

Christians should realize that evolution is not part of genuine natural science, but is an excuse invented by men to reject God.

Theistic evolution: A tragic misunderstanding and grave error - By Clement A. Butel

This article directs attention to the fact that organic evolution is not a testable scientific theory. It also reveals that it is no more than a metaphysical research program¹ based upon a naturalism ("nature is all there is"), which is clearly materialistic.

The program in question uses a methodology that is obviously outside the scientific method. However, it attempts to demonstrate that the facts of nature contain inferences supporting the view that man evolved from amoeba through random changes over a vast period of time. These changes, the theory asserts, were undirected and purposeless.

As shown herein, a leading evolutionist claims that despite its untestable character Darwinism comes within an extended meaning he grants to science because it adopts this methodology. However, along with all other secular evolutionists (including the National Academy for Sciences of the United States-see note 9 below), he rejects this convenient extension of the scope of natural science where inferences are drawn in favor of intelligent design from the true facts of nature, on the ground that they are not wholly naturalistic.

It is obvious that such a distinction cannot be accepted by any true Christian, who in considering the creation/evolution issue should insist that the inferences in favor of intelligent design (and therefore creation by God) should be taken into account.

The article also shows why the case for intelligent design is far superior to the case for evolutionist naturalism. Moreover, after it was written, the author's attention was drawn to a book compiled by experienced scientists, which demonstrates this by making a comparison between the inferences from the true facts of nature that may be validly drawn in favor of either research program. (See *Of Pandas and People* by Percival Davis and Dean H. Kenyon, with Charles B. Thaxton as academic editor, second edition, 1993, Foundation for Thought and Ethics [a pro-family group] P.O. Box 830721, Richardson, Texas, 75083-0721, U.S.A.).

This book bears out what is stated in the present article in this connection and all Christian parents should demand that it be studied whenever the question of biological origins is taught in schools.

Furthermore, after the article was written, the author's attention was also drawn to a recent publication, which confirms his contentions that (a) the materialist philosophy of "naturalism" has permeated the whole fabric of Western society, and (b) this has resulted in the public replacement of Christian morality with a "permissive" one that does not acknowledge any responsibility to God, our Creator.

The book in question, *Reason in the Balance: The Case Against Naturalism in Science, Law and Education* (1995, Intervarsity Press, Illinois, U.S.A.) should be

compulsory reading for any Christian who is engaged in the work of attempting to rid our society of the permissiveness which takes the form of public approval of abortion on demand, promiscuity in both homosexual and heterosexual lifestyles, a damaging so-called sex education for innocent children, pornography, etc.

It was written by Phillip E. Johnson, Professor of Law at the University of California, Berkeley, U.S.A., whose earlier book, *Darwin on Trial* is highly recommended in this article.

It is unfortunate that ever since the publication of Darwin's book many Christians have believed they could take a middle position between the naturalistic hypothesis of evolution and creation by God. This middle position (theistic evolution), however, contains two fundamental errors.

Firstly, it wrongly assumes that naturalistic evolution is part of natural science, even though it cannot be observed or empirically tested; and secondly, it wrongly accords to what is no more than the philosophy of naturalism (nature is all there is, was and ever will be) the status of a scientific paradigm.

The widespread adoption of theistic evolution by Christians has had the effect of stifling criticism of the atheistic hypothesis, thereby allowing the rationalists to dictate the terms of what is supposedly education in the science of origins.

The disastrous results of all this are detailed in Professor Johnson's recent book, referred to above.

Why organic evolution is not science but only materialistic metaphysics

In the seventeenth century Sir Francis Bacon proposed the application of the Scientific Method as a means for distinguishing theories that were truly part of natural science and those which were outside of it. According to a modern text book, the scientific method is applied as follows:¹

Define the problem.
Collect information on the problem.
Form a hypothesis.
Experiment to test the hypothesis.
Reach a conclusion.

The late Sir Karl Popper, a renowned philosopher of science, reminded us that Darwinism could not be tested by science's trial and error methods. Although attracted to it as a philosophy, he was thus forced to admit that Darwinism is not testable

¹ Bigs et al., *Biology: The Dynamics of Life* (1991), Merril Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio, U.S.A. The word "metaphysical" in relation to evolution is conveniently used here because it was adopted by Popper (see article) and by Patterson (as the statement referred to in Ref. 3 of the article shows). Some would argue, however, that it is not a true metaphysical theory but is more a belief system which is the basis of a pantheistic religion.

scientific theory but is no more than a metaphysical research program.² This being so it is not part of natural science within Baconian principles.

Adverting to Popper's view of the distinction between science and non-science, Dr. Colin Patterson, a leading paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, also pointed out that the theory of organic evolution is concerned with a series of (alleged) unique historical events, which, because they are unrepeatable, cannot be part of science because they cannot be scientifically tested.³

Two other scientists, both at the relevant time professors of biology, also drew attention to the untestable nature of the evolution hypothesis.⁴

Neither Popper nor the scientists mentioned above could be accused of any bias in favor of creationism in making the above admissions. But perhaps even more to the point, S. J. Gould, arguably the world's best known evolution polemicist, has also admitted that Darwinism and other historical theories cannot be tested experimentally.

Gould, who teaches biology, geology and the history of science at Harvard University in the United States, stated in 1986 that the theory of evolution relies heavily upon inference and "not on steel balls rolling down inclined planes in a laboratory," but he criticized creation scientists who claimed it was not part of (natural) science.⁵

In 1992 he returned to this theme when he wrote a hypercritical review of Professor Phillip E. Johnson's book, *Darwin on Trial*.⁶ In that review Gould claimed that Johnson held "a narrow and blinkered view of science" because he had claimed that Darwin had "started his theory on the wrong road" by never proposing an experimental test for it.

However, in stating that, ". . . Darwin's method is not generally experimental, for singular and complex events are not so explained by any historical science," Gould tacitly admitted that Darwinism is outside of the Baconian concept of natural science. Notwithstanding this, Gould claimed that Darwinism is "science" because of the methodology Darwin used in arriving at his conclusions.⁷

This methodology-the drawing of inferences or inductions from today's (circumstantial) evidence-can also be applied in a search for intelligent design in the universe. But Gould would be the last to agree that the theory of supernatural creation, supported by evidence of intelligent design comes within the extended meaning of "science" he so readily grants to Darwinism.

² "I have come to the conclusion that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory but a metaphysical research programme. It is important to remember that Darwinism is metaphysical and not scientific." K. Popper, at p. 168 of his autobiography, *Unended Quest*, (1976), Fontana Books Wm. Collins & Co., London.

³ Dr. Colin Patterson, *British Museum of Natural History*, (1978), at pp. 145/6. Dr. Patterson is not a creationist but is an agnostic.

⁴ P. Erlich and L. C. Birch, *Nature*, 22 April, 1967 at p. 352. Also the Revised Quote Book (Creation Science Foundation, Brisbane, Australia) recorded the following from the Melbourne University Assembly Week address by a Professor Whitton: "Biologists are simply naïve when they talk about experiments to test the theory of evolution. It is not testable."

⁵ Gould is thus reported by Christopher Joyce in a newspaper article "Genesis Goes on Trial." Republished by the *Weekend-Australian* 27/28 December, 1986.

⁶ (1990) *Regnery Gateway*, Washington, D.C. Also published by *Intervarsity Press*, Illinois, in 1991 plus a second edition published in 1993.

⁷ S. J. Gould, "Impeaching a Self Appointed Judge." *Scientific American*, July, 1992 at p. 194

In point of fact (as shown later) secular evolutionists vehemently oppose the teaching that the universe and life on earth contain valid inferences of intelligent design. The reason for this is, of course, that such inferences are diametrically opposed to the materialistic philosophy of "naturalism" which they espouse.

The true situation, in relation to biological origins and in regard to creation as a whole, is, therefore, that there are two opposing metaphysical research programs: one which insists upon natural causes only, based upon random changes; and the other, known as natural theology, which insists that there is abundant evidence of intelligent design which is far beyond the capacity of human beings.

However, secular evolutionists claim that their metaphysical research program should be regarded as "science" and natural theology as non-science because science is concerned with natural causes only.⁸

This argument is a flagrant non-sequitur. While natural science does demand natural explanations, its theoretical scope does not extend to historical hypotheses, like evolution. True natural science is concerned with presently existing phenomena: it is not a philosophy of life.

The evolution/creation issue is therefore first and foremost and essentially one between a materialistic philosophy advocating a naturalism based upon chance and a theological philosophy claiming intelligent design and therefore the existence of a Transcendent Creator. Although it is also an issue between a materialism and revealed religion, it is capable of logical resolution by a comparison of the cases for each of the abovementioned philosophies.⁹

It is a fact of life that after 130 years of research evolutionists have not discovered any evidence at all from which any satisfactory inferences can be drawn in favor of their hypothesis,¹⁰ whereas discoveries by natural science as to order in the universe, the design and function of living systems and the properties of matter all contain irresistible inferences of an intelligently planned universe.

⁸ In a "friend of court" submission to the Supreme Court of the United States in the State of Louisiana appeal, the American Academy for the Sciences put this misleading argument. See Darwin on Trial (Reference 7 above) at p. 7.

⁹ Thus the evolution/creation issue is nothing more than the age old controversy between materialism and natural theology.

¹⁰ For a thorough dismantling of all of Darwin's arguments, see Dr. Michael Denton's Evolution: A Theory in Crisis, published by Burnett Books in the U.K. and Adler and Adler in the U.S.A. in 1985/86. At the time of writing at least Dr. Denton, a molecular biologist, was an agnostic and therefore cannot be accused of bias. See also Darwin on Trial (Ref. 7 above). Apart from these two substantial critiques of Darwinism and many others that could be named, there are numerous admissions by evolutionists that there are no intermediate (transitional) forms to be found in the fossil record. Dr. Colin Patterson (Ref. 3 above) has been recorded as saying that after twenty years of research he knew nothing that was true about evolution, and later that a watertight case could not be made out for the existence of any transitional fossil in the fossil record. Sir Fred Hoyle in his 1993 book (Ref. 15 below) has made a strong attack upon the evolution theory, calling it "scientific fundamentalism" and pointing out that it is a failure in relation to fossils and geology. He points out that "the trunk and the main branches of the evolutionary" tree are missing and only exist in the evolutionist's imagination (see pp. 109-114).

The true role of natural science in relation to creation

From a Christian point of view it should be easily seen that God was the Transcendent First Cause of all created things but that he also created secondary causes to uphold his creation and ensure the continuity of life on earth. The true scope of natural science is therefore the observation of created things and the investigation of those secondary causes created by God: that is, those continuously repeatable laws which govern the composition and function of created things and ensure their continuity.

Always subject to his will as to their operation and continued existence, God gave those laws their own autonomy. Natural science can only ever obtain a much less than certain knowledge of them and thus the true investigatory task of scientists is an "unended quest."¹¹

The evolution world view

Rationalist, Auguste Comte, in his *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (1830) claimed that the first two stages of man's thought, the theological and metaphysical stages, had been superseded by the final or positive stage when men through scientific experimentation and observation would reach the positive truth.

Applied to origins, as it was meant to be, this philosophy is a fallacy, because unique past events cannot be observed nor can any hypothesis as to their history be experimentally tested. Yet it is the philosophy adopted by modern scientific establishments, who advocate a world-view built upon uniformitarian and evolutionist concepts in which they claim to know the ages of geological strata, the earth and the universe. Suffice to say that all these suppositions contain assumptions, vital to their validity, which are not only unproven but are also untestable and outside of the scientific method. Any claim that they scientifically contradict the biblical history of origins is therefore untrue.

The diabolical purpose of pro-evolution censorship

During this century there has been an unrelenting censorship of arguments against evolution. In a book published or republished in 1927 and entitled, "Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist," the Parkman Professor of Anatomy at Harvard University in the United States, Thomas Dwight, wrote:

The tyranny of the *Zeitgeist* in the matter of evolution is overwhelming to a degree which outsiders have no idea; not only does it influence (as I admit it does in my case) our manners of thinking, but there is an oppression as in the days of the "terror". How very few leaders of science dare tell the truth concerning their own state of mind! How many of them feel forced in public to do a lip service to a cult they do not believe in!¹²

¹¹ Karl Popper states at p. 104 of his autobiography (Ref. 2) concerning genuine scientific theories: "Although we cannot justify a theory-that is, justify our belief in its truth-we can sometimes justify our preference for one theory over another; for example, if its degree of corroboration is greater." As an example he gives present day preference of Einstein's theory over Newton's. Thus Popper has called his book *Unended Quest*. Although Popper's view concerning certainty in relation to scientific theories is considered by some to be controversial, it is no doubt correct in the case of cosmological theories.

¹² (1927) Longmans Green & Co, London, at pp.20/21.

Another famous scientist of more recent times, the late Professor W. R. Thompson F.R.S., in his introduction to what was virtually a centenary edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, wrote in regard to the suppression of criticism of evolution:

This situation, where scientific men rally to the defence of a doctrine they are unable to define scientifically, much less demonstrate with scientific rigour, attempting to maintain credit with the public by suppression of criticism and the elimination of difficulties, is abnormal and undesirable in science.¹³

In recent times (1993) Sir Fred Hoyle, the noted physicist, has vehemently attacked the arrogance of evolutionists who have infiltrated the education system and have imposed a strict censorship against opposing views.¹⁴

The censorship and oppression in question has continued to the present day. In quite a number of cases in the United States scientists have been deprived of teaching positions or have been rejected for doctoral or other post-graduate courses in science, not because their work in their own respective disciplines was not first class, but because they were known to be sympathetic to what is now popularly called "creationism."

If at present there were irresistible inferences for the alleged fact of evolution but none for natural theology, there would be no need for this censorship and oppression. The facts would speak for themselves. However, the true situation is the very reverse of this.

A current article gives particulars of this oppression exercised in two recent cases.¹⁵ It also brings out that the censorship of criticism of the evolution world-view has as its ultimate object the elimination of all religious beliefs by classifying them as "anti-science." But the weaponry in this war against religion is not true natural science, but, as shown above, is only pseudo-science.

In a speech recently made and now appearing in article form, Professor Phillip E. Johnson refers to the second case of oppression, abovementioned.¹⁶ It was exercised by evolutionists in control of scientific education at San Francisco State University in the United States. It concerned the action they took to suppress reference by a professor of biology to the case for intelligent design, when also teaching the case for evolution to first-year undergraduates.

Johnson gives this case as an illustration as to why the creation/evolution issue is not really one between religious beliefs and science but one between argument for intelligent design (theism) and a philosophical "naturalism" (atheism) and so concludes that any form of theistic evolution is a grave error.

Christians should now realize that evolution is not part of genuine natural science but is no more than an excuse invented by men to reject God, their Creator (cf. Romans 1:19-20); and that theistic evolution likewise is unscientific.

¹³ See introduction to 1962 re-issue of Darwin's, *Origins*, published by J. M. Dent & Sons, London.

¹⁴ F. Hoyle, *Our Place in the Cosmos* (1993) J. M. Dent & Sons, London at pp. 10, 13-15, & 65

¹⁵ *Scientists' War Against Religion* by Dr. Jerry Bergman, 321 Iuka Street, Montpelier, OH, 43543, U.S.A.

¹⁶ "Shouting 'Heresy' in the Temple of Darwin" by P. E. Johnson (1994) *Christianity Today*.

Consequently those who have advocated theistic evolution should now reconsider their position, for to continue to do so will only give support to the secular theory and stifle criticism of it. This in turn will assist atheistic evolutionists in their quest to destroy all religion by relegating it to what they label as "anti-science."

Already in this post World War II era, with the passive help of theistic evolution, they have made giant strides in their quest to turn our Western society into a Godless permissive one. They have been able to do this by falsely claiming that their pseudo-science-which replaces God the Creator of all things with atheistic "naturalism"-has the same authenticity and immense prestige as the science that split the atom and put men on the moon. It's time all Christians united to expose the falseness of this atheistic propaganda.

To combat the massive propaganda in favor of evolution in scientific journals and in the media as a whole and the brainwashing in its favor that passes as scientific education in schools and universities, all Christians should be shouting from the housetops that the theory of organic evolution has no place at all in scientific classrooms. Being metaphysical only, its true place is in the philosophy department where its naturalism would meet with very stiff opposition from the presentation of the overwhelming evidence for intelligent design.

Clement A. Butel