



# Think & Believe

A Publication of Alpha Omega Institute

Jan./Feb. 1985:Vol. 2 No. 1

## Scientific Objectivity?

By Dave and Mary Jo Nutting

Recently a speaking engagement brought us into a closed meeting where most of those in attendance were staunch evolutionists. The presentations and following informal discussion were very interesting. Not only was the meeting closed, but the minds of many of the participants were also closed to an objective evaluation of our position. It became clear to us that many classified us as "former scientists," since we no longer accepted the evolutionary position. In their minds, it was impossible to be a scientist without accepting evolution.

One of the main points put forth was that creationists couldn't be "real" scientists because they could not objectively evaluate data. We've heard that argument before, and realize that objectivity is difficult to maintain. However, we feel that creationists are just as objective, and often *more* open-minded to data than many evolutionists. For example, when presented with evidence and quotes by evolutionists regarding the lack of transitional forms found in the fossil record, one person stated, "I still think they've been found." It's hard to argue with that kind of "logic." It seems that the objective view would have been, "I've never heard that before. I'll have to check it out."

Many evolutionists have said that evolution is a "fact;" the only thing in dispute is *how* it happened, not *if* it happened. Since evolution can never be proven to be a "fact," this becomes a blind statement of faith, not science. Now faith is OK; we all exercise faith everyday of our life. The problem comes when we confuse faith with documented facts: then we lose our scientific objectivity. As a creationist, I am well aware that I must exercise faith to believe in creation -- but I feel this faith is well-grounded and consistent with the observable facts of nature. The big problem in having meaningful discussion with convinced evolutionists is that they usually do not realize that their belief in evolution

is just as much a faith as mine. Often they will not even consider solid scientific data and alternative interpretations because they cannot conceive of any other explanation, or they automatically rule out creation because their closed definition of science leaves no room for the supernatural. At this point it is sometimes helpful to ask them, "What evidence *would* you accept in support of creation? What kind of evidence would indicate to you that evolution has not occurred?" If they can offer no answers to these questions, it is not a question of facts at all, because no matter what evidence you give them they will still believe in evolution. That's *not* scientific objectivity.

We believe there is sufficient evidence in nature to make it obvious that the universe and living systems could not have come about purely as the result of molecules and elements "doing what comes naturally." Objective scientific evaluation of the complex interrelationships and type of the order found in nature clearly points to a creator. Scientific objectivity leads to belief in creation.



Fairy Tale or Science?

# NOTES & QUOTES

## ■ Is evolution fact, or is it faith?

- (The theory of evolution) forms a satisfactory faith on which to base our interpretation of nature. (L. Harrison Matthews, Introduction to *Origin of Species*, 1977 edition publ. by J. M. Dent, London)
- One must conclude that, contrary to the established and current wisdom, a scenario describing the genesis of life on earth by chance and natural causes which can be accepted on the basis of fact and not faith has not yet been written. (Hubert P. Yockey, *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, Vol. 67, 1977)
- Our theory of evolution has become...one which cannot be refuted by any possible observations. Every conceivable observation can be fitted into it. It is thus "outside of empirical science" but not necessarily false. No one can think of ways in which to test it. Ideas, either without basis or based on a few laboratory experiments carried out in extremely simplified systems have attained currency far beyond their validity. They have become part of an evolutionary dogma accepted by most of us as part of our training. (Paul Ehrlich and L. Charles Birch, *Nature*, April 22, 1967)
- Biologists are simply naive when they talk about experiments designed to test the theory of evolution. It is not testable. They may happen to stumble across facts which would seem to conflict with its predictions. These facts will invariably be ignored and their discoverers will undoubtedly be deprived of continuing research grants. (1980 Assembly Week address, Professor Whitten, University of Melbourne)
- Facts do not "speak for themselves"; they are read in the light of theory. Creative thought, in science as much as in the arts, is the motor of changing opinion. Science is a quintessentially human activity, not a mechanized, robotlike accumulation of objective information, leading by laws of logic to inescapable interpretations. (Stephen Jay Gould, *Ever Since Darwin*, 1977)

- With the failure of these many efforts, science was left in the somewhat embarrassing position of having to postulate theories of living origins which it could not demonstrate. After having chided the theologian for his reliance on myth and miracle, science found itself in the unenviable position of having to create a mythology of its own: namely, the assumption that what, after long effort could not be proved today had, in truth, taken place in the primeval past. (Loren Eiseley, *The Immense Journey*, 1957)

- Evolutionism is a fairy tale for grown-ups. This theory has helped nothing in the progress of science. It is useless. (Prof. Louis Bouroune, *The Adocate*, March 8, 1984)

■ Speaking of fairy tales, do you remember the old tale about the princess who kissed the frog and it changed into a prince? Well, there's a new version of that tale going around today. Once upon a time there was a frog who fell in love with Mother Nature. Now Mother Nature was no spring chicken, so when she kissed the frog nothing happened, so she sent for help in the form of Mr. Random Chance and Old Father Time. They all kissed the frog together and lo and behold, out popped the handsome prince. Fairy tale or evolutionary science?

- Belief in evolution is thus exactly parallel to belief in special creation – both are concepts which believers know to be true, but neither up to the present, has been capable of proof. (L. Harrison Mathews, Foreward to *Origin of Species* 1971 edition publ. by J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd, London)

- By faith we understand that the worlds were prepared by the word of God, so that what is seen was not made out of things which are visible. (Hebrews 11:3)

■ Evolution and creation are both faiths. The question is, "Which faith seems the most reasonable as we look around the world and objectively study the facts of nature?" Look around you – Think. . . . and Believe.

(Note: Many of the above quotes were taken from *The Quote Book* compiled by the Creation Science Foundation, Ltd., Queensland, Australia, 1984)

*Think and Believe* is published bi-monthly by Alpha Omega Institute, Box 4343, Grand Junction, CO 81502. Editors: Dave & Mary Jo Nutting. Single copies of this publication are sent free upon request. Please write for permission to reprint material in this publication.

# SPOTLIGHT ON SCIENCE

## The Formation of Coal

The traditional viewpoint on how the great bodies of coal were formed assumes that they are the remains of vast swamps which became buried and then compacted and altered by pressure and heat. While this is certainly one possible explanation for coal deposits, it is not the only explanation. Unfortunately it is usually the only method given in schools throughout the country. Even many elementary school students as well as college age students believe that if they dig down through some of the large swamps, they will eventually come to a place on the bottom where the peat grades into coal. Although this is possible, we just don't find it happening anywhere.

Dr. Steven Austin, while researching the Kentucky #12 coal bed, found well-substantiated evidence that it had not been formed in a swamp. His research can be extended into many other coal deposits since some of the same features appear elsewhere. Readers can request more information on Dr. Austin's research by writing us at Alpha Omega Institute.

If coal did not originate in a swamp, how did it form? Research done by Dr. Austin and several others has indicated that it was not formed in place, but was carried in by the action of water. Dr. Austin's "floating mat theory" of deposition postulates a huge, floating log jam being tossed around by wave action. This mat could be quite extensive and perhaps even large enough to cover several hundred square miles. As the mat drifted over shallower depths, a constant rain of debris from the mat would accumulate on the bottom. Wherever the main portion of the mat drifted, the thickest deposit of peat would accumulate. As the mat drifted away, deposition of other rock-forming materials could take place. As the mat drifted back over the area, another layer of peat would be deposited. This method easily explains why we see multiple layers of coal (as many as 12-26 layers in some places) as well as many other features not explained by the standard swamp model.

We have, then, at least two models of deposition: the swamp model and the floating mat model. Although many theories for the deposition of coal based on material being washed into place have been suggested, the only method usually presented in school is the swamp method which requires literally millions of years of gradual deposition. Has there been a bias toward this model in spite of contradictory evidence? It appears to be so. Students need to be presented with both possibilities and allowed to weigh the evidence.

Where did all the vegetation for "floating mats" originate? Read on about the canopy model!

## The Canopy Model

The "canopy model" has been proposed by many creationists to correlate data about earth history. Basically, the canopy model suggests that the earth was created with a blanket of water high above our atmosphere. Some think this canopy was in the form of ice or liquid water, while others feel it was in vapor form. Let's assume for now it was a vapor canopy. How would this canopy affect the earth?

As sunlight penetrated the canopy, it would warm the earth. The heat would then be trapped, effectively making the earth a giant greenhouse, with moderate temperatures worldwide. There would probably be no great winds since winds are caused mostly by temperature differentials. Lush vegetation would abound, even near the poles, as fossil evidence substantiates. The canopy would also shield the earth from much harmful radiation which causes mutation and premature death, so animals and plants could live and grow longer. Some animals, such as reptiles, continue to grow throughout their lifespan if sufficient food is available. Thus, under canopy conditions, we would expect many to be larger than today; this agrees with actual fossil evidence. Maybe this explains the great size of the dinosaurs.

Now suppose something caused the canopy to become unstable and collapse. It could supply much of the water needed for a world-wide flood. Plants and animals would die and many would be preserved in sediment as fossils. After the flood, as the waters receded, you might expect major readjustments in the crust, possibly resulting in earthquakes, volcanoes, mountain building, and continental drift. The receding waters would cut deep canyons in the yet unconsolidated sediment.

Without the canopy, conditions on earth would be greatly different from before the flood. Temperature differentials, and resulting wind patterns would quickly develop. Great deserts would be formed, as well as frigid arctic regions. Without the canopy shield, more radiation would enter the atmosphere causing increased mutation rates and faster aging. Vegetation would not be as lush as before, so food might become a limiting factor. Animals would not live as long; reptiles would not grow as large. Many species might be unable to adapt to the new, harsher conditions and thus become extinct. Man would also feel the effects. Whereas man had lived 900 years or more before the flood, his lifespan after the flood began to decline to its present 70 years, as verified by recorded historical records. We might expect this if this canopy model is true.

Although the canopy model has not been "proven", it seems to be a fruitful framework in which to correlate much data. It is still the subject of intensive research by creationists. Stand by for further developments!



## Recent Events



The Id-Ra-Ha-Je Jr/Sr High Snow Camp was a "smashing" success, in spite of the rain (yes, we did get hit by a few snowballs). Approximately 35 young people spent 4 days of their Christmas vacation learning about creation, evolution, and scientific evidence. We appreciated their interest and attentiveness.

1985 has been busy already, including 2 seminars (one at First Baptist, Cedaredge, and one at Redland's Community Church, Grand Junction). Both were well-attended and the response was good. We also spoke to 2 groups in Buena Vista. Dave was offered a temporary position at Mesa College, teaching in the math department, so he's been busy there. He's enjoying the opportunity to work with students again and we're thankful for the chance to earn some much needed income while continuing to build a support base for Alpha Omega.

## BOOK REVIEW



Interested in the canopy model? Want more information? An excellent reference is *The Waters Above: Earth's Pre-flood Vapor Canopy*, by Joseph C. Dillow (1981, Moody Press, Chicago). This is an extensive reference including both Biblical and scientific evidence of a vapor canopy. Though some aspects will undoubtedly undergo revision upon further research, this book is one of the most complete references regarding the canopy at this time. (Available only in hardback for \$19.95 + \$2.00 shipping and handling from Alpha Omega Institute, Box 4343, Grand Junction, CO 81502)



### Alpha Omega Institute

P.O. Box 4343  
Grand Junction, CO 81502  
(303) 245-5906

Would you like additional information about any one of the condensed articles or on another subject that we haven't even touched upon as yet? Write to us and we will gladly send you some.



## Upcoming Events



- Feb. 8, 9, 10      Trinity Reformed Presbyterian  
Montrose, CO: Seminar  
Contact Peter Rich, 249-1053
- Feb. 15, 16      Intermountain Bible College  
Grand Junction, CO: Seminar  
Contact Neil Gardner, 243-3870
- Feb. 17            Covenant Presbyterian  
Grand Junction, CO
- April 14            Lutheran Church  
Haxtun, CO  
Contact Rhoda Renzelman
- April 16            Lutheran Minister's Conference  
Estes Park, CO  
Contact Rev. John Peterson 867-5801

Various other church and school lectures are scheduled in the Grand Junction vicinity. Contact us for further details.

We are working on a schedule of seminars and presentations for the summer. The camp setting is ideal for sharing the type of information that we present, so we are trying to include a number of camps this summer (both high school and family camps). If you would like to schedule something in your area, or know of an interested camp, please contact us immediately.

**Bulk Rate**  
**U.S. Postage**  
**Paid**  
**Grand Jct. CO**  
**Permit No. 393**