

Why Evolution Equals Stupid Chance

by Dennis Lange

In origins, the only two choices are (1) God created the world, or (2) all that we see came into existence accidentally. Evolutionists don't like it all when one accurately points out that evolution equals chance. But, according to the godless theory of evolution, all of life occurred, came into existence, arose by stupid chance. Evolutionists fight this idea ferociously because they know how ridiculous it makes their idea appear.

First, according to evolution, non-life gave rise to life in the beginning. A chemical soup accidentally "gave birth" to life. One could stop here and say the point is proven – evolution equals stupid chance since evolution is entirely based on that one random event. It is an event that a number of scientists and mathematicians have said is impossible. But, in going from goo to you, each step along the way where something new came into existence is also accidental, according to evolution.

Mutations, according to the theory of evolution are what give rise to something new. It is mutations that bring something new into existence. But, mutations are simply random, accidental, by chance. Moreover, **they are errors!**

The following quotes are just a few of the many that admit evolution means chance:

- Theodosius Dobzhansky, an evolutionist wrote, "The process of mutation is the only known source of the raw materials of genetic variability, and hence of evolution." ¹(emphasis mine, D.L.)
- Luigi Cavalli-Sforza, head of the International Human Genome Project, and Stanford University geneticist, said, "Genetic mutations are spontaneous, chance changes, which are rarely beneficial, and more often have no effect, or a deleterious one" ²
- Nobel laureate Jacques Monod wrote, "Chance alone is the source of every innovation, of all creation in the biosphere.... All forms of life are the product of chance...." ³
- Michael Denton wrote, "Even today we have no way of rigorously estimating the probability or degree of isolation of even one functional protein. It is surely a little premature to claim that random processes could have assembled mosquitoes and elephants when we still have to determine the actual probability of the discovery by chance of one single functional protein molecule." ⁴
- Dr. Dennis Gabor, the 1971 winner of the Nobel Prize for physics has stated, "I just cannot believe that everything developed by random mutations...." (as quoted in Special Creation vs. Evolution.)

Since mutations are the supposed source of any innovation, evolution teaches that every new thing came into existence by chance. Evolutionists immediately protest and try to add natural selection as part of the creative process. But the other name for the process of natural selection is survival of the fittest. By the theory of evolution, mutation gives rise to something new and it either survives or not. What is new occurs BEFORE natural selection.

Moreover, natural selection is a random process. Random is defined as "lacking a definite plan, purpose, or pattern." Thus, when John Rennie, editor-in-chief of

Scientific American, said that chance played only a part in evolution because natural selection was not random, Bill Hoesch wrote, "To claim that natural selection is governed by something other than chance is to suggest it is somehow a **directed** process. What shadowy entity would he propose? "Selective forces" are ultimately subject to either chance or intelligence. Rennie can't have it both ways."⁵ Henry Gee, chief science writer for Nature wrote, "...natural selection is a random, undirected process, unlikely to work in the same direction for long."⁶

Dutch botanist Hugo deVries said it succinctly, "Natural selection explains the survival of the fittest, but it does not explain the arrival of the fittest."⁷

The choice is: intelligent design or stupid chance. Chance is not adequate to explain the design, complexity, and perfection of nature.

¹ Dobzhansky, Theodosius, "on Methods of Evolutionary Biology", American Scientist, vol.45 (Dec., 1957), p.385.

² Cavalli-Sforza, Luigi, Genes, Peoples, and Languages, (New York: North Point Press, 2000), p.176.

³ Monod, Jacques. Chance and Necessity, (London: Collins, 1972) p.110.

⁴ Denton, Michael. Evolution: A Theory in Crisis (London: Burnett Books, Ltd., 1985), p.324.

⁵ Hoesch, Bill (2002), "A Reply to Rennie," Institute for Creation Research, [On-line], URL: <http://www.icr.org/headlines/rennie.html>.

⁶ Gee, Henry (1999), *In Search of Deep Time* (New York: Free Press).

⁷ de Vries, Hugo (1905), *Species and Varieties: Their Origin by Mutation*, ed. Daniel Trembly MacDougal (Chicago, IL: Open Court).