatural*. It violates many natural laws and relies upon crossed-fingers and false hopes. It’s full of explanations that do not make sense when compared with what is measured, tested, and observed. The Bible states that “the world by wisdom knew not God” (1 Cor. 1.21). In its attempt to find a natural explanation for its existence, did mankind turn away from the only true explanation—the biblical one? The Bible has proved itself to be accurate, both scientifically and prophetically. With all this weight of evidence, what will you believe? Will you believe that cosmic dust, through chance processes over millions of years, can eventually become aware of its own existence? Is your ability to love, laugh, cry, and sing the result of a cosmic and chemical accident? Or, will you believe that you are made in the image of God, formed out of the dust of the earth by the very hand of a Creator who loves you and has revealed himself to you through nature and through the Holy Scriptures (Gen. 1.26; 2.7; Ps. 19.1-4). The choice is yours. If you honestly weigh the evidence, chances are you will not be found “without excuse.”

### Bibliography

- Ayasse, Manfred, Florian P. Schiestl, Hannes F. Paulus, Fernando Ibarra, and Wittko Francke. "Pollinator Attraction in a Sexually Deceptive Orchid by Means of Unconventional Chemicals." *Proc Biol Sci* 270 (2003): 517-22. *PubMed*. Web. 4 Nov. 2009.
- Ganong, William F. *Review of Medical Physiology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Professional, 2005. *NetLibrary*. Web. 4 Nov. 2009.
- Gentry, Robert V. "Creation's Tiny Mystery." Knoxville: Earth Science Associates, 1992. Print.
- Gish, Duane. "A Few Reasons an Evolutionary Origin of Life Is Impossible." *Acts & Facts* 2007: 36-37. *Institute for Creation Research*. Web. 5 Nov. 2009.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'Scientific Creationism' Should Be Taught in Science Classrooms." *At Issue: Creationism vs. Evolution*. Ed. Bruno J. Leone. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2002. *Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*. Web. 3 Nov. 2009.
- Hein, Jotun. "Human evolution: Pedigrees for all humanity." *Nature* 431.7008 (2004): 518+. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 8 Nov. 2009.
- King, Geoffrey R. *Daniel: A Detailed Explanation of the Book*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966. Print.
- Lynn, Leon. "The Teaching of Evolution Is Censored." *Current Controversies: Censorship*. Ed. Laura K. Egenorf. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2001. *Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*. Web. 3 Nov. 2009.
- McCombs, Charles. "Evolution Hopes You Don't Know Chemistry: The Problem with Chirality." *Impact* 371 (May 2004). *Institute for Creation Research*. Web. 5 Nov. 2009.
- Milius, S. "Mailes prefer flower's scent to female wasp's. (Better than real)." *Science News* 1 Feb. 2003: 67+. *Academic OneFile*. Web. 4 Nov. 2009.
- Milner, Richard. *The Encyclopedia of Evolution: Humanity's Search for Its Origins*. New York: Facts On File, 1990. Print.
- Moisset, Beatriz. "Yucca Moths (*Tegeticula* sp.)." *Celebrating Wildflowers*. US Forest Service, 5 Aug. 2009. Web. 4 Nov. 2009.
- National Science Teachers Association. "Creationism Should Be Excluded from Science Courses." *Opposing Viewpoints: Education*. Ed. Mary E. Williams. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2005. *Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*. Web. 3 Nov. 2009.
- Nichol, Francis D., ed. *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*. 7 vols. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Association, 1955. Print. Vol. 4.
- Penzias, Arno. "Creation Is Supported by All the Data So Far." *Cosmos, Bios, Theos: Scientists Reflect on Science, God, and the Origins of the Universe, Life, and Homo sapiens*. Ed. Henry Margenau and Roy A. Varghese. Peru, IL: Open Court Company, 1992. 78-83. Print.
- Pigliucci, Massimo. "Evolution Alone Explains Life on Earth." *At Issue: Creationism Versus Evolution*. Ed. Eric Braun. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2005. *Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*. Web. 3 Nov. 2009.
- Ruse, Michael. "New Creationists and Their Discredited Arguments." *At Issue: Creationism vs. Evolution*. Ed. Bruno J. Leone. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2002. *Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*. Web. 3 Nov. 2009.
- Sarfati, Jonathan. *Refuting Evolution*. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 1999. Print.
- Smith, Uriah. *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1972. Print.
- Starr, Cecie. *Biology: Concepts and Applications*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole, 2006.

Print.

*Study Bible: King James Version*. Loma Linda, CA: PacificRim Press, 1997. Print.

Ulmer, Torsten, John M. MacDougal. *Passiflora: Passionflowers of the World*. Portland: Timber Press Inc., 2004. Print.

Veith, Walter J. *The Genesis Conflict*. Delta, BC: Amazing Discoveries, 2002.

Viegas, Jennifer. "Bee Prefers Sex With Orchid Over Females." *Discovery News*. Discovery Channel, 27 May 2008. Web. 4 Nov. 2009.

Wade, Nicholas. "In Death-Defying Act, Butterfly Thrives on Poison Vine." *New York Times* 1 Aug. 2000, sec. F: 6. Web. 4 Nov. 2009.

Wanser, Keith H. "Keith H. Wanser: Physics." *In Six Days: Why Fifty Scientists Choose To Believe In Creation*. Ed. John F. Ashton. Green Forest, AR: Master Books, 2001. Print.

Wiker, Benjamin D. "Creationism Explains Life on Earth." *At Issue: Creationism versus Evolution*. Ed. Eric Braun. San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 2005. *Opposing Viewpoints Resource Center*. Web. 3 Nov. 2009.

"Yucca Moth." *New Mexico Wildlife*. New Mexico Department of Game & Fish, 1992. Web. 4 Nov. 2009. <[http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/education/wildlife\\_notes/documents/yuccamoth.pdf](http://www.wildlife.state.nm.us/education/wildlife_notes/documents/yuccamoth.pdf)>.