MacDonald King Aston

Fire Eater! Editor

Evolution of the Specious

10 June 2005

(Originally published on Dixieinternet.com.)

> *"To explain the phenomena in the world of our experience, to answer the question "Why?" rather than only the question "What?", is one of the foremost objectives of all rational inquiry..." (Theories of Explanation, The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy)*

Christians historically have lost ground to the secularists over the issue of evolution and it is no surprise that the modern version of evolution was established by an agnostic, or Unitarian (but I repeat myself), Charles Robert Darwin (1809-1882), in his On the Origin of Species (1859). To Darwin, God was an illusion produced by the brain's "organization" and an ingrained tribal survival strategy. (Darwin also was an ardent supporter of radical egalitarianism and was the English equivalent of a radical abolitionist.)

Here is the Big Dark Secret that evolutionists do not want you to know: ***Nothing simple can change into anything complex unless the complexity already exists in the first place.***

What is this "evolution" that has occasioned such vitriolic controversy? Why do so many Christians feel as if they're on the run when it comes to the topic of evolution? The answer is that most Christians—most people—are ignorant about the nuts and bolts of the theory of evolution. And it is important to remember that evolution is just that—a theory, not a law. It is high time that Christians met evolution on its own turf and not in the half-baked pseudo-science taught in the rotting institutions we call universities.

Here are the main points to understand about evolution:

1. It relies upon language to support its thesis.
2. It is a theory of change.
3. It comes in two flavours: *how* and *why*.

The evolutionist-shamans are notorious for misusing language to buttress a shaky theory. Evolution is most often "explained" by appealing to a fairly simple metaphor. The metaphor is change, and you can see this metaphor in the word "evolution" itself, which passed into common usage around 1622 and simply meant "an unrolling". From this simple metaphor came an unlikely number of definitions of evolution. And here is one of the very worst, not only in sense but in its...well...you be the judge:

> "Evolution is a change from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity, to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; through continuous differentiations and integrations." (*Herbert Spencer, 1820-1903, First Principles*)

Eh? I sometimes doubt my sanity when I consider that I actually know what that sentence means. But note the word change in that elephantine sentence.

As you can see, though, Spencer, like Darwin and all his disciples since, laid a heavy emphasis on the metaphor of change. Now if evolution primarily concerns itself with change, what is the reason for the controversy over it? After all, it's a good thing to know how things change. That way we can predict change in our environment.

The problem lies in the nature of the change that so animates the evolutionists. The kind of change they like to talk about does not restrict itself to explanations of how things work, but sneakily goes on to make claims about why things are the way they are. It is one thing to say that different finches from three different islands probably share a common ancestor. It's a whole other thing to claim that finches "evolved" from a "less complex" to a "more complex" form of life. The first statement is a "how" explanation. The second is a "why" explanation.

As a "how" explanation, evolution has some merit. As a "why" explanation", evolution is a fairy story. It is precisely because people confuse these two concepts that evolution has acquired its status as a near deity in science departments across our befuddled land. Consider the standard claim made by evolutionists, that simple things "evolve" into complex things.

Here is the Big Dark Secret that evolutionists do not want you to know: *Nothing simple can change into anything complex unless the complexity already exists in the first place.*

The simple can no more "create" the complex than you or I can walk on our heads. But this claim is the heart of the evolutionist propaganda. It is this simple-to-complex idea of change that leads normally rational people into claiming that a unicellular organism crawling about in the muck of existence "evolves" into you. The simple-to-complex idea itself comes from another silly idea, that the world is a machine and not an organism. There is a long and sorry history of the mechanistic view of the world, all of it nonsense (David Hume representing the apex of the silliness).

The idea that the world is a machine probably stems from the trickery of language. Language deceives us constantly, usually by making distinctions that are true for language but false for reality. In the simple sentence "I like cornbread", the subject ("I") seems to be separated from its action ("like"). In reality, of course, the "I" and the liking are not separated at all. They are the same.

Science claims to get its authority from observing phenomena and making conclusions about those observations. But think about this. To undertake even the most simple of experiments, a scientist must assume that the universe is ordered (in other words, designed). Without order no one could make any conclusions about any experiment, since the conclusion itself would be based upon chaos. If a scientist put his hand over a flame and burned himself, then sadomasochistically repeated the experiment over and again, he would be led to an inescapable conclusion: fire burns. And fire always burns; not just sometimes burns. Why? Because the universe is ordered that way. Now put some salve on that hand.

In other words, science is simply another form of faith. A weak cousin, to be sure, but one who believes in an ordered universe. You won't often hear scientists admit this fact—it is somewhat embarrassing to their project—but it is a fact. Perhaps this is why so many people use an obvious oxymoron: "intelligent design". Can you think of a design that is not intelligent? Design implies intelligence (as does the entire universe).

In the war for our children's future, the ability of ordinary folks to come to grips with the sheer stupidity of scientism will be paramount. In the meantime, Christians have nothing to fear from evolution. It is, after all, a rather intelligent design.