

## What is Evolution?

Despite claims from evolutionists, evolution is not an undisputed, unresolved issue. Some say it is a theory, others insist evolution is a fact. Still others maintain it is both. But just what is evolution?

Evolutionism's great champion, the late Stephen J. Gould said, "evolution is a theory. It is also a fact. And facts and theories are different things, not rungs in a hierarchy of increasing certainty. Facts are the world's data. Theories are structures of ideas that explain and interpret facts. Facts don't go away when scientists debate rival theories to explain them." However, "fact," continues Gould, "doesn't mean 'absolute certainty'; there ain't no such animal in an exciting and complex world."

Gould further affirms "humans evolved from ape-like ancestors whether they did so by Darwin's proposed mechanism or by some other yet to be discovered." But Gould did admit "we have always acknowledged how far we are from completely understanding the mechanisms (theory) by which evolution (fact) occurred. Darwin continually emphasized the difference between his two great and separate accomplishments: establishing the fact of evolution, and proposing a theory--natural selection--to explain the mechanism of evolution."

Richard C. Lewontin has also stated, "It is time for students of the evolutionary process, especially those who have been misquoted and used by the creationists, to state clearly that evolution is a fact, not theory, and that what is at issue within biology are questions of details of the process and the relative importance of different mechanisms of evolution."

First, if any misquotes have occurred, it is because the individuals above spoke and printed them first. So no more straw men and red herrings, Mr. Lewontin!

Second, the "experts" who control the definitions say evolution is a "fact" ("world's data" or observed phenomenon), AND a "theory" (explanation of that data). Gould says "evolution" is "a theory" but Lewontin says it is not. But their dispute, says Lewontin, are "questions of details of the process." It appears the "experts" are saying evolution is everything we see and the explanation for that which we don't! A very convenient theory against which no conceivable test of falsifiability exists. That makes it non-scientific.

Third, no one doubts that "facts don't go away when scientists debate rival theories" because the "facts" (data) are what we all observe - nature! The "facts" (data) simply tell us "something exists or did exist," whether animate or inanimate. Evolutionists don't have the market in ascertaining that. Contrary to Gould's premise, people know, for certain, what they hear, taste, touch, smell, or see. We call it experience (empiricism), and it is the foundation of science. And experience does not show, much less prove, "evolution" as a "fact" or as a "theory" (since theory is merely an explanation, and in the case of evolution, a non-demonstrable one at that). The real question is origins-from where did they come? More particularly, what conclusion would a reasonable person draw for their origin based upon the available evidence?

Since no one believes (yes, even scientists “believe,” read their literature) humans were present in the very beginning, no human eyewitness can substantiate “scientifically” what process started life. And since we know for certain (without doubt) the “fact” (observed experience) that living things produce living things (offspring, reproduction, etc.), we know from where life does come. We can say with certitude this is true (though Gould and his colleagues must deny knowing this for certain if they practiced what they teach). We also have strong evidence (or shall we say, a lack thereof), that life did not spontaneously arise from any inanimate (non-living) object. Not once in human history has this ever been observed (experienced)! This IS a “fact” (“world’s data”). Yet despite evidence to the contrary, evolutionists insist on indoctrinating the public (and their youth in schools) that evolution is a “fact” (observed) and the best “theory” (explanation) which “science” has to offer.

Fourth, and even more incredible, is that Darwinism (natural selection, gradualism, survival of the fittest, descent through modification, etc.) was THE descriptive “theory” (explanatory mechanism) by which “evolution” was defined and yet today it is all but rejected or called into serious question by most leading biologists. Even the “experts” above admit their disagreement over the “mechanism” (process) by which “evolution” occurs. Yet these “scientists” blindly believe in something for which they cannot “scientifically” demonstrate or prove! How can anyone rationally discard the defining element of a concept and still retain the concept (i.e., define apples as fruit but discover fruit really doesn’t exist, but insist apples exist)? They call that “science?” Yet if we attribute that “mechanism” to God, they arrogantly and condescendingly call it “faith.”

Well my friends, Biblical faith is predicated upon rationally deduced and demonstrated evidence (Isaiah 1:18, John 20:24-31). The birth, works, death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ is that evidence. It is historically recorded. But it takes a mountain of irrational “blind” faith for scientists to believe evolution is a “fact” or a “theory” when all the evidence points against it.

So, what is “evolution?” It is a belief system, a faith, presupposed without any “scientific” basis and blindly accepted by individuals whose world view presumes nothing exists unless “evolution” can explain it. At best it’s an exercise in circular reasoning. At worst, it is an evil plot to undermine the intellectual integrity of God’s crowning creation - mankind!

Keith Padgett