

## What They Say

by Henry M. Morris\*

Evolutionary scientists sometimes say the most fascinating things. When confronting creationists, they always present a unified front, insisting that total evolution is a certain fact of science, proved beyond reasonable doubt. Creation, on the other hand, they say, is nothing but religion. Sometimes they even get real ugly about it. One of England's top evolutionary biologists, Richard Dawkins, recently made the following pronouncement:

I think a case can be made that *faith* is one of the world's great evils, comparable to the small-pox virus but harder to eradicate.<sup>1</sup>

Dawkins was speaking of religious faith, in general, especially any faith that opposes his neo-Darwinism which he equates to proven science.

However, while they can be of one mind about creationism, they also squabble vigorously among themselves when they assume we creationist Christians are not listening. A humanist, Rob Wipond, writes:

Scientists can be tired, ornery, and incredibly irrational when they wake up in the morning. Some do lie, some do falsify data. . . . They can be greedy; they may well have weak pow-

ers of logic, while no one else has the time or money to debunk their arguments.<sup>2</sup>

Wipond then proceeds to argue that belief in evolution is itself based on blind faith, stating that so-called “*rational thinking* may just be a highly sophisticated and powerful method of self-delusion.”<sup>3</sup> He goes on to say:

But then, it merely exposes how much the belief in evolutionary theory is ultimately based upon a similar kind of blind faith. It shows there is no definitive, final proof for evolution, either. There are just a lot of suggestive facts that make some of us formulate an argument, every bit as tautological as the quote-the-Bible-to-prove-creationism-is-right arguments, which goes something like this: “Evolution seems to have occurred; therefore, evolution has occurred.”<sup>4</sup>

We wonder if Dawkins would agree that blind faith in evolutionary theory is also “one of the world's great evils.” Probably not.

Wipond is not alone in noting the absence of any proof for evolution. One of the nation's most eminent biologists, Keith Stewart Thompson, has recently

\*Dr. Morris is Founder and President Emeritus of ICR.

discussed this curious fact.

As long as there have been theories of evolution (and certainly before Darwin), critics have complained that “the hypothesis remains destitute of satisfactory evidence” (Rev. William Paley, 1802). . . . That the charge applies equally against creation theorists is of little comfort.<sup>5</sup>

Thompson has noted the same problem that creationists have often emphasized. No one in all human history has documented an example of real evolution taking place. Evolution is not empirical science; it is a set of “just-so stories.” He goes on to say:

Perhaps the most obvious challenge is to demonstrate evolution empirically. There are, arguably, some two to ten million species on Earth. The fossil record shows that most species survive somewhere between three and five million years. In that case, we ought to be seeing small but significant numbers of originations and extinctions every decade.<sup>6</sup>

But, of course, we don’t! Not even in the laboratory, where many attempts have been made to speed evolution up.

Furthermore, the problem cannot be solved by stretching the imaginary process out over millions of years. The fossils also say no! There are no evolutionary transitions fossilized anywhere, although billions of fossils are there still preserved in the rocks.

One of the outstanding problems in large-scale evolution has been the origin of major taxa, such as the tetrapods, birds, and whales, that had appeared to rise suddenly, without any obvious answers, over a comparatively short period of time.<sup>7</sup> Professor Carroll, an eminent Ca-

nadian paleontologist, is well aware of such highly publicized fossils as *archaeopteryx* (the alleged half-reptile, half-bird) and the so-called walking whale, but he still has to acknowledge that birds and whales arose suddenly without obvious ancestors. As a matter of fact, it is well known by paleontologists that literally *all* phyla, classes, orders, and families of plants and animals have arisen suddenly without obvious transitional ancestors, as far as the fossil record shows.

Nor will it do to attribute these ubiquitous gaps in evolution to the popular new theory of “punctuated equilibrium,” being promoted by Harvard’s Stephen Jay Gould. If there is minimal evidence for the slow-and-gradual evolutionary process of neo-Darwinism, there is far less evidence for the invisible process of sudden evolution postulated by Gould and his followers. A very interesting and cogent comment about Gould has appeared recently.

Even his critics grant that Dr. Gould is popular with lay readers, but this has also made him a favorite target of attack. In *The New York Review of Books* last year, John Maynard Smith, a prominent British evolutionist, said of him that “the evolutionary biologists with whom I have discussed his work tend to see him as a man whose ideas are so confused as to be hardly worth bothering with, but as one who should not be publicly criticized because he is at least on our side against the creationists.”<sup>8</sup>

Let’s stay united against the creationists, they say, no matter how we argue among ourselves, and no matter how flimsy is our evidence for evolution.

Dr. Thomson courageously has recently tried to define just what they

should look for that could constitute genuine evidence of evolution.

All evolution is change but not all change is evolution. . . . I would argue that in order to constitute evidence of true evolution, a phenomenon must meet three simple criteria: it must be shown to be genetically based, it must be irreversible, and it should result in reproductive isolation of populations.<sup>9</sup>

That sounds quite reasonable, but no “change” observed thus far in nature, or in the laboratory, has been shown to meet these criteria. Mutations take place, but they are either reversible, deteriorative, or neutral. Recombinations of existing genes take place, but are “horizontal” changes that do not result in reproductive isolation. Natural selection takes place, but this is a conservative phenomenon, which weeds out defective mutants and keeps the population stable. Adaptations take place, but these are horizontal changes which conserve the species against extinction, but do not produce new species. Thomson concludes:

The million-dollar question is: What mechanisms lie between the short-term, low-scale and wholly reversible results so far obtained, and the origin of a new species? What conditions and mechanisms are required to feed back from a given level of phenotypic plasticity to a new genetic or phenotypic constitution? Stay tuned.<sup>10</sup>

Evolutionists must, therefore, simply “keep the faith.” Somewhere, someone may find real empirical proof of evolution. In the meantime, most everything they say (other than mere recitals of facts on which both creationists and evolutionists agree), seems potentially something that can be used

against them.<sup>11</sup> One of their own has said it well.

So if we want to compare science and religion fairly and objectively, let us not compare science the fantasized ideal to religion in human reality but, rather, science in human reality to religion in human reality. And this is where the role of science as spinner of myths, as deluder of the masses, as intensely repressive force, must be confronted.<sup>12</sup>

## References

1. Richard Dawkins, “Is Science a Religion?” *The Humanist* (vol. 57, Jan/Feb 1997), p. 26.
2. Rob Wipond, “The World is Round (and Other Mythologies of Modern Science)” *The Humanist* (vol. 58, March/April 1998), p. 11.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
5. Keith Stewart Thompson, “Natural Selection and Evolution’s Smoking Gun,” *American Scientist* (vol. 85, Nov/Dec 1997), p. 516.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Robert L. Carroll, *Patterns and Processes of Vertebrate Paleontology* (Cambridge, U.K., Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 391.
8. David L. Wheeler, “An Eclectic Biologist Argues that Humans Are Not Evolution’s Most Important Results: Bacteria Are,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (vol. LXIII, Sept. 6, 1996), p. A-23.
9. Keith Stewart Thomson, op. cit., p. 518.
10. *Ibid.*
11. See *That Their Words May Be Used Against Them* (Henry M. Morris, Master Books, 1997), 487 pp., for almost 3000 quotes of this nature from evolutionists.
12. Robert Wipond, op. cit., p. 9. ❄

# Why Do Seminary Professors Entertain Old Earth Ideas?

by John D. Morris, Ph.D.

There is a trend in modern Christendom for Bible scholars to accommodate old-earth thinking and accept it as true. The “millions and billions of years” scenario has become the “politically correct” position, and knowledgeable Christian leaders accept and even insist on it. This might be understandable in liberal circles, but unfortunately one finds few leading conservative, evangelical seminaries or Christian colleges which promote the young earth. Those “fundamentalists” who accept a literal Genesis are marginalized and rarely welcomed on a faculty.

Old-earth proponents will go to great lengths to claim that Augustine or some other “church father” or early Jewish rabbi were open to old-earth ideas thus lending credence to their compromise. Old-earthers might argue that the days of Genesis were long, or overlapping, or allegorical, but never to be understood at face value.

The one thing they are unable to do, however, is to show how Scripture, using standard methods of Scripture interpretation, directly points to an old earth. Instead, they must devise ways to escape the clear meaning of Genesis. Do they do this because they are convinced (wrongly) that science has “proven” an old earth?

But let’s consider science. In principle, scientific claims and theories are self-correcting. What happens when a scientist misinterpretes or fudges the evidence to support an obviously erroneous conclusion? I can assure you that other scientists would quickly move to correct the error and would not mince

words in doing so. I am convinced that if it weren’t for the philosophical insistence on naturalism, even evolution would be abandoned. Already many secular scientists are pointing out that mutations are never beneficial, that natural selection is conservative, not innovative, that conditions have never been right for the origin of life from non-life, that fossils fall into separate, distinct categories, that catastrophism is the rule in geology, etc. If secularists had another view of origins that still denied the Creator, they would abandon evolution in a flash.

Compare this to Bible scholars who twist Scripture to make it say something it clearly does not say. If theologians, who so admire secular scientists and value their approval, applied “scientific” methods of critique and correction to pronouncements of their peers, old-earth ideas would not be tolerated. They would be recognized as a butchering of Scripture. If similar techniques were applied throughout the Bible, we would lose many primary doctrines.

I suspect that Bible scholars condone old-earth interpretations of Scripture because of their own wrong training and desire to gain the acceptance of their peers, both Christian and secular. How much better to gain the approval of the Author of Genesis instead!

Let me issue a call to theologians, pastors, and Christian leaders. Christianity is engaged in a worldview war and needs all her soldiers. Let us hear, once again, the wonderful words: “Thus saith the Lord!” from your lips and pen. ❧



SINGLE COPIES 10¢  
ORDER FROM: **INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH** © 1999 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED  
P.O. BOX 2667, EL CAJON, CA 92021