

by assumed ancestral relationships. Furthermore, creation accounts for the differences as well as the similarities, which evolution cannot do.

In addition, it is reasonable that God would have made for each basic "kind" a genetic system which would permit ample variation in response to environmental changes, even though it must basically continue to "bring forth after its kind" (Genesis 1:11, etc.). Biochemists are only now beginning to unravel the marvelously complex genetic code, which assures that characteristics transmitted to the progeny will be those already present in the parents, even though much variation is possible within those limits.

Occasionally so-called "mutations" occur. These are sudden changes in the genetic structure brought about by penetration of the germ cell by radiations or some other disorganizing medium. **Evolutionists believe that if these mutations turn out to be helpful to the individual (or population of individuals) in the natural environment, they will be preserved and transmitted to the descendants by natural selection.** This is believed by most evolutionists to be the chief mechanism by which evolution occurs.

**The trouble with this idea is that practically all mutations (even leading evolutionists acknowledge this to be true of at least 99.9% of all known mutations) are harmful, rather than helpful, in the supposed struggle for existence.** Mutant varieties thus almost always die out if left to themselves, or else revert back to ancestral types.

This, of course, is in perfect accord with the Second Law of Thermo-dynamics. A mutation is a random change in a highly organized system. In accordance with statistical thermodynamics, a random change in an ordered system will almost certainly decrease the order therein. But if, by infinitesimal chance, the level of order is accidentally raised, then the chance that another mutation would improve the system still further is even smaller. **The probability of an increased order arising by random variation decreases as the degree of order of the system increases.**

**Thus evolution, if it occurs on any broad scale, requires at every step an almost magical manipulation of the basic laws of nature as they are known to function at present. It is a religious philosophy, held by faith, and propagated by the missionary zeal of its leaders.** This is still a free country, and men are free to advocate any religion they choose. But the actual data support the faith of the creationist far better than that of the evolutionist.

For a documented treatment of evolution in its religious, moral, and social aspects, see the author's book, **Evolution in Turmoil** (San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, 1982), 190 pp.}

# Is Evolution A Scientific Fact?

By  
Dr. Henry Morris

Evolution is accepted as fact by a majority of scientists, but one should remember that **scientific principles are not established by majority vote**. Probably the most comprehensive scientific critique on all aspects of evolution is in the book, **Scientific Creationism**, ed. by Henry M. Morris (San Diego: Creation-Life Publishers, Second Edition, 1985), 288 pp.} There is a significant number of scientists today (undoubtedly numbering in the thousands) who either reject the theory altogether or who regard it as a still unsettled issue. Even those who do accept it, in many cases, do so not because of the actual scientific evidence (with which even most scientists are only superficially familiar), but because they have been intimidated by the myth that all scientists accept evolution!

**As a matter of fact, no theory of origins--evolution or special creation or anything else--can possibly be scientific.** "Science" means "knowledge" and by definition means that which we actually know concerning the facts of nature and their interrelationships. **The very heart of the "scientific method" is the reproducibility of experiments.** That is, if a certain process is observed and measured today, and then the experiment is conducted again the same way tomorrow, the same results should be obtained. In this way, by experimental repetition and verification, a scientific description of the process is eventually developed.

Since it is impossible for us to repeat the supposed evolutionary history of the world and its inhabitants, and **since no human observers were present to observe and**

**record the supposed evolutionary changes of the past, it is clear that evolution in the broad sense is beyond the reach of the scientific method. The theory of evolution is, therefore, not science at all.**

The actual processes of nature as they occur today are conservative and decay processes, rather than creative and developmental. That is, all processes (and this includes biological and geological processes) operate within the framework of the First and Second Laws of Thermodynamics, which are beyond question the two best-proved facts of science. The First Law is the Law of Mass-Energy Conservation and states that nothing in the observable universe is now being created or annihilated. The Second Law is the Law of Increasing Entropy, which says that the entropy (that is, the disorder or disorganization) of every observable system in the universe tends to grow. Thus, the basic structure of the universe is not one of continuing "creation" but rather of "conservation." The basic law of change in the universe is not one of evolutionary development upward but rather of "devolutionary" change downward.

These facts are so common to every-day experience that it is amazing that anyone has ever suggested anything else. We do see much biological variation of course, but always within definite limits. No two individuals are exactly alike, even when born of the same parents. New varieties or species are occasionally developed, either by artificial breeding techniques or by natural selection in response to

environmental changes, but these are always still of the same basic "kinds."

**That is, there are many varieties of dogs and many varieties of cats, but never any kind of new animal intermediate between a dog and a cat! Or between a horse and an elephant, or an ape and a man.** If evolution were really true, it should be quite impossible for biologists to develop any kind of classification scheme (that is, division into species, genera, families, etc.), because there would be everywhere a continuous intergrading of all forms of life. **As a matter of fact, since all living plants and animals supposedly have arisen by gradual modification from a common ancestor, in the same world, it stands to reason that they all ought to be exactly alike!**

Nor does it help any to attribute these changes all to the prehistoric past, the world of fossils, because the same great "gaps" exist between basic kinds in the fossil world that exist in the modern world. There are new varieties of dogs and new varieties of cats found in the fossil world, but still nothing between a dog and a cat! **The "missing links" are still missing, despite the innumerable fossils of animals and plants that have been excavated over the centuries.**

Special creation by a divine Creator can account for the actual observed facts of nature much better than a hypothetical process of development in the past which is contrary to basic known scientific law in the present. It is more reasonable that "similarities" be explained in terms of a common Designer, who created similar structures for similar functions, rather than