

# Evolution 101

## Lesson 23

**Artificial Selection** has been used for ages by farmers who cross breed animals to select for a desirable trait such as size, length of fur length, color, etc. Preceding Darwin by 10 years, the creationist, Edward Blythe, is credited with coining the expression, “natural selection,” to explain the negative impact on an animal species by nature. An animal that had experienced a mutation that made it less fit to survive would be selected for elimination by nature. It was viewed as a sieve to screen out inferior specimens. “Natural selection” was equated with “survival of the fittest.”

Charles Darwin theorized that an organism that experienced a favorable mutation would have an advantage in competition for scarce food supplies. He believed that “natural selection” would select this favorable gene and result in more offspring for the animal and spread throughout the species and lead to a new one. We know now, of course, that the Second Law of Thermodynamics declares that a random change in a system will always result in decreased complexity.

Arthur Koestler writes in *Janus: A Summing Up* (p.170,175):

*“Once upon a time, it all looked so simple. Nature rewarded the fit with the carrot of survival and punished the unfit with extinction. The trouble only started when it came to defining ‘fitness.’ . . . Thus natural selection looks after survival and reproduction of the fittest, and the fittest are those which have the higher rate of reproduction—we are caught in a circular argument which completely begs the question of what makes evolution evolve.”*

*In the meantime, the educated public continues to believe that Darwin has provided all the relevant answers by the magic formula of random mutation plus natural selection—quite unaware of the fact that random mutations turned out to be irrelevant and natural selection a tautology [arguing in a circle].”*

Malcolm Muggeridge, Editor of a London daily paper, writes in *The End of Christendom*, (p.59):

*“I myself am convinced that the theory of evolution, especially the extent to which it’s been applied, will be one of the great jokes in the history books in the future. Posterity will marvel that so very flimsy and dubious an hypothesis could be accepted with the incredible credulity that it has.*

*“I live near a place called Piltdown. You probably know that a skull was discovered there, and no less than five hundred doctoral theses were written on the subject, and then it was discovered that the skull was a practical joke by a worthy dentist in Hastings who’d hurriedly put a few bones together, not even of the same animal, and buried them and stirred up all this business. So I’m not a great man for bones.”*

Colin Patterson, senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History said in a speech in New York in 1981:

*“I’m speaking on two subjects—evolutionism and creationism—and I believe it’s true to say that I know nothing whatever about either of them.*

*“Question is: Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of National History and the only answer I got was silence. . . . it does seem that the level of knowledge about evolution is remarkably shallow.*

*“Then I woke up and realized that all my life I had been duped into taking evolutionism as revealed truth in some way.*

*“I feel that the effects of hypotheses of common ancestry in systematics has not been merely boring, not just a lack of knowledge; I think it has been positively anti-knowledge.” [Or anti-science.]*

Karl Popper, philosopher of science, writes in *“Science: Problems, Aims, Responsibilities, (p.964):”*

*“Agreement between theory and observation should count for nothing unless the theory is a testable theory, and unless the agreement is the result of attempts to test the theory. But testing a theory means trying to find its weak spots; it means trying to refute it. And a theory is testable if it is refutable. . . .*

*“There is a difficulty with Darwinism. . . . It is far from clear what we should consider a possible refutation of the theory of natural selection. If, more especially, we accept that statistical definition of fitness which defines fitness by actual survival, then the survival of the fittest becomes tautological and irrefutable.”*

George Wald, Nobel Prize winner, writes in *Biochemical Science: An Inquiry Into Life* (p.42):

***“If life comes only from life, does this mean that there was always life on the earth? It must, yet we know that the world was once without life—that life appeared later. How? We think it was by spontaneous generation.***

...

Earlier, George Wald writes:

***“One has only to contemplate the magnitude of this task to concede that the spontaneous generation of a living organism is impossible. Yet here we are—as a result, I believe, of spon-taneous generation.***

***“There are only two possibilities as to how life arose. One is spon-taneous generation arising to evolu-tion. The other is a supernatural, creative act of God. There is no third possibility. Spontaneous generation that life arose from nonliving matter was scientifically disproved 120 years ago by Louis Pasteur and others. That leaves us with only one possible conclusion that life arose as a supernatural act of God.”***

Next, Dr. Wald goes on to commit intellectual suicide by writing,

***“I will not accept that philosoph-ically, because I do not want to believe in God. Therefore, I choose to believe in that which I know is scientifically impossible, spontaneous generation arising to evolution.”***

Sir Arthur Keith, a prominent British scientist, says,

***“The only alternative to some form of evolution is special creation which is unthinkable.”***

Professor D.M.S.Watson, writes,

***“Evolution is a theory universally accepted not because it can be proved by logical, coherent evidence to be true but because the only alternative, special creation, is clearly incredible.”***

## **A Sad, Sad Story**

Edward O. Wilson writes in *The Humanist*:

***“As were many persons from Alabama, I was a born-again Christ-ian. When I was fifteen, I entered the Southern Baptist Church with great fervor and interest in the funda-mentalist religion; I left at seventeen when I got to the University of Alabama and heard about evolu-tionary theory.”***

An alert church could have provided much factual data about evolution and might have prevented this tragedy.

FineTunedUniverse.com