

Why do people think Darwinism is a perfect creation?

Christopher Booker is familiar with the unabashed bigotry of staunch Darwinists.

By Christopher Booker

As an old hand at tangling with Darwinists, I was well aware that a howl of furious protests would greet my item last week describing their curious inability to recognise just how much of the story of evolution Darwin's theory cannot explain. For pointing out that they rely on no more than an unscientific leap of faith to believe that an infinite series of minute variations could bring about all those extraordinary leaps in the evolutionary story, such as the emergence of the eye and countless others, I was derided as "stupid", "idiotic" and "scientifically illiterate". Clearly I was unaware all these riddles had been solved by genetics and the decoding of the human genome.

The trouble is that, as my colleague Dr James Le Fanu has lucidly set out in his admirable new book *Why Us? How Science Rediscovered The Mystery Of Ourselves* (Harper Press, £18.99), the unravelling of the genome has done nothing of the kind. When mice, men and chimpanzees all turn out to be made of almost identical genetic material, the unknown factor which determines why the same building blocks should give rise to such an astonishing variety of different life-forms leaves the Darwinian thesis as full of holes as ever. To believe that genetics have solved the riddle relies as much on a leap of faith as that Biblical 'Creationism' which causes the more fanatical Darwinians to foam at the mouth.

Last Tuesday various eminent figures from the scientific establishment wrote to the Daily Telegraph, prompted by the remarkable finding of a poll published in this newspaper two weeks ago that only 37 percent of those questioned agree that Darwin's explanation for evolution is 'beyond reasonable doubt'.

These eminent Darwinians want those who 'reject evolution' to accept that the evidence for his theory is now 'overwhelming' - while at the same time asking those neo-Darwinians who promote 'an anti-theist agenda', such as Richard Dawkins, to keep quiet, because their obsessive vehemence is discrediting the theory.

On Friday another group of scientists, including several professors, wrote to the Telegraph to say that the problem with Darwinism is that it has 'far outrun its basis in scientific evidence'. While he might have been right on micro-evolution (Galapagos finches etc.), the 'evidence for how complex organisms developed' - those macro-evolutionary jumps - is 'modest in the extreme'.

Is it surprising, they asked, 'that there is such incredulity' that random mutations alone can 'account for the vast complexity of life?'.

In other words, as they put it, these hugely important questions are far from settled, and if we attempt to shut down the debate 'we dishonour the spirit of science'. Or as one scientist, L.Harrison Matthews, himself a convinced Darwinian, wisely put it 40 years ago in his introduction to my dog-eared copy of *The Origin of Species*: "belief in the theory of evolution is thus exactly parallel to the belief in special creation - both are concepts which believers know to be true but neither, up to the present has been capable of proof".

The unabashed hagiolatry of Darwin, notably by the BBC, continues to shower down on us from every side. But those readers who rushed last week to say that I was a "bloody fool", and that they would never again believe a word I said on anything, little realised how neatly their fanatical intolerance confirmed the point I was trying to make.