

AlbertMohler.com

Evolution on the Mind

Saturday, August 20, 2005

The reporters and editors of *The New York Times* evidently have evolution on the mind. Today's on-line edition of the paper includes at least three articles dealing with evolution in one way or the other. All this attention indicates the anxiety of evolutionary theory's proponents.

[1.] "[Politicized Scholars Put Evolution on the Defensive](#)" deals with the [Discovery Institute](#), suggesting that its scientists and researchers have a political agenda. Well, that would be pretty clear since they are honest in expressing their hope that a more open approach to science will lead to better public policy. What's missing from the article is the obvious — that the pro-evolutionary scientists have a political agenda as well. Just look at the advocacy groups established in order to defend evolutionary theory's dominance in the schools.

[2.] "[Frist Urges 2 Teachings on Life Origin](#)" reports on Sen. Bill Frist's speech to the Nashville Rotary Club in which the Senate Majority Leader, like President Bush, called for Intelligent Design to be taught in schools alongside the theory of evolution. "I think in a pluralistic society that is the fairest way to go about education and training people for the future," Frist said.

[3.] "[A Catholic Professor on Evolution and Theology: To Understand One, It Helps to Understand the Other](#)," features [John F. Haught](#), a professor of theology at [Georgetown University](#) who, according to the paper, "in a long series of learned, eloquent books and essays, has explored the religious significance of the contemporary understanding of evolution."

[Professor Haught](#) is upset with the statements made by Cardinal Christoph Schonborn of Vienna [see previous posting] to the effect that the neo-Darwinian doctrine currently at the heart of evolutionary theory is incompatible with a Christian view of life. Haught, like so many others, wants to claim that evolutionary theory is compatible with Christian faith. In order to do so, he assumes an argument much like the late [Stephen Jay Gould's](#) concept of "non-overlapping magisteria." The problem with this concept is now clear — these magisteria inevitably overlap.

Content Copyright © 2002-2010, R. Albert Mohler, Jr.

