

Notes on Creation Versus Evolution

Yesterday evening on 790 AM, under the topic "Evolution - Fact or Fiction?" I accompanied our foremost fighter against evolution here in Barbados, Roger Marshall, in a live call-in program (Roger did most of the talking and he was VERY GOOD!). We were on air for over an hour answering questions from callers (this was not too difficult since all the callers were supportive of the Genesis 1 account of Creation!)

Re my input, I quoted Darwin's own confession in his book "The Origin of Species" re the lack of transitional fossils being the most serious objection (and it is not just a serious, but a FATAL objection!) to the theory of evolution. Roger more than backed up this point. For further info check out the Institute for Creation Research icr.org or creationevidence.org websites.

Please note: if we believe man evolved from apes, this does away with Adam and Eve (their creation is supported by the words of Jesus Himself in Matt 19:4) and worse of all this does away with the fall of man and his need for a Saviour. Science has recently finally come around to acknowledging that the evidence overwhelmingly shows (e.g. the galactic red-shift of starlight, the cosmic background microwave radiation) that the universe has been expanding and hence had a beginning (as in Genesis 1:1) - the universe is running down both according to the third law of Thermodynamics and Ps 102:25-27. Isaiah 40:22 shows the earth is a sphere before scientists knew or believed it. Job 26:7 says God hangs the earth upon nothing, written when men still believed in a flat earth and pillars. In short, science is always playing "catch-up" with the Bible; e.g. the advanced nature of the sanitary laws of Moses in Lev 11, 13, 15 and Deut 23, and the importance of blood to life - Lev 17:11. There is also a mountain of physical evidence for a young (less than 10, 000 years) old earth, fully in accordance with Genesis. However, the most serious objection to the Genesis account is the apparent age of the stars, based on current measuring techniques re their distance from us and the apparent limitation on the speed of light reaching us from them. Several explanations for this have been put forward by Christians over the last century, viz:

1. The "Gap Theory" - that there is a big time gap between Genesis 1 and 2, during which time the angels were created and Lucifer fell.

2. The “mature” or “created-in-transit” hypothesis that the universe was created to look old.
3. The Moon-Spencer theories (Parry Moon and Domina Spencer were two brilliant professors in the area of electromagnetism, married, the husband has since died) - (a) light travels in circles, not straight lines, so that most of the stars seen (10 to the 26th power by latest calculations!) are just a repetition of much fewer stars within a small universe; (b) based on the idea that the geometry of the universe is non-Euclidean, light can take a shortcut in its path to reach us.
4. The Setterfield speed of light decay theory - first proposed by Paul Steidl in 1979, and popularized in the 1980’s by Barry Setterfield, this theory proposes that the speed of light has been greatly decaying with time so that, by the theory of relativity, a “day” in the past was the equivalent of millions of our current years.

Before going on to my favourite theory (5), I should mention that I am omitting lesser theories which are frowned on even by creationist scientists (e.g. the Camping Theory, which proposes that the universe is only a few light years across and that current methods of measuring it are in error - there seems to be general agreement that this idea is false). All of the above theories mentioned so far have merit and may indeed all be true to some degree, but all appear non-satisfactory. (1) is a compromise with evolution; (2) means we must believe that exploding stars witnessed now that are thousands of light years away in fact never existed; (3a) apparently contradicts scripture which indicates that the stars are nigh infinite in number (see Gen 15:5, Jer 31:37, and Jer 33:22) although the stars do appear to be finite in number since God has a name for every star (Ps 147:4); (3b) is possibly true but simply hard to believe; (4) has some statistical evidence to support it re the measured values of the speed of light over the last few hundred years, but the evidence is very inconclusive especially given the fact that old methods of measuring the speed of light were not as accurate as those used today.

We come to my favourite (and not so well-known) theory, proposed recently by a Dr. Russell Humphreys in his book *Starlight and Time, solving the puzzle of distant starlight in a young universe*. To really understand the theory, one needs a fairly good grasp of Einstein’s equations of General

relativity (which go beyond those of Special Relativity), which is supported to date by experimental observations. I will take the liberty of simplifying it.

Basically, gravity can affect both light and time. A clock on the earth's surface for example, ticks at a different rate to one at a higher altitude, and a mass can deflect that path of a light ray that passes close by. Taken to extremes, in a so-called "black hole", a very high gravitational field can stop light from escaping its pull and at the so-called 'event horizon' of such a hole (at its edge) time stands still relative to an observer outside the hole. The opposite of such a black hole is a "white hole" that matter is forced to escape from; since we know the universe either is or has been expanding, we can theorise that it expanded from a white hole. To cut a very long story short, it is possible that a clock on day 4 of creation would read a day at the earth's surface, but millions of years in the cosmos. Hence Adam would look up in the sky when created on day 6 and see the stars.

This theory (5) is the only theory (to me) that really fits both the scriptures and modern science. Its real beauty lies in the fact that it would also explain why earth appears to be (and probably is) at the center of the universe - as evidenced by the fact that there is roughly the same density of stars around us wherever we look, and also by the cosmic uniform microwave radiation we witness.

This last point is worth a digression. In 1965 two American physicists, Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson, discovered background microwave radiation in the universe which is the same no matter which direction you point your receiver, to an accuracy of 1 part in 100,000 (they later won a Nobel Prize for their discovery). This radiation is the same day and night all year round, even though the earth is rotating on its axis and orbiting around the sun - hence it comes from beyond the Solar system and our Milky Way galaxy; and since it appears the same in different directions, it means the universe is the same also in every direction from us, if only on a large scale. Since we also observe, on the macro scale, all other galaxies to be moving away from us (the galactic red-shift of light wavelengths effect) the logical conclusion is that we are at the center of the universe. Scientists in general do not believe this however, saying it is more "logical" to believe that every point in the universe will exhibit the property of appearing to be at the center.

Coming back to the point, the Humphrey model assumes that the universe expanded outwards from earth, and leaves earth in the center of the universe,

thus explaining the uniform background microwave radiation result while simultaneously solving the 1 creation day on earth versus millions of years of starlight time dilation dilemma.

Before closing, two more things are worth pointing out. The first is that several verses in the Old Testament indicate that the universe was expanded (or is being expanded) by God, speaking of God spreading out or stretching out the heavens (Job 9:8, 37:18; Psalms 104:2; Isaiah 40:22, 42:5, 44:24, 45:12, 51:13; Jeremiah 10:12, 51:15; Zechariah 12:1). The second is that the idea of an “ether” like substance pervading space is under review by scientists - this concept was thrown away in the last century but Job 37:18 may mean it exists - I will avoid the temptation to digress on this topic! Suffice to say that, as mentioned earlier, science is still playing “catch-up” with the Bible, and we can trust God’s inspired Holy Word!

May God bless you all richly.
PC