

Contents

Preface 5

science and origins

- JEREMY L. WALTER • Mechanical Engineering 9
JERRY R. BERGMAN • Biology 23
JOHN K.G. KRAMER • Biochemistry 44
PAUL GIEM • Medical Research 56
HENRY ZUILL • Biology 61
JONATHAN D. SARFATI • Physical Chemistry 75
ARIEL A. ROTH • Biology 86
KEITH H. WANSER • Physics 102
TIMOTHY G. STANDISH • Biology 111
JOHN R. RANKIN • Mathematical Physics 118
BOB HOSKEN • Biochemistry 123
JAMES S. ALLAN • Genetics 127
GEORGE T. JAVOR • Biochemistry 134
DWAINE L. FORD • Organic Chemistry 138
ANGELA MEYER • Horticulture Science 143
STEPHEN GROCCOTT • Inorganic Chemistry 145
ANDREW MCINTOSH • Mathematics 155
JOHN P. MARCUS • Biochemistry 172
NANCY M. DARRALL • Botany 182
JOHN M. CIMBALA • Mechanical Engineering 200
EDWARD A. BOUDREAUX • Theoretical Chemistry 204
E. THEO AGARD • Medical Physics 212
KER C. THOMSON • Geophysics 215
JOHN R. BAUMGARDNER • Geophysics 223
ARTHUR JONES • Biology 241

religion and origins

- GEORGE F. HOWE • Botany 249
A.J. MONTY WHITE • Physical Chemistry 257
D.B. GOWER • Biochemistry 265
WALTER J. VEITH • Zoology 268
DANNY R. FAULKNER • Astronomy 270
EDMOND W. HOLROYD • Meteorology 277
ROBERT H. ECKEL • Medical Research 284
JACK CUOZZO • Orthodontics 288
ANDREW SNELLING • Geology 291
STEPHEN TAYLOR • Electrical Engineering 301
JOHN MORRIS • Geological Engineering 309
ELAINE KENNEDY • Geology 314
COLIN W. MITCHELL • Geography 317
STANLEY A. MUMMA • Architectural Engineering 321
EVAN JAMIESON • Hydrometallurgy 324
LARRY VARDIMAN • Meteorology 327
GEOFF DOWNES • Forestry Research 329
WAYNE FRAIR • Biology 335
SID COLE • Physical Chemistry 340
DON B. DEYOUNG • Physics 342
GEORGE S. HAWKE • Meteorology 344
KURT P. WISE • Geology 351
J.H. JOHN PEET • Chemistry 356
WERNER GITT • Information Science 363
DON BATTEN • Agricultural Science 371

Preface

At a university lecture several years ago, I heard a research scientist state that he did not believe that any scientist with a Ph.D. would advocate a literal interpretation of the six days of creation. His comment was quite similar to statements made over the years by world-renowned scientists like Stephen Jay Gould and Ernst Mayr, both of Harvard. In reply to the lecturer's doubt about credentialed scientists agreeing with the Genesis account of origins, the meeting chairman offered the names of two well-known scientists who, he said, espoused belief in the biblical account. This incident stimulated me to research this book.

Why would educated scientists still believe in creation? Why wouldn't they prefer to believe in Darwinian evolution or even theistic evolution, where an all-powerful intelligence is seen as directing the evolutionary processes? Could scientists believe that life on earth is probably less than 10,000 years old? How would they deal with the evidence from the fossil record and the ages suggested by the radioactive dating of rocks as millions and billions of years old? The essays in this book raise issues which are hotly debated among scientists and educators and they offer a different perspective on our approach to scientific education.

During the past century, the biblical story of Genesis was relegated to the status of a religious myth and it was widely held that only those uneducated in science or scientific methods would seriously believe such a myth. However, my experience in organizing this book is that there are a growing number of highly educated critically thinking scientists who have serious

doubts about evidence for Darwinian evolution and who have chosen to believe in the biblical version of creation.

In this book, 50 scientists explain their reasons for this choice. All the contributors have an earned doctorate from a state-recognized university in Australia, the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, South Africa, or Germany. They include university professors and researchers, geologists, zoologists, biologists, botanists, physicists, chemists, mathematicians, medical researchers, and engineers.

The articles in this book are not exhaustive. Space and publishing deadlines did not permit me to include contributions from many other scientists. The 50 scientists who contributed to this effort gave their personal response to the question, "Why do you believe in a literal six-day biblical creation as the origin of life on earth?" No other requirements were specified. No one was asked to write on a particular topic or from a particular perspective. However, I have arranged the final papers in two sections that allow for a developing discussion from two key perspectives. The first, *Science and Origins*, is a selection of articles that deals with the scientific critique of evolution as well as the scientific basis for creation. The second, *Religion and Origins*, presents a more philosophical approach to the question of evolution and creation. Having reviewed the discussions posed by these scientists, in the light of my own education and experience, I am convinced that a literal understanding of the Genesis account of creation is the most reasonable explanation out of all the current theories of how we came to be here.

John F. Ashton

jeremy l. walter

Mechanical Engineering



1

Dr. Walter is head of the Engineering Analysis and Design Department within the Energy Science and Power Systems Division at the Applied Research Laboratory (ARL) at Pennsylvania State University. He holds a B.S. in mechanical engineering with highest distinction, an M.S. in mechanical engineering, and a Ph.D. in mechanical engineering, all from Pennsylvania State University. He was a 1975 recipient of a prestigious National

Science Foundation Fellowship, funding graduate study at the institution of his choice. At ARL, Dr. Walter has been the leader for a number of undersea propulsion development projects for the U.S. Navy. His research involves multi-disciplinary development and testing of advanced air-independent engines and thermal power systems for various autonomous undersea vehicles.

They Can't Be Wrong, Can They?

In 1961, President John Kennedy set a national goal for the United States to land a man on the moon before the decade was over, and in the summer of 1969 Neil Armstrong made his famous “giant leap for mankind” onto the lunar soil. In the midst of severe social unrest, science and technology seemed to provide an island of stability to a nation caught in internal tension, an unpopular war in Vietnam, and the deep freeze of the Cold War. “New and

improved” became the harbinger of what was expected in technology, and harnessing the secrets of nature for man’s benefit was the engine to propel us into a hopeful future.

This milieu was the incubator for many careers in science and engineering, and so it was for that of the author. Public education introduced the sciences of the space program, but also proclaimed as fact the 4½ billion-year age of the earth and that life had gradually evolved over millions of years from a single-cell organism, supposedly formed by chance in a primeval ocean. Students were compelled to accept the evolutionary model of earth history, as is the case for most people educated in this century. The ancient writings of Genesis were relegated as outdated and allegorical, and most Christian students reconciled an immature faith in God and the Bible with a casually contrived version of the “day-age” interpretation of the creation account. The days of Genesis were assumed to somehow represent the ages or stages of cosmic development that the scientists were now beginning to understand and describe more fully in our modern world.

For multitudes today, the story is the same. The implicit authority of the classroom combines with modern technological achievements to validate the “scientific” models of origins and the great antiquity of the universe. Genesis is viewed as myth, if not fairy tale, and our concept of truth is limited to the empirically derived and subjectively interpreted. But we need to ask the fundamental question mouthed by Pilate, “What is truth?” and determine the role that science plays in the overall development of truth.

The discussion in the following paragraphs takes a look at the nature of science, and how true science does not contradict God’s inscription on stone that “in six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them” (Exod. 20:11).

What Is Science?

Many intelligent people are thoroughly convinced that science has proven the earth to be billions of years old. How can they be wrong? The misconception builds on a neglect of the basic nature of “science” and a natural desire for moral autonomy. Actually, the age of the earth can be neither proved nor disproved by science. Scientific evidence can be compiled to support one model of earth history as compared to another, but such work amounts to a feasibility study, not proof.

Science is the human enterprise of seeking to describe accurately and quantitatively the nature and processes of our universe through observation, hypothesis, and experimental validation. Certain axiomatic principles must be accepted by faith for this method to be valid, the first of which is the expectation of order in the universe. A specific corollary of the order principle is the law of causality, or “cause and effect” relationships. This law states that one cause can have many effects, but no effect can be quantitatively greater or qualitatively superior to its cause.¹ Observed effects are assumed to have causes because of this law, and are not treated as purely random or chance occurrences. The inquisitive mind will speculate on the cause of an observed effect and then seek to recreate and test the cause experimentally. That is the essence of the so-called scientific method.

Note, however, that an observation is always an action of the present, not of the past. Additionally, the observer must recognize that observations are to varying degrees indirect, through an instrument of some sort that may distort his perception. For instance, our eyes are optical instruments that receive incident light, optically focus that light on the retina, which in turn converts the image to a complex system of electrical impulses, transmitted to the brain

in six days

Why would any educated scientist with a PhD advocate a literal interpretation of the six days of creation? Why, indeed, when only one in three Americans believes "the Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word" according to a recent Gallup poll.

Science can neither prove nor disprove evolution any more than it can creation. Certainly there are no human eyewitness accounts of either. However, certain factors are present today which are capable of swaying one's beliefs one way or the other.

In this book are the testimonies of fifty men and women holding doctorates in a wide range of scientific fields who have been convinced by the evidence to believe in a literal six-day creation. For example, meet:

- The geneticist who concludes that there must have been 150 billion forerunners of "modern man" in order for the natural selection required by evolution to have taken place in the development of man. The evidence for such vast numbers of "prehistoric man" is in dire shortage.
- The orthodontist who discovered that European museum fossils of ancient man have been tampered with to adhere to evolution theories.
- The geologist who studied under the late Stephen Jay Gould and literally cut the Bible to pieces before totally rejecting evolution.

All fifty of these scientists, through faith and scientific fact, have come to the conclusion that God's Word is true and everything had its origin not so very long ago, in the beginning, *In Six Days*.

THIS IS A MUST-READ BOOK FOR ALL THINKING PEOPLE.

MB
Master
Books

A Division of New Leaf Publishing Group
www.masterbooks.net

RELIGION / Religion & Science

\$13.99 U.S.

ISBN 13: 978-0-89051-341-5

ISBN 10: 0-89051-341-4

EAN



9 780890 513415