

Evolution: chance and dying animals

"In fact, evolution became in a sense a scientific religion; almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to 'bend' their observations to fit in with it." H. Lipson, "A Physicist Looks at Evolution," *Physics Bulletin*, 31 (1980), p. 138.

"Transformism [evolution] is a fairy tale for adults." (Jean Rostand, *Age Nouveau*, [a French periodical] February 1959, p. 12) (the late Prof. Jean Rostand was a French biologist and a member of the Academy of Sciences of the French Academy).

"Evolution would appear as a theory without value." (Prof. Louis Bounoure, *Determinism and Finality*, edited by Flammarion, 1957, p. 79) (the late Prof Bounoure was a biology professor at the University of Strasbourg).

Evolution says that accidental biological changes and natural selection (survival of the fittest) have somehow produced every living thing on the face of the earth.

It teaches that no matter how complex living creatures may be, the *only* thing that produced these complexities was random chance - pure accidents. *After* random chance had created these complexities, *then* natural selection weeded out the weaker, undeveloped animals.

So, the entire panoply of life crept up - with the strong living and the weak dying over eons of time. This cavalcade of purely accidental mutations and dying animals somehow culminated in man.

Evolution invariably teaches that chance mutations are the *only* source of change:

"... the process of mutation is the only known source of the new materials of genetic variability and hence evolution. Theodosius Dobzhansky, *American Scientist* 45:385

Random chance, says evolution, is the engine that produced all the complexities of life, and natural selection (survival of the fittest) is the knife that cut out the weak and left the world to the strong. The foundational principle of evolution is that the only source of changes that resulted in vast improvements - and all of life - is nothing other than mutations caused by unadulterated random chance.

It is certainly true that the chance

mutations that supposedly cause changes in species are acted upon by the environment and to that extent are not "by chance." But originally, it is always chance and chance alone that produces the mutations. It is blind chance that is supposed to produce the changes and it is the environment that shapes those changes.

But the chance of accidental mutations producing improvements to a species is miniscule:

"It is entirely in line with the accidental nature of mutations that extensive tests have agreed in showing the vast majority of them detrimental to the organism in its job of surviving and reproducing -- *good ones are so rare we can consider them all bad.*" H.J. Mueller, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 11:331. Mr. Mueller won the Nobel prize for his work on mutations(emphasis supplied)

No amount of random chance could ever produce what is common knowledge of science today.

When Darwin wrote the *Origin of Species* in 1859, it was 40 years before end of the reign of Victoria in England, before the telegraph and before the American Civil War. At that time there were neither electric lights nor an effective microscope. And ever since that time, evolutionists have hammered evolution into medicine and into biology.

But much has been discovered since before the Civil War and what has been discovered is far beyond that of which Darwin ever dreamed. It is increasingly clear that life is not just complicated but inconceivably complicated - and intentionally designed down to the sub-atomic level. Unobserved beneficial mutations and dying animals simply cannot account for the organization of

trillions of neuro-connections in the brains of humans, for the encoded chemical formulae for 100,000 human proteins encoded into the arrangement of atoms in a molecule or how the brain of a honeybee can perform a trillion organized calculations in a second.

But evolution remains with us because it has created academic positions with vested interests and because the existence of a Creator is even more of an anathema to evolutionary academe than the belief that millions of unobserved accidental mutations created the human brain.

Evolutionist D.M.S. Watson states the case with pristine clarity:

"[Evolution is] a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logically coherent evidence to be true but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible." D.M.S.Watson, "Adaptation," Nature, Vol. 123 (1929), p. 233.

Evolutionist Richard Dawkins echoes his predecessor:

"*Even if there were no actual evidence in favor of the Darwinian theory ... we would still be justified in preferring it over rival theories [creationism]*" Richard Dawkins, *The Blind Watchmaker* (NY Norton, 1986), 287, emphasis in the original.

These men (and practically all other evolutionary scientists) believe that since God does not exist, evolution must have occurred - and it *does not matter* to them what the evidence is.

The point is that if they had no opinion whatever about God, then their opinion of evolution would be drastically different.

Ladies and gentlemen, that is not science. It is metaphysics.

Written by Charles R. Chesnutt, Sr.
Mr. Chesnutt's professional website is
Chapter7-11.com
See also Biblebooks.co

CLICK TO GO TO CreationDesign.org

THIS DOCUMENT, IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM, MAY BE EMAILED, REPRODUCED, DISPLAYED, PROJECTED, PRINTED, COPIED OR DISTRIBUTED WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM THE PUBLISHER. HOWEVER, IT MAY NOT BE SOLD. ALL OTHER RIGHTS RESERVED. ©2012 CHARLES CHESNUTT