

- <sup>7</sup>Coleman, A. P. 1929. Ice ages ancient and recent. Macmillan, New York, p. 246.  
<sup>8</sup>Flint, R. F. 1971. Glacial and Quaternary geology. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, p. 803.  
<sup>9</sup>Howorth, Sir Henry H. 1905. *Op. cit.*, p. xxxvii.  
<sup>10</sup>Flint, R. F. *Op. cit.*, p. 43.  
<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 110.  
<sup>12</sup>Howorth, Sir Henry H. 1905. *Op. cit.*, p. 383.  
<sup>13</sup>Flint, R. F. *Op. cit.*, p. 111.  
<sup>14</sup>Howorth, Sir Henry H. 1905. *Op. cit.*, Volume 2 p. 351.  
<sup>15</sup>*Ibid.*, Volume 1, pp. 404-405.  
<sup>16</sup>Fairchild, H. L. 1906. Drumlin structure and origin, *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America*, 17, pp. 705-706.

- <sup>17</sup>Miller, J. W., Jr. 1972. Variations in New York drumlins, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 62(3): 418-423.  
<sup>18</sup>Howorth, Sir Henry H. 1905. *Op. cit.*, Volume 1, p. xxxviii.  
<sup>19</sup>Upham, W. 1892. Conditions of accumulation of drumlins, *American Geologist*, 10(6): 339-362. (See especially p. 340)  
<sup>20</sup>Grovenor, C. P. 1953. The origin of drumlins, *American Journal of Science*, 251(9): 674-681. (See especially p. 680)  
<sup>21</sup>Howorth, Sir Henry H. 1905. *Op. cit.*, Volume 2, pp. 344-345.  
<sup>22</sup>Reineck, H. E., and I. B. Singh. 1973. Depositional sedimentary environments. Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, p. 181.  
<sup>23</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 172.  
<sup>24</sup>Flint, R. F. *Op. cit.*, p. 218.  
<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 770-771.

## A CREATION MODEL FOR NATURAL PROCESSES

EMMETT L. WILLIAMS †

*The author here proposes a creationist model for natural processes. In summary: natural processes act to conserve or to degenerate. Improvement by spontaneous natural processes acting without intelligent direction is impossible. Nature could be viewed as a battleground for the struggle between processes of conservation and of degeneration. It is necessary to be careful in studying these; for processes of conservation are often mistaken for improvement.*

### I. Types of Natural Processes

An irreducible classification of natural processes\* would include three types:

1. Improvement processes—things get better and become more complex
2. Conservation processes—things stay the same
3. Degeneration processes—things get worse, fall apart, and disorder

Assuming all natural processes can be placed into one or two of the above categories,\*\* a logical scientific question to ask is, "Are all of these types of processes possible?" It has been ascertained particularly in the science of thermodynamics that categories 2 and 3 are definitely possible and observable. The interested reader should consult the papers listed in References 1-4 for a technical exposition of the first and second laws of thermodynamics as related to natural processes.

Supposed evolutionary processes fall into category 1. They are impossible and unobservable. This paper is not primarily intended to be a polemic against the philosophy of evolutionary progress.\*\*\* The bibliography in Reference 1 may be consulted for such an argument.

### II. Evolution as History

Many evolutionists admit that the so-called natural process of evolution is not going on now. It occurred supposedly once in the far past, but being irreversible it cannot now be demonstrated, for it is history. Obviously such an imagined sequence of steps required by evolutionary philosophy (molecules-to-man) cannot fall within the pale of science.

History cannot be subjected to scientific investigation for the reason that the *exact* condition of an event cannot be duplicated. The arrow of time, among other things, prevents this. Another requirement of the scientific method, repeatability, cannot be satisfied by historical events. Evolution, therefore, is unscientific.

Many evolutionists are aware of this limitation of their philosophy. Some evolutionary scientists are trying through research to outline the *supposed* conditions under with evo-

lution, particularly chemical evolution, could have occurred. Any forced improvement processes generated by such experiments are automatically rejected by creationists because they are not spontaneous, are conducted under artificial conditions, are carefully guided by intelligence, and have no necessary relationship to any possible primeval natural condition.<sup>6</sup>

Even if a logical sequence of painfully sensitive improvement processes from molecules-to-men could be developed by scientists, no one could guarantee that it has ever occurred; thus it would not pass the test of observation.

### III. Creation as History

The creationist accepts the creation account in Genesis 1 and 2 as historical fact. It is obvious that the creation account, like evolution, cannot be subjected to scientific investigation. It offers, moreover an additional difficulty to an investigator: it is supernatural.\*\*\*\* Supernatural events are beyond scientific investigation.<sup>7</sup>

The physical creation at the end of the six-day creative period was in a state of perfection as deduced from Genesis 1:31—"and God saw everything that He had made and it was very good." Perfection is characteristic of everything done by the perfect, holy God, Whose personality is revealed in Scripture. Immediately after the creative period no improvement process would be possible since nature was in a state of perfection. Thus improvement processes have no place in a creationist model.

\*A natural process is defined as a spontaneous change occurring in nature in a sequence of steps over a period of time.

\*\*A natural process possibly could be a combination of categories, such as 1 and 2, or 2 and 3, but not 1 and 3.

\*\*\*Natural evolution fits into the general philosophy of progress that is deeply ingrained in human thought and can be traced very easily back to Greek thought. Consider this comment on Aristotle's metaphysical theory.

Everything in the cosmos, from stones, animals, and people up to heavenly bodies, goes through its natural process of change and development in order to approach the perfection, the immutability, of the Unmoved Mover.<sup>5</sup>

\*\*\*\*However as Dr. John N. Moore has pointed out since molecules-to-man evolution cannot thrive on strictly natural processes, evolutionists must appeal to *supranatural* processes for the improvement they imagine.

†Emmett L. Williams, Ph.D., teaches at Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina 29614.

#### IV. Which Philosophy?

Neither the creation nor the evolutionary philosophies can be subjected to any kind of scientific verification. Yet they form entirely different frameworks for the facts of science. Which philosophy is superior? Or putting the question in another way: into which model do the facts of science best fit?

In the discussion of natural processes the evolutionary model allows for categories 1, 2, and 3. The creation model allows for only categories 2 and 3. Since improvement processes have not been observed, the creation model is more scientific than the evolutionary model, which demands molecules-to-man improvement.

The creationist claims scientific superiority for his model on this and many other points. The evolutionists may claim that the creation model cannot be tested scientifically (ignoring the fact that his model has the identical defect). The creationist must answer yes to this charge; however he can simulate conditions that he feels may have existed in the past and conduct experiments to verify or disprove such claims.

For instance, one aspect of the creationist model is the rapid formation of stalagmites and stalactites. Experiments are being conducted at Bob Jones University to find the conditions that would allow for such rapid formation. Then these conditions must be evaluated in the light of expected natural conditions as forecast from the model. Of course, the model may undergo modification as the test results dictate. The creationist model offers many research opportunities.

#### V. The Creationist Model and Conservation Processes

A. Suggested Origin of Conservation Processes—At the end of the six days of creation a fully-functioning, finished physical universe existed. One might ask how did the Creator intend to insure the continuance of His creation? Each day or at certain chosen times God Himself could have appeared in His physical universe and personally attended to it to guarantee that it would operate properly. Or He could have had angels do the janitorial work.

Or, He could have set in motion certain physical, chemical, and biological processes to insure the proper continuance of His physical creation. The author suggests the latter possibility as the origin of conservation processes. God ordained them to conserve, maintain, or preserve His creation.

B. Purpose of Conservation Processes—Following the framework of the previous suggestion, conservation processes are the means employed to insure the continuance of the created order.

C. Conservation Processes and Living Organisms—God commanded many living organisms to multiply and fill the earth. This reproduction is after its kind (the phrase “after its kind” is found in Genesis 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25 in the creation account). Creationists have not been and may not be able to determine the extent of the kind.<sup>8-10</sup> But whatever the kind, it was to reproduce itself. In other words, living organisms were to be *preserved* on the earth through reproduction.

As trite as it may sound, reproduction guarantees conservation of kind. Reproduction, therefore, is a conservation process. Also many maintenance and repair processes in living organisms can be considered conservation processes. These operate so that organisms can continue to reproduce and fill the earth.

As a means of preserving original created order, growth is no more than a conservation process. Many organisms grow to maturity to reproduce to conserve the kind. Also God created fully-mature organisms when He created the earth (creation with apparent age).<sup>11</sup> Thus during growth to maturity the organism is simply replicating in limited degree the original created order. As the number of organisms increases, the *quantity* of order increases but not the *quality*. Growth, incorrectly, is considered an ordering process by many evolutionists.<sup>12</sup>

D. Conservation Processes and Reproducibility—Conservation of energy, momentum, etc., form a theoretical foundation for much of physics. Likewise conservation of mass forms a foundation for most of chemistry. Scientific conservation laws are laws of prohibition.<sup>13</sup> It is theoretically possible for anything to happen that is not counter to conservation laws.

Conservation laws depend on certain symmetry properties of the physical universe. For instance, conservation of energy depends upon the symmetry of time. That is, energy can be conserved regardless of when an experiment is performed as long as the experimental conditions are identical. Time is not a variable affecting the outcome of a physical event conducted under identical conditions. If hydrogen gas had been reacted with oxygen gas to form water in 1575, this reaction ( $2\text{H}_2 + \text{O}_2 \xrightarrow{\text{spark}} 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ) would have occurred the same way as in 1675, 1775, 1875, and 1975. Reproducibility is a prime requirement of scientific work.

The author calls this repeatability “conservation of event” for want of better terminology. Four grams of hydrogen combined with 32 grams of oxygen to form water vapor [ $2\text{H}_2(\text{g}) + \text{O}_2(\text{g}) \longrightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O}(\text{g})$ ] will always yield about 58 kcal. of heat energy. Oak trees will bear acorns which will grow into oak trees which will bear acorns which will grow into oak trees. Dogs will have puppies which will grow into dogs. Humans will have babies which will grow into adults. The same thing repeats over and over again.

As the consequence of an orderly operating universe, reproducibility is indirect evidence that an intelligent Being created the universe. It is also a teleological circumstance. Symmetry properties and conservation laws (scientific statement of conservation processes) imply design.<sup>14</sup>

#### Examples of Conservation Laws and Symmetry

Conservation Law	Symmetry in Nature
energy	translations in time
linear momentum	translations in space
angular momentum	rotations in space

#### VI. The Creationist Model and Degeneration Processes

Another type of process observed in nature is degeneration. Things tend to fall apart, living organisms die and decay, and there is a continual drift toward disorder.

When did such a principle become operative in the physical universe? No one can be sure. The Bible is silent, and scientists offer no answers. Any suggested solution is purely conjectural. The author *assumes* that degeneration processes originated at the Fall and unidirectionality in natural processes existed before the Fall.\*

\*There has been considerable discussion<sup>15</sup> in past *CRS Quarterly* about when the second law of thermodynamics came into operation. To clarify the argument, Harold Armstrong<sup>16</sup> suggested that any discussion of the second law should be compartmentalized. Statements of the second law<sup>16,17</sup> fall into two categories, those dealing with the unidirectionality of natural processes and those dealing with degeneration (the tendency toward disorder).

Much of this interpretation depends upon the passage "and God saw everything He had made and it was very good" in Genesis 1:31. A state of natural perfection existed with no degeneration—every process operating at 100% efficiency—and with no death in the animal kingdom.

Such a world staggers the mental processes of anyone living in our present world. It is incomprehensible. With the introduction of degeneration processes, nature did not "run" as smoothly. Conservation processes attempt to preserve the created order. However degeneration processes operate countercurrent to any conservation. The net result of degeneration is destruction of order.

### VII. The Interrelation of Conservation and Degeneration Processes

A natural "war" ensues in nature, conservation vs. degeneration. Created order is "eroded" by degeneration processes. Conservation processes, however, continually operate to "hold back" degeneration and in many cases may actually overcome the effects of degeneration processes for awhile.

An example will be given to illustrate the interplay of the processes. Lammerts and Howe<sup>18,19</sup> recently performed some excellent plant succession studies on wildflowers in California. In good years when there was proper rainfall, suitable temperatures, and generally good growing conditions (conservation processes operating efficiently and/or favored by natural conditions), the wildflowers put on a "good show" with many colors per variety, ruffled flowers, lush foliage, etc.

In bad years when there were unfavorable growing conditions (degeneration processes prevailing), the wild flowers were stunted: the blossoms were of the usual color per variety and had no ruffled flowers and less foliage, and many varieties became extinct.

Conservation processes operate more efficiently under conditions suitable to living organisms. Degeneration processes prevail under conditions unsuitable to living organisms, causing them to suffer, die and even become extinct.

What evolutionists attribute to improvement processes is in actuality the result of conservation processes overriding degeneration. The natural changes they would be prone to consider as evolutionary are in reality the result of the interplay of conservation and degeneration processes, by means of which the organism either degenerates or appears to improve. Any apparent improvement would have to come through genetic recombination or change similar to that observed by Lammerts and Howe.

Which organisms survive? Those that are able to utilize the conservation processes available to them. Those that cannot utilize them cannot cope with the degeneration processes and consequently die out. Struggle does not improve organisms. The less the struggle, the more improved the organism. Struggle weakens organisms (as Lammerts and Howe have shown).

Evolutionists often confront creationists with the following argument. If degeneration processes are so important in the universe, why hasn't everything collapsed into a state of total disorder? This is an excellent question considering the emphasis put on degeneration processes by creationists. The answer is that degeneration processes do not have full sway in the universe. They are opposed by conservation processes. This writer feels that conservation processes are by far the stronger of the two.

†Many writers try to separate the concepts of progress in history and naturalistic evolution. This writer considers them as two manifestations of a single idea.

It is true that even conservation processes are inefficient. This inefficiency results in a slow deterioration of living organisms. The final result is death for the individual organism. Over a period of time the kinds themselves may degenerate. The order of the Universe is slowly being "destroyed" by degeneration processes. However, conservation processes insure that life will continue.

Intelligence aids conservation processes. Man has conquered many diseases and many other things that would have destroyed him. Man in learning about his environment (as he was commanded in Genesis 1:28) has learned how to take care of himself in the face of universal degeneration.

This achievement, coupled with his seemingly remarkable material progress, has lent weight to the idea of evolutionary progress since the Middle Ages.† Man appears to be advancing. Yet man is only employing previously ordained conservation processes for his good.

### VIII. Conclusion

A creationist model for natural processes is superior to any evolutionary model. Nature is minimally a battleground of conservation and degeneration processes. Conservation processes are the stronger of the two. The persistence of order in the universe is due to their superiority, not to improvement processes. Degeneration processes reduce the order in the universe.

### References

- <sup>1</sup>Williams, E. L. 1973. Thermodynamics: a tool for Creationists, *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 10(1): 38-44.
- <sup>2</sup>Williams, E. L. 1974. Living organisms: conservation and degeneration processes. A Challenge to Education: Technical Essays. Second Creation Convention, Milwaukee, August 18-21, 1974. Bible Science Association, Caldwell, Idaho, II B: 103-113.
- <sup>3</sup>Armstrong, H. L. 1975. Use of the second law of thermodynamics in macroscopic form in Creation studies, *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 12(2): 103-106.
- <sup>4</sup>Gish, D. T. 1975. A decade of creationist research, *Creation Research Society Quarterly* 12(1): 34-46.
- <sup>5</sup>Stroll, A., and R. H. Popkin 1972. Introduction to philosophy. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., New York, page 107.
- <sup>6</sup>Gish, D. T. 1972. Speculations and experiments related to theories on origin of life: a critique. ICR Technical Monograph no. 1. Institute for Creation Research, 2716 Madison Avenue, San Diego, California 92116.
- <sup>7</sup>Williams, E. L., and G. L. Mulfinger, 1974. Physical science for Christian schools. Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, South Carolina, pages 4-6.
- <sup>8</sup>Jones, A. J. 1972. A general analysis of the Biblical "kind" (min), *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 9(1):53-57.
- <sup>9</sup>Jones, A. J. 1972. Boundaries of the min: an analysis of the Mosaic lists of clean and unclean animals, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 9(2): 114-123.
- <sup>10</sup>Jones, A. J. 1973. How many animals in the Ark?, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 10(2): 102-108.
- <sup>11</sup>Whitcomb, J. C., and H. M. Morris 1961. The Genesis flood. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, pages 232-239.
- <sup>12</sup>Williams, E. L. 1971. Resistance of living organisms to the second law of thermodynamics: irreversible processes, open systems, creation, and evolution, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 8(2):117-126.
- <sup>13</sup>Ford, K. W. 1963. The world of elementary particles. Xerox Publishing Co., Waltham, Mass., page 82.
- <sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, pages 26 and 27.
- <sup>15</sup>Kofahl, R. E. 1973. Entropy prior to the fall, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 10(3):154-156. See also the replies by Williams and by Morris immediately following. Also Kofahl, R. E. 1974. Reply concerning entropy prior to the fall, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 11(3):175-177, also comments by Jansma, and "In Retrospect" by Armstrong, immediately following. Also White, A. J. 1975. Comments on the nature of things before the fall, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 12(2):124, and a letter by Williams, immediately following.
- <sup>16</sup>Armstrong, H. L. "In Retrospect", mentioned in Reference 15.

<sup>17</sup>Williams, E. L. 1973. Reply mentioned in Reference 15.

<sup>18</sup>Lammerts, W. E., and G. F. Howe 1974. Plant succession studies in relation to micro-evolution, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 10(4): 208-228.

<sup>19</sup>Lammerts, W. E. 1974. Plant succession studies in relation to micro-evolution and mutations. A Challenge to Education: Technical Essays. Second Creation Convention, Milwaukee, August 18-21, 1974. Bible-Science Association, Caldwell, Idaho II B:24-31.

## WHAT ABOUT THE ZONATION THEORY?

CLIFFORD L. BURDICK \*

*Some creationists, taking it for granted that the existence of a geological column in the fossil record is well established, have proposed the theory of zonation as a way in which such a column could have been established in a relatively short time. The author proposes, however, that it is not necessary to account for the universal existence of a geological column, for it does not exist universally. Thus Creationist Geology may be relieved of the job of trying to account for a phenomenon which in fact does not exist in any world-wide or universal way.*

Since the theme for this issue is "Creationist Thinking in 1976", this may be also a good time to do some re-thinking—about things which creationists have perhaps been taking for granted. May I suggest that one topic on which some re-thinking may be in order is the notion of zonation?

As readers will recall, zonation has been considered an alternative to or corroboration of the geological column. The geological column was the (often assumed) order of occurrence of fossils in the rocks; and according to uniformitarianists represented the historical order of the evolution of the creatures which produced the fossils.

Those who have held the theory of zonation have allowed the evolutionists' order of fossils for the most part, but differ in the interpretation. They believe that the fossil record covers, at most, a few thousand years, rather than 500 million or more years. Moreover, and most important of all, the order does not represent that in which the creatures evolved, for they did not evolve at all. Rather, the order is the order of burial.

Marine life was buried first, as mud flowed into the oceans; and the resulting rocks are those called Paleozoic. Later, as flooding continued, lowlands and swamps were flooded, and creatures, such as dinosaurs, living in such places were buried. The resulting deposits are those called Mesozoic. Still later, the uplands, inhabited by mammals, were flooded; and the deposits from them are those called Cenozoic. Thus the (supposed) order of fossils was explained in terms of Flood geology.

It is quite likely that there has been some zonation, in some places and in some cases. But may I suggest that recent discoveries make it appear that zonation was by no means universal, and that it is not needed to explain the order of fossils generally?

Recent studies of fossil spores, in rocks from the Grand Canyon and elsewhere, have shown that Conifers, belonging to Gymnosperms, have been dominant back to the Permian, and even back to the Precambrian Proterozoic, which is often alleged to be more than a billion years old.<sup>1</sup>

The geological column is also commonly interpreted to include a gap of 80 million years between the extinction of the dinosaurs at the close of the Cretaceous and the appearance of man within the last million years or so. The theory of zonation will likely include such a gap in the rocks, although not such a long period of time. But there is now evidence to indicate that man co-existed with the dinosaurs, as well as with the sabre-toothed tigers or other giant felines.<sup>2</sup>

Galully, a leader in geology, has remarked that a theory can be wiped out by one sound line of evidence which contradicts it. I firmly believe that the dominance by the geological column is becoming a thing of the past. The theory of zonation, then, if too closely tied to the geological column, might go down with it. For there is other evidence, too.

Not only have fossil conifers been found in the Precambrian, but also Angiosperms, the flowering plants, claimed by evolutionists to have evolved in the Cretaceous. The U. S. Geological Survey\*\* has discovered fossil arthropods in Sierra Ancha Mountains, of Arizona, in rocks considered to be Precambrian, and over a billion years old. According to conventional views, this is about half a billion years too early for such fossils. Other fossil arthropods have been found in rocks, of the Keweenaw formation, ascribed to Precambrian, Proterozoic, times, on the south shore of Lake Superior.\*\*\*

Moreover, it is only by alleging that rocks have been thrust one over the other, in formations such as the Lewis or the Glarus, that uniformitarianists are able to continue to hold the notion of the geological column at all. But there is no independent evidence that these formations are overthrusts; in fact, the evidence shows otherwise. So to depend on this allegation of overthrusting is to indulge in a circular argument.<sup>3</sup>

What can be concluded from all of this? I suggest that the following are in order:

(1) The complete geological column does not exist in the rocks; it exists, if at all, in the geologists' minds, in textbooks, and in museums.

(2) There is no necessary connection between the assigned age of a rock and the kinds of fossils found in it.

(3) Hence all of the creatures represented by fossils could have lived at the same time, or at not very different times.

(4) Likewise, much of the rock which geologists study must have been laid down at about the same time, and that in a relatively short time, certainly not a billion years.

(5) And this is just what one would expect to find, granted that there was a world-destroying Flood a few thousand years ago.

(6) Thus, while zonation likely occurred here and there, and we may study cases in which it seems to have occurred, there is no need to invoke it as a general explanation of the nature of the rocks.

\*Clifford L. Burdick, D. Sc., is a Consulting Geologist, and has done much exploration for minerals as well as extensive work in paleontology. He lives at 924 North 6th Avenue, Tucson, Arizona 85705.

\*\*Dr. Don Elston of the United States Geological Survey presented this evidence in a lecture at the University of Arizona. Also, I have a tape of a lecture Dr. Elston delivered at California Institute of Technology on this data.

\*\*\*Date from Dr. Anderson of Texas (Midland).