

# Baumgardner Does not Understand Evolution

---

David E. Thomas

9 April 1997

*The Los Alamos Monitor*

[globalflood.org/origins-debate.html](http://globalflood.org/origins-debate.html)

Editor:

Re: The time hasn't been adequate for evolution (John Baumgardner, Monitor, April 3). This letter is a classic example of a Straw Man. Baumgardner doesn't refute evolution; he only shows the absurdity of his own twisted understanding of the theory.

Baumgardner's detailed "proof" of the impossibility of evolution only considers random chance. But no biologist contends that life comes about from a big bowl of amino acids, which suddenly goes POOF! and generates detailed genes or proteins. Evolution (the origin of new species from existing species) has at least FOUR major requirements. One of these is random increases in diversity, via genetic mutations, sexual recombinations, or drift; this is the random, or chance element. A second critical element is the opposite of chance: stasis and constancy, which are a result of heredity (cats always give birth to baby cats, never to alligators or oak trees). A third important factor is the reduction of genetic variability by natural selection: the improved parental capability of those organisms best adapted to the environment of the day. And the fourth key component is history - the effects of time and events (one 10-km asteroid can ruin your whole species' day).

Saying evolution is just "random chance" is like criticizing the theory of fire for saying the only ingredient required is fuel. I can picture Dr. Baumgardner holding up a piece of wood and declaring "See? Here's some fuel! But does it burst into flame? NO! The Theory of Fire is FALSE!" Everyone knows that fuel alone isn't enough. You need heat and oxygen too. Chance alone does not produce evolution. You need heredity, selection, and a little time as well.

Baumgardner also confuses the origin of the first life with the ongoing evolution of new species or genes. While traditional evolution (origin of species) is thoroughly documented, the origin of the first self-reproducing snippets of life is not. But several promising leads exist -- and serious

scientists are testing these explanations, rather than throwing up their hands and declaring that only Genesis can hold the answer.

David E. Thomas