THE REIGN OF LAW

WILLIAM J. TINKLE *

In the study of nature, it is easy to concentrate on the laws discovered, to the extent of forgetting that there is anything else. The author points out that two kinds of law, statutory and natural, are quite different. As for natural laws, they are just observed regularities. Thus it is not reasonable to invoke natural law, as some have done, in an attempt to eliminate the need of a Ruler of nature. Neither does the existence of natural laws, that is of regularities which happen usually, make the occurrence of miracles impossible.

Many statements float from lip to ear which, if they were proved would be oracles of truth, for instance. "Order is Heaven's first law." What a wealth of observation and depth of understanding are claimed by the unknown savant who said this! He claims not only the wisdom to discern what is primary in the administration of the universe but he also assumes that it is ruled by fixed law.

It is characteristic of the times to emphasize action by law. This may be done to the extent that little room is left for intelligence or wisdom or personal choices on the part of God. It may even lead to a decision that no God is needed!

P. S. Laplace, a successor to the great Isaac Newton, stated the rule of law in great detail. Laplace had faith that nothing matters except the setting up of laws in the beginning.

> We ought then to regard the present state of the universe as the effect of the preceding state and the cause of the state which is to follow. An intelligence which for a given instant should be acquainted with all the forces by which nature is animated, and with all the positions of the things composing it, if further his intelligence were vast enough to submit these data to analysis, would include in one and the same formula the movements of the largest bodies in the universe and those of the lightest atom; nothing would be uncertain for him; the future as well as the past would be present to his eyes.[1]

It is my purpose in this paper to show that the Ruler of the universe is more than the sum of the laws which he has formulated. We may say "God is law" or "God is love" or "God is justice", but none of these terse statements is a complete description. A law is somewhat like a computer which is valued highly for some use in a limited way; one never sees a computer acting as the superintendent of a factory.

Two Kinds Of Law

Unfortunately the public confuses two kinds of law, the meanings of which are distinct. They are (a) statutory regulations formulated by states and other authoritories, and (b) general statements by scientists as to expected results.

For the welfare of the public a state formulates rules which the people living within it are told to obey. If the people do not do so they are punished by losing property or freedom. Even if the culprit escapes punishment he is looked upon by his neighbors as bearing a moral stigma.

Incidentally such laws emphasize the fundamental difference between mankind and animals. Laws are not made for animals to obey but for people. We would laugh at a government that made laws for animals.

Law passed by the state is not the subject of this paper: consequently attention will be given to natural or scientific law only. Persons who observe the facts of nature learn that the world is usually orderly. One learns that things can be grouped into classes and that a description of one object applies for the most part to another thing of that class.

It also is true that an action usually causes the same result as another action of that type. These observations enable men to make general statements or laws about things or forces which hasten and facilitate our work with them. Thus one studies science.

Of course two tentative groups are supposed to be recognized before one uses the word *law*, namely *hypothesis* and *theory*. The ideal method of learning truth is to accumulate many data on a question that needs to be solved. The data should be exact, observed without bias, and have a real bearing on the question. Then an estimate or hypothesis is made to solve the question being studied, then the hypothesis is put to test by experiment, and more observations are made.

> When observations confirming a hypothesis accumulate, the hypothesis becomes a theory; and a theory unchallenged and consistently supported by facts is called a law after a considerable lapse of time.[2]

Through making such plans for their work, scientists have been awarded quite a reputation for selfless application and impartial conclusions, but they know that they stand no higher than other groups. Such ideal conduct is attained by only a few, for it is above human nature.

> Often a statement that something is "scientific" is taken by the layman to mean that it is *certain* but this shows an incorrect comprehension of the true situtation. . . . in this process the generalization does not become fact; the likelihood of its being correct merely increases.[3]

Examples of Law

As stated above, many laws never were intended to be more than a description of the *majority* of a group or of what usually happens, even failing to apply to large minorities. With respect to Cope's law, there are marked exceptions.

> . . . in line after line—horses, elephants, cats, deer, etc.—the mammals have followed Cope's law that in the course of evolution . . . a race of animals tends to become larger in body size. In this too they resemble the reptiles. Note however, that in both groups there are lines, like the rodents, where there has been little if any tendency to increase in size.[4]

With respect to this law and others to be mentioned below creationists do not even admit the truth of the principal statement, that these animals have developed through evolution. Animal fossils are found widely scattered, not little ones below, larger ones a little higher and the largest ones in the highest layers of rock. Then how do paleontologists know that the small types are the oldest? They do not know it; they assume it because this is how it should be in evolution.

Evolutionary geologists actually decide the relative ages of the rock layers by the order of the fossils which they contain, as according to K. L. Currie:

*William J. Tinkle, Ph.D., worked in genetics for many years. He lives at Timbercrest Home, North Manchester, Indiana 46962.

> In the case of the geologic record we have seen that . . . the record depends on (1) an ordering of the sedimentary units in order of age, which is based almost entirely on *fossil* evidence, and (2) identification of conditions of deposition from present physical conditions.[5] (Emphasis added)

Then how is it known that the evolutionary order of the animals is correct? Because it agrees with the order geologists have assigned to the fossils. But how did geologists learn the order of the fossils? Supposedly, it is the order animals and/or plants followed in their evolution. One naturally comes back to the starting point, namely a belief in evolution. Such circular reasoning has been pointed out many times.

Consider now the fruit fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*, to see how well this species illustrated Cope' law. Many strains have arisen from the wild type through mutation and these mutant flies are not larger than the wild. These strains have been seen to arise, researchers have handled them, and every strain is inferior to the wild strain from which they arose.

For instance the strain called *vestigial* not only has crumpled wings but is diminutive in size and crawls about in a manner which arouses one's pity. Mutations in general, a very large group, tend to be exceptions to Cope's law.

According to Dollo's law, the direction of evolution is irreversable and those who believe in evolution believe of course that the direction is upward. Yet both evolutionists and creationists agree that 99 percent of all mutations are harmful to the plant, animal, or person.[6] Consequently little is heard of Dollo's law now.

Another rule which is being dropped, the Biogenetic law, included such claims as gill slits in the neck of bird and mammalian embryos. It was given up by authorities as much as 20 years ago, but still is occasionally found in the literature.

The laws of physics have fewer exceptions than those mentioned above. While no one knows just what gravity is, no one doubts that heavenly bodies attract each other just as small objects fall toward the earth. Even here, however, it is easy to make statements which are too sweeping about the certainty of the power of law.

Water in the atmosphere does not fall as rain unless the drops are large. Water as single molecules or even fine grains of dust may remain in the atmosphere indefinitely. When the mass of a particle is reduced beyond a certain point it is affected more by other forces such as air currents, than by gravity.

Another example of the failure of gravity is that a needle laid carefully on water does not sink. In this instance gravity is weaker than cohesion of the surface film.

God as Ruler

The reader should now be able to understand how a personal choice on the part of God may be able to rule rather than any single law. God may cause the combined forces to bring about some result that is different from the result of any single force. Or He can stop the action of one force and let another produce its effect.

While it is true that God usually chooses to work by law (in other words, He is consistent), He is not restricted to any particular method, nor does He have to waste time looking through His "chest" of laws to decide which to use.

The readers of this *Quarterly*, along with a big percent of Americans, believe in God. Certainly God can control the various forces of the world and decide which of them in a given situation is to produce the desired result.

To be sure this attitude requires faith and no apology is offered for mentioning faith in a publication devoted principally to science. The situation is not faith versus knowledge as some have alleged, but faith in observation and a trusted record on the one hand, against faith in a man-made, Godless religion on the other.

> The evolutionist may finally admit that his theory does still have many serious unsolved problems. Nevertheless he feels it is the only proper belief, since belief in special creation in effect gives up on the problems, relying on a force outside present scientific phenomena to explain the origin of these phenomona.
>
> The creationist acknowledges this. He finally must accept creation and a Creator by faith, since the process of special creation is not accessible to scientific observation.
>
> But neither is the historical process of evolution, he reminds the evolutionist. Evolution also must be accepted on faith, and that faith is more arbitrary than that of the creationist.[7] Actually faith in a man-made religion.

Miracles

It is quite true that much action is a repetition of that which has gone before just as an oak tree is a rough copy of former oak trees, and that this standard procedure is basic to the work of scientists. But the world is not a slave to natural procedure or to the laws which keep it in operation. The world could not even have started without a miracle, for present natural processes produce only conservation and loss.

Webster's Collegiate dictionary contains four definitions of the word *miracle*, of which the second is preferred: "A wonder or wonderful thing; a marvel." This definition is chosen because of the etymology of the word; it is derived from a Latin word meaning to marvel.

Now it is true that many people have the idea that a miracle must go contrary to a natural law. They confuse natural and statutory laws in their thinking, and remembering that the breaker of a statutory law is disgraced they somehow have an odious feeling toward a miracle.

If they will remember that a natural law may be only a statement of an average and that a miracle does not necessarily break even that average, they should find miracles attractive. I conclude by stating that a miracle is God's *unusual* method of working.

A World-Ruling Person

Granted that the laws of nature (i.e. those which have proved to be valid) are God's regular methods of working, then one may ask if He simply *found* these laws in operation. This would postulate either that there were some previous God or gods who lost their reign or that all things arose by chance. There is no reason to draw either conclusion and to do so would be an effort to discredit God without cause; for God drafted those laws.

But some one has objected that if "with God all things are possible"[8] *He should be able to make a world where miracles are not necessary*. Of course God could make such a world but who would want to live in such a place?

The first response of the reader to this statement probably is negative. Who would object to a perfect God and a perfect world? But consider the absolute and meticulous control God would have to exercise, making not only monotonous weather but just as monotonous people. Of course it would be well to be rid of annoying sins and even

mistakes but would human beings be human? No, machines. Is the prospect attractive? The proposed world would be more like a clockwork.

The freedom of man is not perfect because of limitations in heredity and environment but men have enough freedom to afford many choices of action. It naturally follows that many mistakes are made——even worse, wrong deeds are committed knowingly.

If God gave man no choice but to do right then man would not have an opportunity to be wrong. If God made man with power to choose but with no provision for repentance when he does wrong, man would be helpless indeed, for all of us have sinned. This need for a man to correct a broken life and rebuild the damaged places is one of the reasons for miracles. Jesus Christ is that man.

All must be reminded that, while law is used, the ultimate rule of the world is by a Person. The words are not vain when repeated, "I believe in God the Father Almighty!"

References

[1]Allen, Frank 1950. Modern science and Christian faith. Van Kampen, p. 295. The author was quoting P. S. Laplace.
[2]Frair, Wayne, and P. W. Davis 1972. The case for creation, Moody, p. 17.
[3]*Ibid.*, pp. 16 and 17.
[4]Moment, G. B. 1958. General zoology. Riverside Press, p. 493.
[5]Currie, K. L. 1970. In rock strata and the Bible record. P. A. Zimmerman, Editor. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, p. 119.
[6]Snyder, L. H., and P. R. David 1957. Principles of heredity. Heath, Boston, pp. 349 and 353.
[7]Morris, Henry M. 1974. The troubled waters of evolution. Creation-Life Publishers, p. 22.
[8]Matthew 19: 26.

ON METHODS OF TEACHING ORIGINS: A PROGRESS REPORT

JOHN N. MOORE *

If creation science becomes an integral part of curriculum in both public and parochial schools, then teachers must learn "how to do it". The author recounts aspects of his course at the university level, and indicates how he is aiding others to do similarly, even at the secondary level of learning.

Introduction

When I began teaching I was an evolutionist and taught evolutionary thinking for almost six years before I became a Christian in 1962. Most instructors in the scientific field are exclusive evolutionists, as that is the only point of view they have been taught regarding origins. Ever since Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared in 1859, the philosophy of evolutionism has pervaded all the disciplines of human knowledge, so that even an English major is trained to think that way.

After 1962 I changed my teaching of general education science at Michigan State University to include more and more of a two-way presentation about origins. In my present teaching I make it clear that my students will experience a formative confrontation between the evolutionary explanation of the majority and the creation explanation of the minority. Students are encouraged to realize that today, in the 20th century, they still have a real, live option with regard to origins.

The scientist does not have it all "sewed up" when he proposes that the universe began by an explosion. He has no knowledge of such an event *as a scientist*. When he claims that life began by some transcombination of molecules he only expresses his imagination. When he says that humankind is a consequence of mutational mistakes–errors of reproduction or the failures of DNA replication that formed the blacks and yellows, and so on–this is sheer imagination, and he pushes his position at the expense of academic freedom, and good, solid scientific work.

*John N. Moore, M. S., Ed.D., is professor of natural science at Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824

General Course Outline

At Michigan State University the natural science course I teach ("Science, Beliefs and Values") emphasizes discussion of "The Origin of the Universe", "The Origin of Life", and "The Origin of Humankind".

In the *fall term* the theme is, "What are men's ideas about the place of the earth in the solar system and in the universe?" This leads to the question, "Is it possible to study scientifically the origin of the universe?" And the answer is "no". Subject matter is drawn from astronomy with attention to "motion", good scientific theories, contrasts of cosmology and cosmogony; and my students examine carefully the two principal explanations of "evolution" and "creation" regarding the origin of the universe.

Classwork in the *winter term* centers on the question, "What are men's ideas regarding the origin and continuity of life? This leads to the question, "Is it possible to study scientifically the origin of life?" And the answer is "no". Subject matter is drawn from sexual and asexual reproduction and genetics and attention is given to two beliefs about origins: one is spontaneous generation, which is consistent with the philosophy of naturalism; and the other is created life order as coming from the Creator.

The *third term* is the capstone of the year with the question asked, "Is it possible to study scientifically the origin of humankind?" And again the answer is "no". Subject matter is drawn from geology regarding geological changes as basis for consideration of biological changes as to two degrees of change, that is, *within* kind and *across* kind. Application of circumstantial and conclusive evidence to an evolution model and creation model about origins of the variety of living things, including man, is stressed. My stu-