The following 2 images present an example of Watchtower dishonesty.

Speaking to a student of mathematical properties I was informed that the Watchtower Society incorrectly asserts that mathematical probabilities supports the conclusion that only someone who knew the order of creation could have written the account in what has become the Bible. –See Life: How did it get here? By evolution or creation? p 36-37

He pointed out that anyone could come to the correct order as stated in the Bible simply by logical thinking. The beginning will be the beginning. You can’t put a beginning further down the list. You can’t have light come after plants. They need light to grow. You can’t put man before the atmosphere – they need to breathe.

Paragraph 34 states:
What are the chances that the writer of Genesis just guessed the order? (see below)

They then give an example to prove their point of a person picking blocks out of a box and getting them in the right order. However, this example isn’t the same at all. There is no logical order in picking numbers out of a box. The only one you would get correct would be the last one because all the others would already be chosen.

Another example of Watchtower dishonesty.
only "according to their kinds." The fossil record provides confirmation of this. In fact, it indicates that each "kind" appeared suddenly, with no true transitional forms linking it with any previous "kind," as required by the evolution theory.

33 All the knowledge of the wise men of Egypt could not have furnished Moses, the writer of Genesis, any clue to the process of creation. The creation myths of ancient peoples bore no resemblance to what Moses wrote in Genesis. Where, then, did Moses learn all these things? Apparently from someone who was there.

34 The science of mathematical probability offers striking proof that the Genesis creation account

33. Where only could the information in the Genesis creation account have come from?
34. What other line of evidence underlines the soundness of the Genesis outline of events?

A well-known geologist said this about the Genesis creation account:

"If I as a geologist were called upon to explain briefly our modern ideas of the origin of the earth and the development of life on it to a simple, pastoral people, such as the tribes to whom the Book of Genesis was addressed, I could hardly do better than follow rather closely much of the language of the first chapter of Genesis." This geologist, Wallace Pratt, also noted that the order of events—from the origin of the oceans, to the emergence of land, to the appearance of marine life, and then to birds and mammals—is essentially the sequence of the principal divisions of geologic time.
must have come from a source with knowledge of the events. The account lists 10 major stages in this order: (1) a beginning; (2) a primitive earth in darkness and enshrouded in heavy gases and water; (3) light; (4) an expanse or atmosphere; (5) large areas of dry land; (6) land plants; (7) sun, moon and stars discernible in the expanse, and seasons beginning; (8) sea monsters and flying creatures; (9) wild and tame beasts, mammals; (10) man. Science agrees that these stages occurred in this general order. What are the chances that the writer of Genesis just guessed this order? The same as if you picked at random the numbers 1 to 10 from a box, and drew them in consecutive order. The chances of doing this on your first try are 1 in 3,628,800! So, to say the writer just happened to list the foregoing events in the right order without getting the facts from somewhere is not realistic.

However, evolutionary theory does not allow for a Creator who was there, knew the facts and could reveal them to humans. Instead, it attributes the appearance of life on earth to the spontaneous generation of living organisms from inanimate chemicals. But could undirected chemical reactions relying on mere chance create life? Are scientists themselves convinced that this could happen? Please see the next chapter.

35. What questions are raised, and where are the answers to be discussed?