

Evolution Lacks Evidence and Bible Remains True: A response to Marshall Berman

John Baumgardner

27 Feb 1997

The Los Alamos Monitor

globalflood.org/origins-debate.html

Editor:

Mr. Marshall Berman, in his 2/18/97 letter, is misleading Monitor readers when he claims that "valid answers have been provided" for the issues I and Tim Wilson have raised concerning biogenesis, the macroevolution mechanism, the origin of coded language in DNA, and the paucity of Darwinian intermediates in the fossil record. Where, pray tell -- in what book or scientific journal -- do such answers to these core issues for the molecules-to-man evolution story reside? I assert again that, in claiming molecules-to-man evolution is science or fact, while having no authentic scientific support for these critical aspects of their hypothesis, evolutionists are deceiving themselves and the public, discrediting the entire scientific enterprise, and committing outright fraud.

If Mr. Berman believes otherwise, I implore him to present to the Monitor readership the essence of how biogenesis could possibly occur, or describe by what process a new gene necessary for genuine macroevolution can arise, or elucidate what conceivable laws of chemistry or physics can generate coded language. If my criticisms are not valid, I beg him to provide references from the professional scientific literature that supply specific scientific answers to these pivotal questions. I say it is high time for evolutionists either to deliver the goods, i.e., scientific answers, or else be honest and admit that evolution is only a tentative hypothesis, motivated by atheist presuppositions, and without substantive scientific justification.

Mr. Berman in his letter also raises the issue of how the Bible is to be understood and spends considerable space in listing supposed scientific errors in its pages. But if one focuses not on details, like how Jacob managed to obtain so many spotted and speckled lambs from Laban's flock, but rather

on the primary themes of the Bible, does Mr. Berman have the candor to tell us how these are to be understood?

What about the Bible's primary truth claims that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob exists; that He created the universe and all it contains; that He has been active in human history--particularly in the history of the nation Israel; that human beings have a very special place in God's plans; that we individually are accountable to Him for every thought, word, and deed; that Jesus is the promised Messiah/King who, before He assumes His kingly role, laid down His life for the sins of every human being, Jew and Gentile; that on the basis of Messiah's sacrifice a legal pardon for sin has been decreed in heaven for every individual, the only condition being acceptance, as opposed to rejection, of this pardon?

Does Mr. Berman have the courage to tell us how these major themes of the Bible from his perspective are to be understood? This is a relevant issue because I have been arguing that ones prior metaphysical commitments profoundly influence how one handles -- how one assigns weights to -- scientific observations and what conclusions one is allowed to draw from these observations. A prior materialist bias most assuredly does influence the options a person can allow, especially on ultimate questions. Does Mr. Berman have the courage to admit this?

And since Mr. Berman raised the issue of morality, on what conceivable basis does he defend the morality logically linked with evolution? Molecules-to-man evolution insists it is solely the laws of physics and chemistry, coupled with the laws of chance and the survival of the fittest, that brought humans into existence. What other morality does this perspective allow but the natural dominance of the strong over the weak?

This is precisely the moral outlook Hitler and Stalin used to justify the brutal political executions of tens of millions of their citizens. It is a 'morality' that insists there is no transcendent right or wrong, no basis for human worth, no basis for human responsibility, no basis for government by law, no purpose or meaning for the individual. Such a morality without exception leads to savagery and social disintegration. It turns cities into graffiti-painted, gang-controlled, drug-infested wastelands.

How does Mr. Berman even dare raise the issue of morality when this is the sort of morality his point of view advocates? How can Mr. Berman with a clear conscience support SB155, which requires molecules-to-man evolution be taught as dogma at taxpayers expense in the schools of our state, when it

imposes this sort of inherently destructive moral outlook on our young people and on our culture?

John Baumgardner