

SUPERIORITY OF SCIENTIFIC APPROACH THAT ACCEPTS ITS LIMITATIONS AND MAKES USE OF THE SCRIPTURES

THOMAS G. BARNES, Director
Schellenger Research Laboratory
Texas Western College

There is no means by which science, per se, can determine with certainty how matter and energy or living things came about. From a strictly scientific point of view their beginnings are indeterminate. This *principle of indeterminate inception* is comparable to the uncertainty principle which plays such a fundamental role in quantum mechanics. It points out the futility of scientific efforts to provide an absolute solution to the problem of the beginnings.

The principle of indeterminate inception rests on the premise that the beginnings must have taken place outside the domain of the two most inclusive laws of science, namely the first and second laws of thermodynamic, because those laws renounce anything other than a full-blown system and its irreversible transitions toward a lower-ordered system.

After one recognizes the limitations imposed on science in regard to absolute knowledge of the beginnings, he is in a better position to weigh the relative merits of the Scriptural account of origins as opposed to evolutionary theories.

If one accepts the Biblical record of creation with "apparent age," and acknowledges that it took place by God's special means which are indeterminate and by means which are perhaps nonexistent now, he may then gain insight into subsequent phenomena by applying laws which can be checked by experiment.

The evolutionist is not so fortunate. He cannot employ the experimental technique to check evolutionary theories. Theodosius Dobzhansky in his article *On Methods of Evolutionary Biology and Anthropology*, *American Scientist*, Vol. 45, December 1957, p. 388 states "These evolutionary happenings are unique, unrepeatable, and irreversible. It is as impossible to turn a land vertebrate into a

fish as it is to effect the reverse transformation. The applicability of the experimental method to the study of such unique historical processes is severely restricted before all else by the time intervals involved, which far exceed the lifetime of any human experimenter."

The only evidence for evolution carrying any real weight is that afforded by the fossil record and its classification with the geologic time table. In their book, "The Genesis Flood," *Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.*, 1961, Drs. Henry M. Morris and John C. Whitcomb, Jr. show with well documented arguments that the uniformitarian theory upon which this is based is fraught with difficulties. The authors then present a consistent framework based upon a harmonious relationship between science and a literal interpretation of Genesis which could displace the uniformitarian-evolutionary concepts of geology and biology. The position of the authors is stronger than that of the widely accepted uniformitarian-evolutionary position in two respects: It requires fewer amendments to explain known scientific data. It makes use of the first and second laws of thermodynamics — a generalization of those important laws.

In conclusion: There are great weaknesses in the uniformitarian-evolutionary theories. They cannot give a positive insight into the beginnings because this is indeterminate scientifically. They run counter to the greatest laws of science. The experimental method cannot be employed to check those theories. The theories themselves require too many amendments to check with known scientific data.

The scientist who is willing to accept the Scriptures at face value is then able to discard the uniformitarian-evolutionary concepts and finds that science and Scripture blend into a harmonious relationship that opens new avenues to both life and science.