

## Scientific Irrationality

by Henry M. Morris \*

Evolutionary scientists like to picture themselves to the public as paragons of rational thought—cool, detached, careful observers and analyzers of the systems and processes of nature. Creationists on the other hand are pictured as ignorant, bigoted religionists, bent on destroying science in favor of ancient mythology.

We creationists do admit to being biased and fallible human beings like everyone else. But the same deficiencies are characteristic of evolutionary scientists—in fact, even more so. As far as their scientific rationality is concerned, humanist writer Rob Wipond makes the following caustic comment.

“Rational thinkers” have not always been the most insightful and open-minded of people. Throughout history, “thinking rationally” has often become a guise for repressive attitudes toward the new or unconventional.<sup>1</sup>

He illustrates this scientific irrationality by reminding us of the attitude of nineteenth century biologists to the discoveries of the creationist biochemist and anti-Darwinist Louis Pasteur.

Indeed, science and rational thinking have had a dubious and ragged history in our cul-

ture. . . . Louis Pasteur was widely ridiculed for his speculations about invisible creatures that caused illnesses.<sup>2</sup>

Evolutionary scientists have outdone themselves, however, in their paranoid reaction to the 1999 Kansas decision not to specifically mandate total evolutionism in the state’s public schools. A few of their comments follow:

Biology without evolution hardly counts as science and thus does not logically fulfill any university’s admission requirement for science. . . . The colleges and universities of the nation could make an enormously powerful statement by announcing their refusal to count as an academic subject any high school biology course taught in Kansas.<sup>3</sup>

How is that for an irrational reaction to the relatively innocuous action of the Kansas Board of Education! Here is another.

Creationists seem to be winning the “battle” and an obvious facet of the problem is science illiteracy. . . . essentially dominated by individuals who understand neither fundamental

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

scientific theories nor what science is.<sup>4</sup>

If creationist scientists, thousands of whom have postgraduate degrees in science from accredited universities, are so illiterate scientifically, how do they manage to win all their formal scientific debates with evolutionists? This prompted an evolutionary botanist to make the following irrational comment.

After participating in and watching debates with creationists eager to argue about supposed gaps in the evidence for evolution and natural selection, I concluded that arguing about the data is pointless. . . . The debate . . . should instead center on the basic philosophies of science and religion. . . .<sup>5</sup>

This is typical. Evolutionists would rather debate philosophy and religion than scientific data and evidence.

Another comment of Rob Wipond is appropriate at this point.

Ultimately, what we call rational thinking may just be a highly sophisticated and powerful method of self-delusion.<sup>6</sup>

## The Cosmophysicists

But if we would see the most egregious of all evolutionary scenarios, we must explore the wonderland of evolutionary cosmo-physics. Here we encounter an ever-changing kaleidoscope of quantum fluctuations of nothing into everything, cosmic inflation, multiple universes, ten-dimensional spaces, effects without causes, black holes, universes reproducing themselves, cold, dark matter, ordered systems out of chaotic explosions, hyper-strings, antimatter, loops of time, and all kinds of marvels generated by higher-dimensional mathematics and computer simulations. Not only have these scenarios extended

themselves back multi-billion years to the big bang and beyond, but also into the infinite future.

The sheer chutzpah of physicists is amazing. Not content to speculate on the first  $10^{-43}$  seconds of the universe, they believe they can map out—at least roughly—the next  $10^{100}$  years and beyond.<sup>7</sup>

Brilliant and inventive such calculations undoubtedly are—but rational?

An eminent scientist and science writer—himself an evolutionist—says that these cosmophysical theoreticians, especially those seeking what they call a theory of everything, have “become lost in a fantasy land of higher dimensional mathematics that has less and less to do with reality.”<sup>8</sup>

We creationists think that it is much more rational to believe that “*In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth*” (*Genesis 1:1*). God is the uncaused First Cause that adequately explains all the effects in the universe.

## The Gaians

Another group of evolutionary scientists are advancing the pagan Gaia hypothesis, attributing the innumerable evidences of rational design in the universe to the irrational explanation that the earth is alive and creating itself, so to speak, perhaps as a component of the conscious cosmos that has evolved itself into being. Dorion Sagan, son of the famous astronomer, Carl Sagan, is one of these.

Scientific evidence for the idea that the Earth is alive abounds . . . the Gaia hypothesis . . . lends credence to the idea that the Earth—the global biota in its terrestrial environment—is a giant organism.<sup>9</sup>

Gaia, of course, was the name of the Greek goddess of the Earth.

## Evolutionary Psychology, and Sociology

And what could be more irrational than having scientists who don't believe in the human "psyche" (or soul) studying supposed disorders of the soul in terms of evolution and calling it psychology (literally, "study of the soul")? Psychologists and psychiatrists often are afflicted with mental disorders themselves and are notoriously unsuccessful in solving such disorders in others.

Governments spend even more billions on mind and brain research while journals and conferences dealing with neuroscience multiply like rabbits. . . . But so far there has been virtually no payoff in diagnosing and treating mental illness.<sup>10</sup>

This is most likely because they interpret mental and emotional problems in terms of our supposed evolution from animals instead of their true source in man's sinful nature and practices, originating ultimately in rebellion against God and His Word.

In terms of sheer complexity, particle physics is a child's game—a 10-piece jigsaw puzzle of Snow White—compared with neuroscience. . . . Nobody has come close to solving such "core" mysteries as consciousness, the self, free will and personality.<sup>11</sup>

As far as sociology is concerned, evolutionary "science" has been applied to justify all manner of social evils, from sexual promiscuity and abortion to communism, racism, and Nazism, all of which are claimed by their practitioners to be "scientific" because they are based on evolution.

Since Darwin's death, all has not been rosy in the evolutionary garden. The theories of the Great Bearded One have been

hijacked by cranks, politicians, social reformers—and scientists—to support racist and bigoted views. A direct line runs from Darwin . . . to the extermination camps of Nazi Europe.<sup>12</sup>

Charles Darwin may not have approved of some of the fruits grown from the tree he planted. But, as the Lord Jesus said: "*Ye shall know them by their fruits. . . . A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit*" (Matthew 7:16,18).

### References

1. Rob Wipond, "The World is Round (and Other Mythologies of Modern Science)," *The Humanist* (March/April 1998), p. 9.
2. Ibid.
3. Herbert Lin, "Kansas Evolution Ruling," *Science* (vol. 285, September 17, 1999), p. 1849.
4. John W. Geisman, "Active Scientists Make the Difference," *Geotimes* (vol. 44, October 1999), p. 19.
5. Barry A. Pelevitz, "Science and the ??? Versus of Religion," *Skeptical Inquirer* (vol. 23, July/August 1999), p. 33.
6. Rob Wipond, op. cit., p. 10.
7. Marcus Chown, "Time after Time." Review of *The Five Ages of the Universe* (The Free Press). In *New Scientist* (vol. 163, August 31, 1999), p. 47.
8. John Horgan, "The Big Bang Theory of Science Books," *New York Times Book Review*. December 1997, p. 39.
9. Lynn Margulis and Dorion Sagan. *Slanted Truths: Essays on Gaia, Symbiosis and Evolution* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1997), p. 190.
10. John Horgan, "Endless Voyage," *New Scientist* (vol. 163, September 18, 1999), p. 49.
11. Ibid., p. 50.
12. Martin Brookes, "Ripe Old Age," *New Scientist* (vol. 161, January 30, 1999), p. 41. ❄

# What Would Need to Change for a Dinosaur to Evolve into a Bird?

by John D. Morris, Ph.D.

Evolutionists have expended great effort in trying to establish that birds evolved from dinosaurs. Some skeletal similarities do exist—encouraging them to minimize the differences and to champion any possible clue (like hints of feathers in theropod dinosaurs) that the two classes might be related. Now it appears that some would even resort to fraud to establish such a lineage. It behooves us to step back and take a look. What structural and physiological transformations must occur to change one into the other? The following abridged list of evolutionary obstacles might be helpful.

**Wings:** The proposed ancestors of birds are thought to have walked on their hind legs. Their diminutive forelimbs had digits similar to a hand, but consisting only of digits one, two, and three. Bird forelimbs consist of digits two, three, and four. Today, most hold that ground-dwelling theropods learned to run fast and jump to catch insects and eventually used arms with frayed scales to fly. But flight requires fully formed, interlocking feathers and hollow bones, not to mention the flight muscles and keeled sternum to anchor the muscles.

**Feathers:** Feathers are not at all similar to scales. Even if scales were frayed, they would not be interlocking and impervious to air as are feathers. Actually, feathers are more similar to hair follicles than scales. Could such precise design arise by mutation? In all the recent discoveries of dinosaur fossils with “feathers,” the “feathers” are merely inferred. What is actually present is better described as thin fila-

ments which originate under the skin.

**Bones:** Birds have delicate, hollow bones to lighten their weight while dinosaurs had solid bones. The placement and design of bird bones may be analogous to those in dinosaurs, but they are actually quite different. For example, the heavy tail of dinosaurs (needed for balance on two legs) would prohibit any possible flight. And besides, the theropods were “lizard-hipped” dinosaurs, not “bird-hipped” as would be expected for bird ancestors.

**Warm blooded:** Birds are warm-blooded with exceptionally high metabolism and food demands. While dinosaur metabolism is in question, all modern reptiles are cold-blooded with a more lethargic life style.

**Lungs:** Birds are unique among land-dwelling vertebrates in that they don't breathe in and out. The air flows continually in a one-directional loop supporting the bird's high metabolism. Reptilian respiration is entirely different, more like that in mammals.

**Other organs:** The soft parts of birds and dinosaurs, in addition to the lungs, are totally different. A recent “mummified” dinosaur, with soft tissue fossilized, proved to be quite like a crocodile, and not at all like a bird.

Thus, the dinosaur-to-bird transition is blocked by many major obstacles, not just the acquisition of feathers. It gets even worse, for in order to make the transition, most if not all of the definitive characteristics must be acquired simultaneously. They all must be present or else none serves a valid purpose. Evolutionary stories don't fit the facts. ❄



SINGLE COPIES 10¢  
ORDER FROM: INSTITUTE FOR CREATION RESEARCH © 2000 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED  
P.O. BOX 2667, EL CAJON, CA 92021