

## Invited Paper

### Far-Out Evolution

Henry M. Morris\*

#### Abstract

Dr. Henry M. Morris, now in his eighties, is still active in defending the Christian faith. This invited article is a synopsis of a chapter, "The Wild Blue Yonder", in his new book, *Defending the Faith*. The author discusses in his usual crystal clear manner, the abject foolishness of atheistic scientists trying to account for the physical universe without the benefit of a creator. He

touches on the so-called Big Bang theory, hydrogen as the father and mother of all things physical and the even more esoteric concepts of the universe generating itself. A sense of realism prevails as one reads the author's arguments contrasted against the mathematical "fog-bound" mazes that brilliant scientists construct to free themselves from God.

#### Introduction

Evolutionary scientists and philosophers in general cannot be content with organic evolution. They must have total evolution. The very purpose of evolutionism is to explain everything naturalistically, without any supernatural injections into the process by a transcendent agent of any kind. Speculative naturalistic evolutionary processes must explain not only the origin of species, but also the origin of life itself, and even of the entire cosmos.

So we have theories of cosmic evolution, stellar evolution, galactic evolution, planetary evolution, and finally abiogenesis, all as precursors to organic evolution.

It is painfully obvious that no one has ever *observed* this kind of evolution. Those who wish to have stars evolve or galaxies evolve or life evolve from non-life are, in the very nature of the case, limited to mathematical manipulations, computer simulations, or just plain metaphysical speculation, for they can never observe any such thing happening in the real world.

The biggest question of all is that of the origin of the universe. Various theories exist, none of which can be tested, of course, but the theory in current favor is that of the Big Bang, which had to precede everything else if it ever really happened. This widely accepted theory is contrary to the laws of thermodynamics, the law of cause-and-effect, and to other scientific laws, as well as being completely contrary to the revealed Word of God. The Big Bang and all other theories of the origin of the great

blue "yonder" are wild indeed. Yet a goodly number of evangelical churches and para-church organizations are accepting them as true, and then trying to "wrest the scriptures" (II Peter 3:16) to accommodate them in their theology.

#### Evolving from Nothing to Everything

The notorious Big Bang that supposedly started our evolving cosmos was neither "big" nor a "bang." It is said simply to have evolved suddenly out of the primordial "nothing" to become an infinitesimal particle of space/time. This remarkable particle somehow contained essentially infinite energy and unlimited information which enabled it to expand rapidly into our gigantic universe with all its stars and galaxies and animals and people.

Fred Hoyle, who was deriding the whole idea while promoting his own "Steady State" concept of the universe, originated the name "Big Bang" in 1950.

But how could one really find a suitable name for something as esoteric and intangible as this mathematical toy of the cosmo-physicist? What, exactly, is meant by "quantum fluctuations of empty space," as they are saying by way of explanation? In an article intriguingly titled, "Everything for Nothing," a theoretical physicist at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Austin, Texas, notes that Alexander Vilenkin of Tufts University "proposed that the universe is created by quantum tunneling from literally nothing into the something we call the universe.

\*Henry M. Morris, Ph.D., Institute for Creation Research, P.O. Box 2667, El Cajon, CA 92021  
Received 10 April 1999; Revised 16 May 1999

Although highly speculative, these models indicate the physicists find themselves turning again to the void and fluctuations therein for their answers” (Puthoff, 1990, p. 55).

Highly speculative indeed! Astronomer Robert Oldershaw, of Dartmouth College, has some pithy comments about all this. “First, the big bang is treated as an unexplainable event without a cause. Secondly, the big bang could not explain convincingly how matter got organized into lumps (galaxies and clusters of galaxies). And thirdly, it did not predict that for the universe to be held together in the way it is, more than 90 per cent of the universe would have been in the form of some strange unknown dark form of matter” (Oldershaw, 1990, p. 59).

It does seem that science is becoming quite squishy if it has to salvage its theory of cosmic evolution by assuming that 90 per cent of all matter in the universe is invisible and unknown and strange. Oldershaw (1990, p. 59) goes on to say: “Theorists also invented the concepts of inflation and cold dark matter to augment the big bang paradigm and keep it viable, but they too have come into increasing conflict with observations. In the light of all these problems, it is astounding that the big bang hypothesis is the only cosmological model that physicists have taken seriously.”

There are other cosmological models (the steady state theory, the plasma theory, etc.), but these have even more problems, which is why most cosmologists cling to the Big Bang. Nevertheless, as one of America’s most eminent astronomers has said: “Big bang cosmology has become a bandwagon of thought that reflects faith as much as objective truth.... This situation is particularly worrisome because there are good reasons to think the big bang model is seriously flawed” (Burbridge, 1992, p. 120).

The fact is that astronomers simply do not know *how* the universe evolved, nor do they know how stars evolved, how galaxies evolved, how clusters of galaxies evolved, how anything evolved! They do have mathematical equations that purportedly describe in part how some of these *might* have evolved, but that’s a far cry from any experimental proof. It should be remembered that no one has ever actually *observed* the formation of a star or a galaxy or a universe.

In the very nature of things, this type of exercise must always be nothing but sheer speculation. Astronomer Roger Windhorst, of Arizona State University, has said concerning stellar evolution: “Nobody really understands how star formation proceeds; it’s really remarkable” (Powell, 1992, p. 30).

With respect to galactic evolution, a recent article is even entitled, “Seven Mysteries of Galaxies,” indicating how little is really known about such things. Its authors say: “Now, in the 1990s we can still say that we are only on

the verge of understanding how galaxies are born, how they work, and what roles they play in the universe at large” (Gallagher and Keppel, 1992, p. 39). Furthermore, “the process by which galaxies clump together poses a significant mystery for astronomers” (p. 41).

Lest anyone misunderstand, none of these authorities whom I have quoted are creationists in any sense of the word; they are all devout evolutionists. Nevertheless, they are honest enough to admit they do not yet have any proof.

And the sad thing about all this is that there are a number of evangelical scientists and theologians who are willing to give up the straightforward, factual, sensible Genesis record of the creation of the universe in order to accommodate this badly flawed Big Bang model of evolutionary origins. Some are even trying to convince Christians that the Big Bang is God’s work of creation, as announced in Genesis 1:1.

The leading astronomers, cosmologists, and astrophysicists harbor no such notions, of course. A few may be flirting with New Age pantheism, but not Biblical creationism. Note the words of Paul Davies of England, one of the world’s most influential astronomers: “When the Big Bang theory became popular in the 1950s, many people used it to support the belief that the universe was created by God at some specific moment in the past.... However, this sort of armchair theology is wide of the mark. The popular idea of a God who sets the universe going like a clockwork toy and then sits back to watch, was ditched by the church in the last century” (Davies, 1993, p. 4).

Sometimes, Christians refer to Davies, or Fred Hoyle, or Robert Jastrow, or some other eminent astronomer as believing in God, but their “god” is not the God of the Bible, and it is dangerous to follow them. As Davies says, it is “possible to imagine the universe coming into being from nothing entirely spontaneously. . . .” He sees “no need for an external creator” (p. 4).

Oh, but there *is* a need! Without a Creator, there is no Savior and no hope for eternity. May God help us to do all we can to tell the world there is a great God who made us for Himself and has even, through Christ, given us eternal life in Him!

There is not a fact of science anywhere to keep us from believing that: “By the word of the LORD were the heavens made, . . . and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth.... For He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast” (Psalm 33:6,9).

## In the Beginning, Hydrogen

But evolutionists have a more amazing faith. They believe that people have evolved up from the ape (or some-

thing like an ape), that apes and other mammals have evolved from reptiles, that reptiles have evolved from amphibians, amphibians from fish, fish from some unknown phylum of multicelled invertebrates, that invertebrates in all their phyla evolved from some unknown protozoan, that some other unknown protozoan evolved from complex chemicals, and that the complex chemical elements evolved from the simplest chemical element of all, namely, hydrogen.

The operative word in the above sentence is *believe*. There is no evidence for this remarkable chain of events. Apes and reptiles and vertebrates and invertebrates and chemical elements (including hydrogen) still are here in abundance, but none of them are changing into anything else. Neither are there any evolutionary transitions documented in the records of the past (despite olden tales of mermaids and centaurs), not even in the fossils which are purported to represent a billion years of earth history. This remarkable chain of events is in reality nothing but a remarkable statement of faith in the great god Hydrogen, the elemental substance that is supposed to be the father and mother of us all!

Thus, hydrogen, the simplest chemical element, is “a colorless, odorless, tasteless gas which, given ten billion years or so, produces people.” That quaint definition, originally suggested by the late creationist astronomer George Mulfinger, in a cogent summary of the faith one must exercise in order to be an evolutionist.

It was that prince of evolutionary astronomers, Harlow Shapley, longtime head of the Harvard University Observatory, who long ago pontificated that people today should rewrite the first verse of Genesis. According to him, it should be something like: “In the beginning, hydrogen created the heavens and the earth.” Modern evolutionary astronomers and cosmologists have thus ruled out the idea of a personal, omnipotent, omniscient God as Creator of the universe. A more recent scientist has put it this way:

Take some matter, heat while stirring and wait. That is the modern version of Genesis. The “fundamental” forces of gravity, electro-magnetism and the strong and weak nuclear forces are presumed to have done the rest (Scott, 1985, p. 30).

But this same writer, perhaps not suspecting that some creationist might happen to read his evaluation of this statement of faith, proceeds to make the following admission:

But how much of this neat tale is firmly established, and how much remains hopeful speculation? In truth, the mechanism of almost every major step, from chemical precursors up to the first recognizable cells, is the subject of either controversy or complete bewilderment (p. 30).

To a biased creationist such as myself, it seems that “every major step” from one degree of organization to the next higher degree is not only speculative, but also impossible—at least in any realistic sense.

The chief problem (among many) is the Second Law of Thermodynamics, which notes that everything at least *tends to go* toward disorganization—not greater organization.

Cosmologists, however, have devised various curious schemes in their attempts to circumvent the Second Law. That most prolific of all science writers, the late Isaac Asimov, assumes the initial universe was like a cosmic egg (the ancient pagan evolutionists used to think of it in some such way also). He once wrote (1981, p. 24):

The cosmic egg may be structureless (as far as we know), but it apparently represented a very orderly aggregation of matter. Its explosion represented a vast shift in the direction of disorder, and ever since, the amount of disorder in the Universe has been increasing.

Just how the cosmic egg could have no structure and yet have a high degree of order is not clear to me, but of course I am an ignorant and biased creationist. Neither is it clear how this vast shift toward disorder somehow produced all the highly ordered systems in the universe, including human beings.

One of the great successes of evolutionary cosmology is the supposed ability of the Big Bang to explain the origin of hydrogen gas, and this is always offered as one of the three “proofs” of the Big Bang (the others are the background radiation and the supposedly expanding universe—both of which, however, have also been explained by certain rival cosmologies).

But that is all. Thus we are left with hydrogen as the originator of everything else, even though we do not know how it did this. As an article of faith, we are asked simply to intone the evolutionary mantra: “In the beginning, hydrogen.”

Perhaps the saddest aspect of this whole scenario is that so many Christians are being taken in by it. For example, a currently popular evangelical scientist seems to be echoing the atheist Asimov when he defends the Big Bang and the whole system of cosmic and stellar evolution. He says:

What [Dr. Duane] Gish and others fail to recognize is that the hydrogen which forms (by God’s cause and design) one millisecond after the universe began is much more ordered and less entropic than the galaxies, stars, planets, and life-essential elements. The galaxies and stars are broken-up pieces of the primordial gas cloud. The planets and life-essential elements are the burned-up remains, i.e., ashes—of hydrogen gas. Thus, the big bang

manifests, rather than violates, the second law of thermodynamics (Ross, 1994, p. 131).

I am not making this up; that paragraph is really quoted verbatim from a recent book! He believes that the obvious conflict of this concept with the Second Law is resolved simply by the postulated heat energy in the Big Bang.

He would like for us to believe that stars are “broken-up pieces” of the primordial hydrogen and that our own living bodies with their “life-essential elements” are the “burned-up ashes” of hydrogen gas because that’s what the secular astronomers who reject the God of the Bible believe.

## Still Farther Out

However, these scientists (astronomers, astrophysicists, and cosmologists) whose professional activities focus on outer space seem to this biased creationist scientist to live in a strange wonderland of relativistic mathematics and quantum theory, which non-initiates find hard to believe. In fact, the evolutionary socialist Jeremy Rifkin (1998, p. 24) says:

Cosmologies are made up of small snippets of physical reality that have been remodeled by society into vast cosmic deceptions.

Cosmologists speak of ten dimensions instead of the familiar three-dimensional space in which “we live, and move, and have our being” (Acts 17:28). We also read about curved space, quantum fluctuations in the infinite vacuum, cosmic inflation, causeless beginnings, and other marvels from their mathematical manipulations.

But if any common purpose can be discerned in all this space research, it seems to be that of explaining the universe without God. A recent survey found that 92.5% of the leading physicists and astronomers (those in the National Academy of Science) reject the idea of a personal God altogether (Larson and Witham, 1998, p. 313).

Still, there are a few theistic astronomers who are telling us creationists that most astronomers accept the Big Bang as the act of cosmic creation recorded in Genesis 1: 1. Unfortunately, many leading evangelical Christians today, fearful of being thought anti-intellectual, are buying this notion.

Since the mid-1960s, scientifically informed theists have been ecstatic because of Big Bang cosmology. Theists believe that the best scientific evidence that God exists is the evidence that the universe began to exist in an explosion about 15 billion years ago, an explosion called the Big Bang. Theists argue that ...the cause of the universe is God. This theory hinges on the assumption that it is obviously true that whatever begins to exist has a cause (Smith, 1998, p. 35).

Most scientists have, in the past, assumed the validity of the cause-and-effect principle, that every effect must have an adequate cause. But now evolutionary cosmologists are questioning this most basic of all scientific laws.

An eminent cosmologist at the Fermi Labs “explains”:

One of the consequences of the uncertainty principle is that a region of seemingly empty space is not really empty, but is a seething froth in which every sort of fundamental particle pops in and out of empty space before annihilating with its antiparticle and disappearing—these are the so-called quantum fluctuations.... In a very real sense, quantum fluctuations would be the origin of everything we see in the universe (Kolb, 1998, pp. 42, 43).

To us outsiders, this seems like an unreal never-never land. But evolutionary astrophysicists believe it is “very real,” and that it proves the universe came into existence all by itself

The claim that the beginning of our universe has a cause conflicts with current scientific theory. The scientific theory is called the Wave Function of the universe. It has been developed in the past by Stephen Hawking, Andre Vilenkin, Alex Linde, and many others. Their theory is ... that a universe with our characteristics will come into existence without a cause (Smith, 1998, p. 35).

Probably the most eminent of this group of astrophysicists is Stephen Hawking, whose 1988 book, *A Brief History of Time*, has sold over 2.5 million copies. He has claimed that science is on the verge of developing a “theory of everything” including the origin of the universe.

The problem is that the ultimate theory envisioned by Hawking and others never materialized. Theorists seeking that theory have become lost in a fantasyland of higher-dimensional mathematics that has less and less to do with reality. The theory of everything has become a theory of nothing (Horgan, 1997, p. 39).

But, if the idea of the universe emerging naturalistically as a quantum fluctuation of nothing into something seems bizarre, there is a new theory going around now that seems even more “spaced-out” than that!

We suggest that the Universe emerged from something rather than nothing—and that something was itself... Such a thing is possible because Einstein’s general theory of relativity permits closed time-like curves—loops of time (Chown, 1998, p. 14).

This theory has been advanced by J. Richard Gott III and Li-Xin Li of Princeton University and even suggests that time travel may be possible.

Ruling out the possibility of traveling back in time has turned out to be trickier than many physicists had supposed. Two researchers have now shown that quantum effects do not necessarily pre-

vent the occurrence of loops in time, Li-Xin Li and J. Richard Gott III of Princeton University present their case in the April 6 *Physical Review Letters*... "Hence," the researchers say, "the laws of physics may allow the universe to be its own mother" (Peterson, 1998, p. 231).

Marcus Chown (1998, p. 14) comments that this theory, if true, would mean that

...it's possible that a branch of space-time could loop backwards to form the tree trunk.... Space would have been in a loop of time perpetually recreating itself.

But the observational facts with which to test such notions are very limited. One group of eminent astronomers has disparaged the entire Big Bang theory, with all its strange offshoots:

Cosmology is unique in science in that it is a very large intellectual edifice based on very few facts (Arp et al., 1990, p. 812).

Although these astronomers reject the Big Bang theory, they still believe in cosmic evolution: they are not believers in Biblical creation.

It is sad that so many brilliant space scientists are seeking to comprehend the cosmos without God. If God was not there at the beginning, neither will He be at the end, so they must try also to extrapolate its future without God.

And such a future is dreadfully dark, for the stars must eventually burn out, according to these theories, and even matter itself will disappear.

Therefore, nothing made of ordinary matter—including atoms—will last (Adams and Laughlin, 1998, p. 37).

In the beginning there may have been light, but in the end, it seems there will be nothing but darkness (Matthews, 1998, p. 30).

Not so, however, for those who have trusted the Lord Jesus Christ as their Creator and Redeemer. This created universe will continue forever. "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (Daniel 12:3).

## References

- Adams, F. C. and G. Laughlin. 1998. The future of the universe. *Sky and Telescope* 96(2):32-39.
- Arp, H., G. Burbidge, F. Hoyle, J. Narlikar and N. Wickramasinghe. 1990. The extra-galactic universe: An alternate. *Nature* 346:807-812.
- Asimov, I. 1981. *In the beginning*. Crown, New York.
- Burbidge, G. 1992. Why only one Big Bang? *Scientific American* 226(2):120.
- Chown, M. 1998. In the beginning. *New Scientist* 157(2118):14.
- Davies, P. 1993. What hath COBE wrought? *Sky and Telescope* 85(1):4-5.
- Gallagher, J. and J. Keppel. 1994. Seven mysteries of galaxies. *Astronomy* 22(3):39-45.
- Horgan, J. 1997. The Big Bang theory of science books. *New York Times Book Review* (December). p. 39.
- Kolb, R. 1998. Planting primordial seeds. *Astronomy* 26(2):38-43.
- Larson, E. J. and L. Witham. 1998. Leading scientists still reject God. *Nature* 394-:313.
- Matthews, R. 1998. To infinity and beyond. *New Scientist* 158 (2129):27-30.
- Oldershaw, R. 1990. What's wrong with the new physics? *New Scientist* 127(1748):56-59.
- Peterson, J. 1998. Evading quantum barrier to time travel. *Science News* 153:231
- Powell, C. S. 1992. A matter of timing. *Scientific American* 267(4):26-31.
- Puthoff, H. 1990. Everything for nothing. *New Scientist* 127(1727):52-55.
- Rifkin, J. 1998. Reinventing nature. *The Humanist* 58(Mar./Apr.):24.
- Ross, H. 1994. *Creation and time*. Navpress, Colorado Springs.
- Scott, A. 1985. Update on Genesis. *New Scientist* 106(1454):30-33.
- Smith, Q. 1998. Big Bang cosmology and atheism. *Free Inquiry* (Spring) p. 35.

---

Everything in life has to do with your world view. You go to the zoo either to rejoice in the Creator or to find some alternative to Him. Your help for the needy is wrapped either in the arrogance that you are godlike and can figure out every detail, or in the modesty and humility that admits even your kindness might be wrong. Your starting point, and your discoveries along the way, determine how you build and manage both your zoos and your governments—if, indeed, these days you can tell the difference.

Joel Belz in *World* (5/20/95)