

THE CASE FOR CREATION: 1

MODEL PLAUSIBILITY

Genesis 1:1 -- In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.



A. Introduction

1. As various authors, both evolutionists and creationists, have observed, there are two and only two possible origins to our world. One or the other of these two philosophies must be true. The first is the concept of evolution, the model that presents the Universe as being self-contained.
2. The other is the concept of Creation, the model that presents the Universe as not self-contained. Both evolution and creation may be referred to properly as scientific models, since both may be used to explain and predict scientific facts. Obviously the one that does the better job of explaining/predicting is the better scientific model. Or, we might say, the model that better fits the available scientific data is said to be the one that has the highest degree of probability of truth.
3. In this series of lessons we are going to look at the Laws of Cause and Effect, Biogenesis, Genetics, Probability, and the Fossil Record to show that the Creation model fits the scientific data and the model of evolution does not. But first we will start in this lesson with the Plausibility of the Creation Model.

A. What are the options?

1. Albert Einstein once said that scientists are “possessed by the sense of universal causation”. Causality confirms that every material effect has an adequate antecedent cause. The basic question, then, is this: Can the origin of the Universe, the origin of life, and the origin of new life forms best be accounted for on the basis of non-intelligent, random chance, and accidental processes? Or, are these phenomena best accounted for on the basis of a Creator capable of producing the complex, ordered, information-relating processes we see around us?
2. The Universe exists, therefore, it must be explained in some fashion. However, there are only three ways to account for it:
 - a. The Universe is eternal.
 - b. The Universe is not eternal; rather it created itself from nothing.
 - c. The Universe is not eternal; it was created by something (or Someone) outside, and superior, to itself.

B. Is the Universe eternal?

1. There is no doubt that an eternal Universe is the most comfortable position to evolutionists, because it requires no explanation of a beginning or an ending. In fact, to avoid this problem, Dr. Fred Hoyle suggested that the best way to try to explain an expanding and eternal Universe was to suggest that at points in space called “irtrons” hydrogen was coming into existence out of nothing.
2. In the book, *Until the Sun Dies*, astronomer Robert Jastrow wrote that “the proposal for the creation of matter out of nothing possesses a strong appeal to the scientist, since it permits him to contemplate a Universe without beginning or without end.”
3. However, Jastrow (who is not a creationist) went on to say, “But these attempts have not succeeded, and most astronomers have come to the conclusion that they live in an exploding world.” In his book, *God and the Astronomers*, he explains why. “...three lines of evidence - the motion of the galaxies, the laws of thermodynamics, and the life story of the stars - pointed to one conclusion; all indicated that the Universe had a beginning.” And then adds, “...modern science denies an eternal existence to the Universe, either in the past or in the future.”

C. Did the Universe create itself out of nothing?

1. First, of course, it must be stressed that according to the First Law of Thermodynamics, matter is incapable of creating itself. Physicist George Davis declared: "No material thing can create itself." Dr. Davis added that this statement "cannot be logically attacked on the basis of any knowledge available to us."
2. However, Anthony Kenny, a British evolutionist, suggests in his book, *"Five Ways of Thomas Aquinas,"* that something actually came from nothing. In a 1984 issue of *Scientific American*, an article on "The Inflationary Universe" stated, "From a historical point of view probably the most revolutionary aspect of the inflationary model is the notion that all the matter and energy in the observable universe may have emerged from almost nothing...."
3. Such a concept, however, has met with serious opposition from within the scientific establishment. Ralph Estling wrote a stinging rebuke in the 1994 edition of the *Skeptical Inquirer*: "And so they conjure us an entire Cosmos, or myriads of cosmoses, suddenly, inexplicably, causelessly leaping into being out of - out of Nothing Whatsoever, for no reason at all... [This] universe possessed the interesting attributes of Infinite Temperature, Infinite Density, and Infinitesimal Volume, a rather gripping state of affairs, as well as something of a sudden and dramatic change from Nothing Whatsoever."
4. The Renowned British astrophysicist Stephen Hawking wrote: "In my personal opinion, the new inflationary model is now dead as a scientific theory."
5. In his book, *Not A Chance*, R.C. Sproul wrote: "For something to bring itself into being it must have the power of being within itself. It must at least have enough causal power to cause its own being... It would have to have the causal power of being before it was. It would have to have the power of being before it had any being with which to exercise that power." Thus, there is not a chance the universe could have created itself.

D. Is the Universe the result of creation?

1. If the Universe had a beginning, it either had a cause, or it did not have a cause. One thing we know: it is correct - both scientifically and philosophically - to acknowledge that the Universe had an adequate antecedent cause. The cause/effect principle states that wherever there is a material effect, there must be an adequate antecedent cause.
2. Further indicated, however, is the fact that no effect can be qualitatively superior to, or quantitatively greater than, its cause. It is apparent then that the Universe was created by something (or Someone): (a) that existed before it, i.e. some eternal, uncaused First Cause; (b) superior to it - the created cannot be superior to the creator; and (c) of a different nature since the finite, dependent Universe of matter is unable to explain itself.
3. If there ever had been a time when absolutely nothing existed, then there would still be nothing now. Nothing produces nothing.
4. Since something does exist, it must follow logically that something has existed forever. Everything that exists can be classified as either *matter* or *mind*. There is no third alternative. Therefore either matter or mind is eternal. Since it is scientifically proven that matter is not eternal, then it is the mind that is eternal.
5. In the past, atheistic evolutionists suggested that the mind was nothing more than a function of the brain, which is matter. However, this is no longer credible scientifically, due in large part to the experiments of Australian physiologist Sir John Eccles. Dr. Eccles, who won the Nobel Prize for his discoveries relating to the neural synapses within the brain, documented that the mind is more than merely physical. He showed that the supplementary motor area of the brain can be fired by mere *intention* to do something, without the motor cortex (which controls muscle movements) operating.
6. A cause can communicate to its effect only what it has to communicate. If our mind or ability to know is received, then there must be a Mind (God) that gave it.