

Evolution, the key idea of neopaganism and deChristianization, should be studied in one domain only: science. That is the reason why creationists should happily receive these latest publications which reveal the inconsistency between logic and scientific data on the one hand and evolution theory on the other.

References

- ¹Monod, J. 1971. *Le Hasard et la nécessité*. Editions du Seuil. Paris.
²*Ibid.*, p. 135.
³Salet, G. 1973. *Hasard et certitude. Le Transformisme devant la biologie actuelle*. Editions scientifiques Saint-Edme. Paris.
⁴*Ibid.*, p. IX.
⁵*Ibid.*, p. X.
⁶Borel, E. 1943. *Les probabilités et la vie*. Presses Uni-

versitaires de France. Paris; and 1950. *Probabilités et Certitude*. Presses Universitaires de France. Paris.

- ⁷Holroyd, H. B. 1972. *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, 9(1):5-13. In this article, Dr. Holroyd gets to the same results using the same kind of mathematical reasoning. He concludes that Darwinism is absurd either from a physical or from a mathematical view. See also an article of Howe and Davis, 1971. *C. R. S. Quarterly*, 8(1):30-43.
⁸Salet, G. *Op. cit.*, p. 327.
⁹*Ibid.*, p. 331.
¹⁰Vialleton, L. 1911. *Morphologie des Vertébrés*. O. Doin. Paris; 1924. *Membres et ceintures des Vertébrés supérieures—Critique du transformisme*. O. Doin. Paris. 710 pp.; and 1929. *L'origine des êtres vivants—L'illusion transformiste*. Paris. 395 pp.
¹¹Loyer, P. 1971. *Du Cosmos à Dieu*. Nouvelles éditions latines. Paris.
¹²Rostand. 1972. Cited by G. Salet (*Loc cit.*, p. 419) *Figaro Littéraire* no. 574.

"THE KING IS NAKED"

(Reflections on H. B. Holroyd's criticism of Darwin's theory of evolution)

JERZY Z. HUBERT*

When some definitely biased and one-sided outlook is being hurled upon a young mind, there are three possible ways of reaction to it: (a) become indoctrinated, (b) revolt against it, or (c) withdraw into a protective shell of total indifference. This third attitude was the one that I had most frequently adopted to protect my mind against the official "ex-cathedra" preached ideology.

There are however instances when even the most neutral and placid minds revolt. For me such a moment came when I was being taught Darwin's theory of evolution. Yes, I thought that survival of the fittest might be correct, but then amoebas are not worse equipped to live and survive on this earth than man and higher mammals. Why would there not be just a great variety of amoebas, bacterias, viruses, etc.?

This very reasonable question might cast some serious doubts upon the usefulness of Darwin's theory to explain *all* about the origin of man. However, the major thesis that the development of life could result in an interplay of two blind factors: chance variations and natural selection, is not refuted.

Nevertheless the article¹ in question, written by a physicist, seems to contain such a refutation, to have Darwin's theory of evolution—at least in its original version—completely destroyed. I use the word "seems" purposely. For the argument that Dr. Holroyd uses against Darwin is incredibly simple. So simple that in spite of its logical coherence one is tempted to become

suspicious about it and keep asking; if it is so obvious, why could not the scientists have said it earlier?

Well, there are some very good reasons explaining this fact. Darwin's theory was published when the statistical methods of reasoning had not yet been firmly introduced even into physics. In the period that followed, biologists, generally speaking, had very little knowledge of physics or mathematics. One can perhaps also say that physicists and mathematicians tend to be rather narrow minded and few take interest in general matters, outside their specialty.

All this being true however one cannot forget the major psychological factor: courage. To oppose deeply ingrained superstitions and beliefs, to be alone against all the scientific community, to risk one's career and prestige, requires either total innocency and unawareness or a great intellectual and moral courage. A child could say, "the king is naked," out of inborn simplicity and straightforwardness, but when a scientist does it, we cannot hesitate in attributing him with full merit for the act.

Dr. Holroyd's direct argument against Darwin's mechanistic theory of development of life is based on the impossibility of realizing the full trial-and-error (in Darwin's language: chance variation and natural selection) processes of which man—or other complex forms of life—would be an outcome. The interval of time that has elapsed since the formation of the earth is too short for trying even a small fraction of the total number of configurations and structures which could be made up of groups of all molecules contained in more complex living organisms.

*Dr. Jerzy Z. Hubert is a member of the Department of Physics, Academy of Mining and Metallurgy, Mickiewicza 30, Krakow, Poland.

I am accepting Dr. Holroyd's argument not only because it appears logical and well-grounded; but, also, because I know that there exist other scientific ways to prove that no mechanistic theory of life can be true. I shall mention here two patterns of such reasoning.

The first one² could be called the cybernetic proof. It is based on Gödl's theorem applied to computers. According to that theorem, for any machine which is functioning according to some built-in program, there exists an infinity of problems which it **cannot** solve.

It follows that for any machine there exists a limited class of tasks which it may perform or of modes of behaviour which it may simulate. (It does not follow, that for any task that we may think of, we cannot build *the* machine to perform it).

It follows, further, that although any specific goal pursued by man's brain or his muscles can be accomplished by a suitable machine, no mechanistic system can exist that would substitute for man as a whole.

The second pattern of reasoning is based on the concept of negentropy and on the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Both living systems and machines are subject to the Second Law. The living system, however, can locally increase negentropy, regardless of the conditions which are actually reigning in the immediate environment. Man can do so individually, other organisms do it as the total mass of all species living presently and in the past.

There are, however, some limits to which the environment can change without impairing man's ability to "produce" negentropy. As shown by our history, these limits are incessantly expanding.

Considering only the physical limitations, we may notice how they have been unceasingly transgressed in recent years; environmental temperatures from 0°K up to 400°K and more, pressures from 0 to 20 or more atmospheres, velocities greatly exceeding that of sound now have become standard external conditions for many categories of men (for instance Apollo astronauts, men working on off-shore drillings, deep-sea divers, etc.).

Setting aside considerations regarding the questions of limits and environmental conditions, it must be emphasized that no system ruled only by deterministic laws can "produce" negentropy. It follows that man and his development (man as a whole, not his particular functions and modes of behaviour) cannot be understood by any theory based on a mechanistic model. As shown by Dr. Holroyd the model based on chance must also be discarded.

If neither chance nor determinism, where then can one turn?

References

- ¹Holroyd, H. B. 1972. Darwinism is physical and mathematical nonsense, *Creation Research Society Quarterly*, June.
²Hubert, J. Z. 1968. Gödl, Ruyer and Assembling, *Znak* 16, Krakow.

REVIEW OF CREATIONIST ASTRONOMY

GEORGE MULFINGER, JR.*

Introduction

As can be seen from the brevity of the list of offerings presented here, much work remains to be done in the area of creationist astronomy. Christians who have sufficient background in the field and who have strong enough convictions to take a good stand on the issues involved should be encouraged to write.

Frankly, I have been appalled at the number of professing Christians who have taken the easy way out and have compromised with atheistic theories. Yet, whether realized by readers or not, creationists are in the midst of a spiritual warfare. Satanic forces and doctrines, which creationists oppose, exist at all levels, even in the basic sciences of physics and astronomy. Perhaps the heresy in those areas is more subtle than in, say, the doctrine of human evolution, but it is present nonetheless.

And, as has been brought out in Bible-science seminars in various parts of the country, a compromising tendency is taking a tremendous toll among our young people today. How can they be helped to withstand the wiles of the devil in this respect?

It is instructive to note from Ephesians 6:14 that *truth* is listed first among the defenses that comprise the "whole armor of God." But how can they know the truth in some of these subject matter areas unless capable Christians are willing to exercise some of their God-given talent to "dig it out" and make it available to them?

The writings reviewed in this article are, to the best of my knowledge, strictly creationist in their approach. Admittedly some decisions had to be made in determining what was to be included. Several books and articles that exhibit some measure of compromise with an evolutionary cosmology or time-scale have been excluded from the listing.

*George Mulfinger, Jr., M.S., is a member of the Department of Physics, Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina 29614.