Classic Reprints

Editor's Introduction: *In this issue we bring you another classic article from early issues of the* Creation Research Society Quarterly. *This article, by one of our founding members, appeared in the January, 1966 issue (volume 2, number 4) on pages 5–8. In the article, Dr. Thomas Barnes of Texas Western College (now University of Texas at El Paso) discussed a foundation for the creation model as an alternative to evolution. He argued that three fundamental laws of nature are more consistent with creation than with evolution.*

A Scientific Alternative to Evolution

Dr. Thomas C. Barnes*

Introduction

One of my colleagues, a Ph.D. in philosophy who has been reluctant to speak out publicly against evolution, privately expressed his concern. He said, "Evolution is a *dogma* and not a science." This is a very serious charge because there are a great many disciples of Darwin in the scientific community. I believe, however, that a critical analysis of the literature on evolution justifies his statement.

A scientific fallacy in evolution may be seen by noting that its whole superstructure is built upon *extralogical* considerations. Extralogical considerations are the *extensions* of a proposition beyond the scope of true logic. *In evolution, an extralogical error occurs when phenomena with observable limits are cited as evidence in support of an unbounded proposition.*

A recent speaker on our campus defined evolution as "change." He then said, "Change is fact; therefore evolution is fact." It soon became evident that the evolution he adheres to is far more than an observable change. He committed the extralogical error of defining evolution as observable and employing it as an unlimited process. Fabrications upon that kind of premise are nothing more than figments of imagination.

The failure to give an adequate definition of evolution is a common failing among evolutionists; definitions implying observables are employed to frame speculative propositions. It is not uncommon, however, to find these same adherents of evolution charging that the remaining scientific community ignores the observable evidence.

No scientist questions the validity of *variety, change, and development within groups of living things*. The works of Luther Burbank, Walter Lammerts, and others in California have made it obvious that it is possible to breed new forms differing from parent forms. But it is also observable that this type of breeding is limited and invariably shows bounds beyond which it cannot go. One would say in mathematics that the curves of these real processes have asymptotes which never cross finite boundaries. Evolutionists ignore those asymptotes.

After more than a hundred years of research in biology, evolution remains without a solid foundation. Dr. G. A. Kerkut (1960, p. 157) states it this way: "The evidence that supports it [general evolution] is not sufficiently strong to allow us to consider it anything more than a working hypothesis."

It is amazing that after all these decades of toil by scientists in numerous disciplines that evolution is still a mere hypothesis and not a law!

By now it should be clear that the evolutionary hypothesis is neither

* Dr. Thomas C. Barnes, Texas Western College, El Paso, Texas

necessary nor sufficient. There are scientific laws that are much more successful in specifying the processes of nature. These laws can be checked by experiment and may profitably be employed as guides to invention and progress.

I therefore invite your attention to a *scientific alternative to evolution*, an alternative that has present processes that follow the basic laws of science.

Three Basic Laws

Let us consider three of the great laws of science *which are included in the present processes of the alternative to evolution*. These laws are the *first law of thermodynamics*, the *law of biogenesis*, and the *second law of thermodynamics*.

The first law of thermodynamics is also known as the law of conservation of mass-energy. It states that energy may have different forms (including mass) and that it is possible to change from one form to another, but the total energy remains constant.

The law of biogenesis states that *life comes from life*. Every living organism came from some other living organism.

The second law of thermodynamics states that there is an irreversible tendency for processes in a self-contained system to go toward lower order. This means an increase in randomness, disorder, and decay if the whole system is taken into account. That is to say, systems run downhill, not uphill. They don't wind themselves up; they tend to run down. Biologist Harold Blum (Blum, 1962, p. 5) says, "One way of stating this law is to say that all real processes tend to go toward a condition of greater probability."

Please remember his statement of this law (that real processes tend to go toward a condition of greater probability) because he is an evolutionist and we shall see later he points out the improbability of major evolutionary events.

Validity of the Three Basic Laws

No laws of science are more firmly established than these three laws. They hold priority over all other laws of science. There are no known violations of these laws.

There was a 300-year debate on the law of biogenesis. During this period, maggots were claimed to be products of *spontaneous generation* of life, but that was disapproved. Then, after the invention of the microscope, microorganisms were claimed to be evidence of spontaneous generation of life. In a series of masterful experiments, Louis Pasteur showed that there is no such thing as spontaneous generation of life.

Pasteur's sealed vessels, which contain a yeast infusion and pure air from the top of the Alps, can be seen even now in the Pasteur Institute Archives in Paris as a testimonial to that conclusion. After more than a century, no life has appeared out of the inanimate. The law of biogenesis is accepted today by all reputable scientists.

Again, I quote the aforementioned Dr. Blum in regard to the validity of the second law of thermodynamics. He states (Blum, 1962, p. 6): "The Second Law is in a sense an empirical and pragmatic law which owes its acceptance to the fact that it has worked whenever it has been put to test."

Dr. Blum is one of the most scholarly evolutionists, and as you see, he agrees that there are no known violations of this law.

How do Evolutionists Handle These Three Laws (Particularly the Last Two)?

1. They are a real problem to an evolutionist.
2. Most evolutionists evade the critical issues exposed by these laws.
3. Some admit that evolution violates some phase of these laws.
4. Others make rhetorical claims of consistency.

The following admission by Professor George Wald (Wald, 1962, p. 187) illustrates the evasive rhetoric of evolutionists:

> As for spontaneous generation, it continued to find acceptance until finally disposed of by the work of Louis Pasteur—it is a curious thing that until quite recently professors of biology habitually told this story as part of their introduction of students to biology. They would finish this account glowing with the conviction that they had given a telling demonstration of the overthrow of a mystical notion by clean, scientific experimentation. Their students were usually so bemused as to forget to ask the professor how he accounted for the origin of life. This would have been an embarrassing question, because there are *only two possibilities: Either life arose by spontaneous generation, which the professor had just refuted: or it arose by supernatural creation, which he probably regarded as antiscientific*.
>
> For my part, I think the only tenable scientific view is that life originally *did* arise by spontaneous generation. What the history we have just reviewed demonstrated is that spontaneous generation no longer occurs. (Emphasis added)

So you see, he only uses rhetoric—he has no scientific evidence to support his opinion. The law of biogenesis stands in his way.

Dr. Blum attempts to show that evolution is consistent with this law, but when he gets down to cases such as the origin of life, he sees real trouble. I shall quote two of his statements (Blum, 1962, p. 170) to illustrate:

> I do not see, for example, how proteins could have leapt suddenly into being. Yet both Heterotrophic and Autotrophic Metabolism are, in

> modern organisms, strictly dependent upon the existence of proteins in the form of catalysts. The riddle seems to be: *How, when no life existed, did substances come into being which today are absolutely essential to living systems yet which can only be formed by those systems?* It seems begging the question to suggest that first protein molecules were formed by some more primitive 'nonprotein living system,' for it still remains to define and account for the origin of that system.

After mentioning an extension of Oparin's hypothesis by Horowitz, he further states:

> I must point out that Horowitz's hypothesis still leaves a seemingly unbridged gap in the story of the origin of life, for does not the invoking of natural selection postulate the prior existence of that for which the origin is sought? Natural selection itself seems only possible in systems having a complexity corresponding to at least that of the proteins. . . . Who would venture much more than to suggest that time's arrow played an important role? (Blum, 1962, p. 171)

By time's arrow he means the second law of thermodynamics, which can point in only one direction—and as we previously noted, Blum himself specifies that direction as the direction of greater probability.

But it should be obvious that evolutionists will gain nothing by invoking the second law because it actually points downhill, not uphill—toward the probable, not toward the improbable.

I maintain that Blum is attempting to reverse the direction of time's arrow. Blum is a scholar, and I do not mean to imply dishonesty. He continually admits his perplexing difficulty. For example, he states in an addendum to chapter X of his book (Blum, 1962, p. 178A):

> The more we study living systems the more we marvel at their beautifully ordered complexity; and we may estimate that the forming of such system (or even much simpler ones) by a single chance act would have an improbability of the order of a miracle, that could have happened only once in our universe.

Let me summarize this point. Dr. Harold Blum has failed to account for evolutionary processes, including the origin of life by means of the second law of thermodynamics. A careful reading of his book will reveal that he really admits that he hasn't proved the case. He stated that second law processes go irreversibly in the direction of greater probability. Then he identified some of the major evolutionary events as extremely improbable. As further example he states that the probability of evolution of the human brain is so small that it "occurred" only once. But if it is that improbable, surely the second law of thermodynamics shows that it could not happen while that law is valid.

Constraints Imposed by the Three Laws

It is well to enumerate the constraints that are imposed by these laws. They are as follows:

1. *Matter and Energy cannot be created, while* the first law of thermodynamics is valid.
2. *Life cannot be created out of the inanimate, while* the law of biogenesis is valid.
3. *An increase in ordered-complexity cannot happen* (in a self-acting system), w*hile* the second law of thermodynamics is valid.

These constraints are not mysterious. They are observable, and common sense tells us to expect them. They remind us that you cannot get something for nothing. Extralogical considerations cannot override the cold facts of nature. Nature's basic laws spell out these specific constraints.

Mankind has always had its would-be inventors of perpetual motion machines, but each one of them has had to eventually face fact: The observable constraint of the first law of thermodynamics.

Mankind has always had its advocates of spontaneous generation, and today there are those who make bold claims that scientists will fabricate life itself within the next ten years. May I recommend that you not buy any stock in their proposed life factory. They must face fact: the observable constraint of the law of biogenesis.

The validity of these three laws is observable beyond any doubt today. One might ask, then, how anything got started if these constraints prevent such beginnings. That leads us to inquire about the time sequence of the origin of these laws.

Logical Time Sequence of the Laws

A logical time sequence of the origin of these laws is self-evident. It is as follows:

1. *The first law of thermodynamics began after the origin of mass and energy.*
2. *The law of biogenesis began after the origin of life.*
3. *The second law of thermodynamics began after the existence of a fully wound-up system with living maturity.*

It is foolish for one to claim that our present laws can be employed to explain the beginnings of the physical universe, or living matter, or man himself. These laws specify their own limitations and make it obvious that their origins are indeterminant by science *per se*.

It is difficult for me to see how one can question the logic of the above-mentioned time sequence of the beginnings

of these laws. That sequence must hold for the laws to be self-consistent.

Evolutionists make the mistake of trying to invoke present natural phenomena to "explain" the winding-up processes and the beginning of life and even man himself.

There is another interesting inconsistency in evolutionary logic. Evolutionists try to date a hypothetical winding-up process by a running-down radioactive clock. Times's arrow cannot point in *both* directions.

The question then arises, Is there a scientific alternative to evolution that is consistent with the time sequence of the origin of these laws?

Special Creation Makes the Time Sequence of These Three Laws Consistent

It is clear that the processes involved in any of these origins lies outside the realm of science. Indeterminancy principles are commonplace in science; true scientists always acknowledge the limitations of science. Postulates at any beginning stage are of necessity arbitrary ones. There is nothing unscientific, then, about postulating special creation for the beginnings. The scientific virtue lies in the consistency that can be shown to follow after we get into the time frame represented by present laws.

The postulates of special creation make the time sequence of the three laws consistent. That time sequence runs as follows:

1. The creation of the physical universe preceded the first law of thermodynamics.
2. The creation of life preceded the law of biogenesis.
3. A fully wound-up biophysical world preceded the second law of thermodynamics.

All of the present observable processes are consistent with that type of beginning. This makes a strong scientific base. Everything runs toward the probable.

Perspective of This Alternative to Evolution

The perspective of this alternative to evolution is as follows:

1. *The domain in which science is indeterminant is satisfied by special creation*. To be sure, that is miraculous, but any other beginning must lie in the realm of metaphysics. There is certainly no more logic in beginning with the metaphysical hypotheses of a "materialist" than to begin with the postulate of a God of creation. This is particularly true when one realizes that present scientific processes are more consistent with a system that begins with special creation.
2. *Present processes obey the established laws of science*. These processes behave as if a full-blown system was initiated, a system such as provided by special creation. No new matter and energy are being created nor are they needed. Life does come from life. There is a need for conservation because of the tendency for processes to go toward disorder and decay.

The Fruits of This Alternative to Evolution

This alternative to evolution leads to *progress with confidence* because it deals with present processes that are founded on the *laws of science*. There is no danger of being hoodwinked by artifacts. Whereas evolution is based on extralogical considerations that can only be sup ported by unreliable evidence. For example, the Piltdown Man was exhibited in the British Mu seum as basic evidence of evolution. But the famous Piltdown Man was really the fabrication of a clever trickster who had fitted an ape's jaw to a chemically aged human cranium. Yet it took 45 years to expose this fraud.

The *realistic laws of genetics* can be credited to this alternative. They give no comfort to total evolution. Dr. Walter Lammerts (1961) states that evolutionists are misled in plant breeding because they are accustomed to thinking that immense time may get results, whereas the process can be accomplished in a limited number of generations or not at all.

Finally, preventive medicine developed out of the alternative to evolution. In reality, Louis Pasteur laid the foundation of preventive medicine when he established the law of biogenesis by empirical means. He demonstrated that bacteria come from other bacteria and that bacteria pass from one individual to another. His effort to arrest this inexorable downgrading process in living systems can be attributed in part to the importance he placed on the *tendency toward disorder*, that is to say, the principle embodied in the second law of thermodynamics.

This alternative to evolution has always been sound, and it will continue to produce fruit because it is based upon a foundation that will not fail.

References

Kerkut, G.A. 1960. *Implications of Evolution*. Pergamon Press, New York, NY.

Blum, Harold. 1962. *Time's Arrow and Evolution*. Torchbook Edition, Harper and Brothers, New York, NY.

Wald, George. 1962. *Frontiers of Modern Biology in Theories of Origin of Life*. Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, NY.

Lammerts, W.E. 1961. Newton-induced variation of roses. *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation*, March, 1961.