

DEVIOUS DAWKINS OR CREATION NOT EVOLUTION

Some years ago, before he achieved his more recent celebrity status, I wrote to Dr Richard Dawkins after one of his radio statements. I challenged his aggressively-atheistic anti-creationism on strictly scientific grounds.

First, I pointed out that the evolution hypothesis is contrary to the well-established second law of thermodynamics. According to the latter empirically-based theory, entropy tends to a maximum, or, in short, everything is 'running down'. As with physics, so with biology, evidential genetic change suggests *decreasing* not *increasing* complexity, *decay* not *development* (as in the case of non-reproducing hybrid mutations, e. g. mules).

Second, I pointed out that evolution cannot be demonstrated by an empirical method. Indeed, to achieve the status of a valid scientific theory, observable phenomena require repeated experimental testing before any data-based conclusions may be drawn. This well-established philosophy of science argued for by the late professor Karl Popper is irrefutable. To be strictly scientific, the theory of evolution really demands the presence of scientific observers millions of years before such intelligent beings had evolved! The truth is that evolutionists arrive at their conclusions by *speculative* extrapolation. It is because they insist that the evolution process is imperceptibly slow that they require their multi-million year time scale, for which there is no *actual* empirical evidence.

Third, faced by observable data, presuppositions are active in assessing the nature and origins of the phenomena concerned. So when Richard Dawkins insists that facts are evaluated by 'reason' rather than 'faith' (as he assumes is the case with creationists), he is misrepresenting the debate. In opposing the creationist stance, he is voicing his own atheistic presuppositions, incorporating them into a dubious scientific methodology. Since a *bona fide* scientist who happens also to believe in creation is no less concerned with testable data than any other scientist, the disagreement is not about 'reason *versus* faith' but 'faith *versus* faith' and 'reason *versus* reason'. In short, evolutionary scientific thinking is every bit faith-driven as creationist scientific thinking.

Instead of giving me a reasoned response to these points, Oxford-based Dr Dawkins could only attempt to discredit me by communicating with my doctoral thesis publisher - Oxford University Press - that I thought as I did. Clearly, the behaviour of an intelligent, cool-headed, objective scientist! As is now obvious from his books and TV documentaries, Richard Dawkins' fanatical anti-creationism is driven by an atheistic rather than a strictly scientific agenda.

Whatever fuming objections irrational Richard Dawkins raises against biblical creationism, his neo-Darwinianism requires a greater leap of faith than ever a creationist demands. Belief in intelligent design coexists consistently and comfortably with observable phenomena. Thus when King David wrote, 'Marvellous are your works' (*Ps. 139: 14*), he was probably thinking of creation in general as well as the human body in particular - 'a world within a world'. As far as the psalmist was concerned, it was self-evident that 'The heavens declare the glory of God' (*Ps. 19: 1*) and that 'The earth is the Lord's' (*Ps. 24: 1*). Like Moses in Genesis, David never *argues* for God's existence and creative activity. He assumes and asserts them. His limited awareness of the design and function of the body in the wider context of an ordered universe was sufficient to affirm the reality of God. Thus atheism has to yield to the 'argument from design' for God's existence (known as the *teleological argument* from Gk.

telos = 'end' or 'purpose'; see Paul's use of this in *Romans 1: 20*).

This argument is well illustrated by an amusing incident. The German mathematician Athanasius Kircher used it to confound and convert an atheistic friend. After he acquired a new astronomical globe, the professor showed it to his friend who admired it. On asking where it came from, the atheist was told - tongue-in-cheek - that it 'arrived by mere chance'. "That is impossible. Stop joking and tell me." The professor wisely responded: "I am surprised you insist that small globe must have a maker but that the world and the galaxies represented by the globe exist without the design and order of a creator!"

Indeed, God is to His creation as the playwright is to the play, and the composer is to the concerto. Thus David would dismiss both atheism *and* evolution (without advocating a compromised 'theistic evolution' view maintained by some Christian thinkers today). The world and the body are products of divine intelligence and power, not a cosmic accident. The scientist Lord Kelvin said that, "The atheistic idea is so nonsensical that I cannot put it into words." In connection with the Darwinian theory, Dr Ambrose Fleming said that, "Evolution is baseless and quite incredible." Even Charles Darwin himself stated that no empirical evidence is available to prove the evolution of one species into another. He even admitted that "To suppose that the eye with all its inimitable contrivances ... could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest degree." As the style of Professor Richard Dawkins' popular polemic against Christian creationism makes very clear, 'evolutionism' is actually more 'religious' than scientific, being based on speculation rather than evidence. Thus Dr Albert Fleishmann declared: "The theory of evolution suffers from grave defects which are more and more apparent as time advances. It can no longer square with practical scientific knowledge."

While much media discussion and public misinformation has yet to catch up with the latest research, many modern scientists would concur with the King of Israel: "I am fearfully and wonderfully made." Note, *made* not *evolved*! For further information on this complex subject, see relevant studies by A. J. Monty White, *What About Origins?* (1978), M. Bowden, *Science vs Evolution* (1991) and Richard Milton, *The Facts of Life* (1992). Remarkably, the 1956 Everyman edition of Darwin's *Origin of Species* was published with an *anti*-evolutionary introduction by Professor W. R. Thompson! Dr Graham Everest of the University of East Anglia stated that the theory of evolution 'lacks hard evidence, experiment and, most crucially, rigour in argument' (*Eastern Daily Press*, 9 July 1998).

Dr Alan C. Clifford
Norwich Reformed Church
www.nrchurch.co.nr