

THE CASE FOR CREATION: 5

LAWS OF PROBABILITY

Proverbs 16:33 -- The lot is cast into the lap, but its every decision is from the Lord.



Introduction

1. One of the limitations of science is that, by its very nature, it deals not with absolute proof, but with probability. In a widely used biology text, by G. G. Simpson, the student is warned: "We speak in terms of 'acceptance,' 'confidence,' and 'probability,' not 'proof.' If by proof is meant the establishment of eternal and absolute truth, open to no possible exception or modification, then proof has no place in the natural sciences."
2. Today, almost every scientific discipline is based on the "laws of probability." At the outset of any discussion on probabilities, however, two questions arise. First, are probabilities of any practical nature? Second, are probabilities of any usefulness in the creation/evolution controversy? The answer is "Yes!" James Coppedge, a former director of probability research has stated: "Probability is a practical concept. The uncertainties of chance affect our everyday lives."

A. The Nature of Probability

1. Dr. Borel, ever the practical mathematician, remarked that "the principles on which the calculus of probabilities is based are extremely simple and as intuitive as the reasonings which lead an accountant through his operations."
2. King and Read, in their excellent work, *Pathways to Probability*, stated: "We see... that the theory of probabilities is at bottom only common sense reduced to calculation..."
3. Indeed, whether most people realize it or not, our daily lives are affected by such mathematical studies, sometimes in ways we do not even know or understand. Harold Morowitz, former professor of biophysics at Yale University commented: "Often a process is so complicated or we are so ignorant of the boundary conditions, or of the laws governing the process, that we are unable to predict the result of the process in any but a statistical fashion... Randomness is in a certain sense a consequence of the ignorance of the observer, yet randomness itself displays certain properties which have been turned into powerful tools in the study of the behavior of systems of atoms."
4. Since probability studies deal with randomness, and since evolution, in its entirety, is built upon the very concept of randomness, it would appear that the laws of probability could shed some light on the possibility of evolution having occurred.
5. "Evolution is an ideal subject in which to apply the laws of chance.... Evolutionary doctrine denies advance planning, and has random matter-in-motion as its basic source. 'Chance mutations' furnish the variability upon which presently accepted evolutionary thinking in America is generally founded" -- James Coppedge.

B. Is Evolution Statistically Probable?

1. Borel's law of probability states that the occurrence of any event, where the chances are beyond one in one followed by 50 zeros, is an event that we can state with certainty will never happen, no matter how much time is allotted and no matter how many conceivable opportunities could exist for the event.
2. Dr. Morowitz estimated that the probability for the chance formation of the smallest, simplest form of living organism known is one chance in 1 followed by 340 million zeros. [There are only approx. 10^{80} electrons in the whole Universe!]

3. The Late Carl Sagen estimated that the chance of life evolving on any given single planet, like the Earth, is one chance in $1 \times 10^{2,000,000,000}$ [that is one chance out of 1 followed by 2 billion zeros].
4. Numbers this large are so infinitely beyond one followed by 50 zeros, that according to Borel's law of probability there is absolutely no chance that life could have "evolved spontaneously" on the Earth.
5. If we assume the Universe to be 5 billion light years in radius [as some assert], and assume that it is crammed with tiny particles the size of electrons, it has been estimated that conceivably 10^{130} particles could exist in the Universe. Every structure, every process, every system, every "event" in the Universe must consist of these particles, in various combinations and interchanges. If, to be extremely generous, we assume that each particle can take part in 10^{20} (that is a hundred billion) events *each second*, and then allow 10^{20} seconds of cosmic history (this would correspond to 3,000 billion years or 100-200 times the current maximum estimate of the age of the Universe), then the greatest conceivable number of separate events that could take place in all of space and time would be: $10^{130} \times 10^{20} \times 10^{20} = 10^{170}$ events.
6. The problem is, that any living cell or any new organ to be added to any existing animal - even the simplest imaginable replicating system - would have to contain far more stored information than represented even by such a gigantic number as 10^{170} . Marcel E. Golay, a leading information scientist, calculated the odds against such a system organizing itself as 10^{450} to 1. Frank Salisbury set the figure at 10^{415} to 1. Consequently, it can be concluded that the chance origin of life is utterly impossible.

C. Which Model is Logically Possible?

1. R.W. Kaplan, who spent years researching the possibility of the evolutionary origin of life, suggested that the probability of the simplest living organism being formed by chance processes was one chance in 10^{130} . He then stated: "One could conclude from this result that life could not have originated without a donor of information." Creationists suggest that "donor" was the Creator, and that the evolution model cannot circumvent basic laws of probability.
2. Evolutionist Richard Dawkins once observed: "The more statistically improbable a thing is, the less we can believe that it just happened by blind chance. Superficially the obvious alternative to chance is an intelligent Designer.
3. The problem with the distorted thinking of the evolutionist is that when you state that something has "a 1 chance in..." they see the "1" and not the other numbers. For them it means there is "a chance" no matter what. But Sproul, Gestner, and Lindsley concluded: "The fact is, however, we have a no-chance creation. We must erase the "1" which appears above the line of the "1" followed by a large number of zeros. What are the real chances of a universe created by chance? **Not a chance.** Chance is incapable of creating a single molecule, let alone an entire Universe. Why not? Chance is **no thing**. It is not an entity. It has no being, no power, no force. It can effect nothing for it has no causal power within it, it has no **itness** to be within..."
4. Claude Tresmontant, eminent philosopher of science from the University of Paris, stated: "No theory of chance can explain the creation of the world. Before chance can send atoms whirling through infinite void, the atoms have to exist!"
5. Mathematician Murray Eden in defense said: "...the randomness postulate is highly implausible and that adequate scientific theory of evolution must await the elucidation of new natural laws - physical, physico-chemical and biological."
6. By the admission of its supporters, the only way that a theory can be accepted and propagated is by the elucidation of completely new natural laws in the physical, chemical, and biological sciences, the logical impossibility of holding to such a theory under present natural laws hardly needs further comment. Evolution is such a theory, and should therefore be rejected because it is impossible - both probabilistically and logically.