

Evolution 101

Lesson 22

In the previous lesson Michael Behe, biochemist, and Michael Denton, molecular biologist, were persuasive in making the case that natural processes could never produce complexity in living or nonliving systems by random chance and that an external intelligent agent would be required.

Natural processes can produce order but not complexity. For instance, water will form orderly crystals of ice and atoms will form crystals of granite when the temperature is lowered. These are not complex events. But the granite will not change into a statue of George Washington without the input of an external, intelligent agency such as a sculptor.

Wind and waves can produce orderly ripples and patterns of sand on a beach. But if the patterns happen to spell out the letters, SOS, the complexity would testify that an external, intelligent agency was responsible, not natural processes.

A person who finds an arrowhead on a mountainside instantly rules out natural, random processes as the cause. The arrowhead is too complex. Today, evolutionists are analyzing radio patterns from outer space in hope of discovering patterns of complexity that will prove that intelligent life exists in outer space. Ironically, they do not concede that complex arrangements of matter on earth must be caused by an external, intelligent agency. It was all caused by random, chance interaction of natural processes, they say.

It is noteworthy that today the most severe criticism of macroevolution comes from the scientific community, not the theologians. It was the same way in Darwin's day. Sir John Herschel, famous astronomer, mathematician and Fellow of the Royal Society, called Darwin's theory '*the law higgely-piggely*'. The brilliant physicist, Clerk Maxwell, strenuously opposed Darwinism. Michael Faraday, said to be the world's greatest experimental physicist, was a stern critic of Darwinism. William Whetwell, renowned science philosopher, wouldn't even let Darwin's book into the Cambridge library. Adam Sedgwick, the geologist who taught Darwin the elements of field geology and the entomologist, Andrew Murray, both decided firmly against Darwin's theory. Richard Owen, the superintendent of the Natural History Department of the British Museum, caused Darwin to hate him.

Louis Pasteur, often called the greatest scientist of the 19th century, pioneered immunization and developed the Law of Biogenesis (life comes only from life) was strenuously opposed to Darwin's theory.

Gregor Mendel, the father of the science of genetics, established the basic stability of created kinds of plants and animals. He rejected Darwinism even though he was quite familiar with it.

It may surprise most people that most branches of modern science were founded by believers in creation:

Physics	Newton, Faraday, Maxwell, Kelvin
Chemistry	Boyle, Dalton, Ramsay
Biology	Ray, Linnaeus, Mendel, Pasteur, Virchow, Agassiz
Geology	Steno, Woodward, Brewster, Buckland, Cuvier
Astronomy	Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Herschel, Maunder
Mathematics	Pascal, Leibnitz, Euler

On the other hand, there were many religious people in Darwin's corner cheering him on such as the famous preachers: Josiah Strong, Frederick Farrar, James Orr and Henry Drummond. In America, A.H. Strong and Henry Ward Beecher championed evolution as a valid idea whose time had come.

Some religious people said that when Darwin was buried in Westminster Abbey, *“This saintly man, who had borne the flag of science ... gave the Abbey ‘an increased sanctity, a new cause for reverence.’”*

Ironically, two years before he died, Darwin wrote, *“I do not believe in the Bible as a divine revelation and, therefore, not in Jesus Christ as the Son of God.”*

Currently, there seems to be as many outspoken theologians who accommodate Darwinism as there are who reject him. They rationalize that macroevolution was God’s plan of creating which introduces more theological problems that it solves. The question arises, “How many pastors use sermon time today to instruct the flock in the scientific absurdities of macro-evolution?”

In this writer’s Christian experience of 75 years, he has not had a pastor who devoted sermon time to refuting macro-evolution with scientific evidence. Nor has the Sunday School shown an interest in the subject. Yet, as these essays show, the scientific objection to macroevolution are powerful and many.

Today, even outspoken evolution-ists expose the scientific weaknesses of macroevolution. Dr. Henry Morris has listed nearly 3,000 devastating quotations from them in his book, **“That THEIR WORDS May Be Used AGAINST THEM.”** (Visit ICR.org for more Creation information.)

Facts Do Not Speak For Themselves.

There is no argument about the facts. There is a difference of opinion about what the facts mean. Facts must be interpreted within a philosophical framework. Evolutionists follow a worldview of naturalism and chance and the Christians adopt a worldview of supernaturalism and design. One must observe that both worldviews are meta-physical—outside and beyond natural processes. Neither worldview can be proved or disproved empirically by science.

C.S. Lewis has pointed out that depending on random chance, accidents, to explain everything calls into question our ability to reason:

“If the solar system was brought about by an accidental collision, then the appearance of organic life on this planet was also an accident, and the whole evolution of Man was an accident too. If so, then all our thought processes are mere accidents—the accidental by-product of the movement of atoms. And this holds for the materialists’ and astronomers’ as well as for anyone else’s. But if their thoughts—i.e., of Materialism and Astronomy—are merely accident-al by-products, why should we believe them to be true? I see no reason for believing that one accident should be able to give a correct account of all the other accidents.” (From **God in the Dock**, p.52)