

Don't forget, of course, the thousands of species of fresh-water fishes. They couldn't have survived in a raging, salty sea [which is very true], so the ark must have had a big aquarium in it [with non-salty water for the freshwater fishes].

Can you believe that any grown man or woman with the slightest knowledge of biology, geology, physics, or any science at all, not to speak of plain and simple common sense, can conceivably believe this? Can you for one moment imagine that this is supposed to be taught to children in the name of science? With or without the story of the ark, the flood cannot conceivably account for the facts of geology and paleontology. Not only are the creationists who propound such nonsense abysmally ignorant of, or blind to, the most elementary facts of biology and geology; not only are they willing to invent stories that defy every law of nature to save their myth of creation; but they have the arrogance to claim that these stories are "science," and that their "science" is just as good as that of thousands of geologists and biologists who have devoted their lives to careful experimentation, observation, and logic. (p. 203)

This is certainly caustic language, but (sadly) much of what it says is true. Futuyma later elaborates on the part about the hypotheses of "Flood geology" as "defying every law of nature." With his ever-present concern for science education, he says:

The child who learns that living things are created and directed by unknown and unknowable forces that can alter natural laws at will cannot apply its rules of scientific logic and procedure in any other field, from physics to psychology. He or she can only learn that the human quest for knowledge is doomed to failure by the willful whim of an inscrutable agent who acknowledges no natural law. (p. 219)

I certainly do not approve of Futuyma's open disdain for Christianity, but what possible reason is there for our generously providing him and other anti-creationists with a solid basis for telling almost the entire educational world that we do not believe in the stability of the natural laws which God created? His irreverent book would not have been accepted by educators if creationists had not supplied him with many examples of their unwillingness to recognize obviously valid scientific principles.

We need to take seriously the fact that it is not consistent with the nature of God to suppose that He allows--or ever did allow--the created natural laws by which the universe operates, to be erratic. We recognize His absolute right to supersede whatever natural laws He wants to, for special purposes. This He has done in certain cases, as recorded in the Bible; but the Bible gives no hint that during the Flood the laws which control the movement or non-movement of various kinds of matter, the rates of settling of suspended particles, the dissolution and precipitation of soluble substances, the effect of water buoyancy on terrestrial plant matter, and several other physical laws, operated whimsically.

The leading young-earth creationists, e. g., Morris and Whitcomb, have repeatedly insisted that they do not invoke special miraculous action of God to accomplish the deposition of sediments during the Flood. Yet they and dozens of other creationist authors continue to describe the effects of the Flood and its supposed formation of the main parts of the earth's sedimentary cover, in ways which demand either many special miracles or the complete altering of a large number of physical laws which, according to the Bible's description of life on the earth, had to be operating before and after the Flood. And, what is worse, these creationist authors usually insist that they have gotten these ideas directly from the Bible. Because of this, Futuyma and many other scientists now