

DARWAISM

Dr. Phil Smith ©

This essay covers a number of articles concerning science within Job. It provides a different perspective with challenging arguments. There is no claim of authorship here except for compilation of the material from the article mentioned and its respective author. The challenge put forth in this essay is for the reader to consider the possibility of a different world view.

Introduction

Darwin's Enigma by Luther Sunderland copyright 1988. Sunderland starts off by introducing the subject of origins and its worldwide interest. There's been tremendous advancement in many areas of science however the search for explaining how life, earth and the existence of the universe has produced more questions than answers, and others have now admitted so many weaknesses in evolutionary theory. Scientists turn to space, thinking that it would have the answers but the solar system has created yet many more questions that continue to challenge the theory of evolution.

In this essay the basic theories of evolution: the geological column, gradualism, punctuated equilibrium, neo-Darwinism, uniformitarianism and basic evolution are all analysed and debated with proven examples of how they all fail. And above all, it answers the question of why is evolution so popular and accepted.

Part I

Even Charles Darwin questioned some of his own theories, saying that the fossil record presented the strongest single evidence against his theory. He ended up stating that the geological records were extremely imperfect and hoped that discovery would eventually prove his theory correct. But after 120 years, after discovery after discovery, the gaps in evolution continue to get wider with no evidence toward Darwinism. The hard facts of palaeontology revealed a different story. So as theories of evolution are being introduced, people like Dr. David Pilbeam, curator of the Peabody Museum of Natural History at Yale says that he is convinced that scientists would not find a true and correct story of human evolution. Dr. David Raup, curator of geology at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago says that the 250,000 plant and animal species do not support Darwin. Creationist scientists were winning debate after debate to the extent that evolutionists were advised not to debate them.

Evolutionary ideas were not new with Charles Darwin. They had been formed long ago by way of ancient philosophies of the Chinese, Hindu, Egyptian and Assyrian. These philosophies also came from Plato and Aristotle and Erasmus Darwin, a physician in England. Many shunned Darwin for accepting all the credit for idea of evolution himself. Darwin said that creationists accepted his views on selection but creationists only thought it was a conservative principle while evolutionists saw it as a force to create every living thing from a common ancestor. Darwin's book only popularized an existing idea pushing it as the answer

to creation without God. After his return from a five year voyage around the world on the HMS Beagle, Darwin adopted the mechanism of the 'survival of the fittest' idea and added it to his evolutionary theory. This idea had already been stated by Herbert Spencer seven years before the publication of the 'The Origin of the Species' in 1852. It was admitted that the acceptance of Darwin was more due to his hypothesis since there was no other hypothesis on this subject outside creationism. It spread like wild fire over the western world amongst non Christians. In 1809 Jean Baptiste de Lamarch said that organisms were capable of changing their form, proportions, colour, agility and industry within a certain environment. He discarded the idea of a fixed species and instead viewed them as variable populations. He was the first to state that complex organisms evolved from simpler ones.

But later, if scientists are truthful, Dr. Patterson said that neither evolution nor creation qualified as a scientific theory, since such theories can not be tested. L. T. More commented that the more one studies palaeontology, the more certain one realizes that evolution is based on faith alone. The famous Dr. Karl Popper says that Darwin's proposals don't even qualify as a theory. Then, when Watson and Crick discovered the structure of DNA, scientist again thought the answer to life would soon be coming. On the contrary, it created a reversal question, 'how can such a high degree of order be achieved in a cell by a random and natural process? It doesn't seem possible,' Watson and Crick asked. Karl Popper, as already mentioned, says that Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory. It's well known that Darwin's theory was accepted only because it was the first non-theistic theory ever proposed; whether it was correct or not was immaterial. Dr. Eldredge, a prominent scientist and evolutionist said that neither evolution nor creation could be falsified through testing. There can be only two explanations, he continued, 'Either God had a plan, or as you get away further from a common ancestor you get more modification, so you get a nested set. It seems that you must accept one or the other axiomatically.' But the public continues to accept Darwinism, unaware of the fact that random mutations are turning out to be irrelevant and natural selection a tautology. And still different evolutionists try to identify the heart of evolution as being adaptive, generations, mutations, and recombination with natural selection still being the dominant theory. Macbeth, another known scientist says that natural selection is an exercise in circular reasoning; it keeps going around and around. The phrase is utterly empty. It doesn't describe anything. Macbeth further says that if evolution is considered as change, it could then be called a fact but if equated with Darwinism, it isn't. The writer says that evolution needs to be evaluated only against the fossil evidence.

In considering the fossil record, historical geology includes a hypothetical geological column that shows organisms from simple to complex. This column represents hypothetical layers which represent hypothetical periods of earth history. This column was developed in England and Scotland supposedly by Christians in 1840 during a time that the world had yet been explored. And since then, there have been so many discovered fossil formations which simply do not fit the column's character at all. These formations are explained away or simply ignored. So the question, do these fossils reveal a gradual progressive continuum connecting all species to a common ancestor or not? No, it doesn't! Dr. Preston Cloud in discussing the Cambrian rocks fossils where such information should be located shows a multitude of highly complex creatures with no ancestors such as trilobites, brachiopods, corals, worms, clams and soft-bodied creatures like jellyfish have been discovered. But this shouldn't be; as vertebrates, they should be in the Lower Ordovician. Of course, this isn't taught in schools. They now called this the 'Cambrian Explosion.' This was explained off by Dr. Raup saying that today, evolution is moving at such a slow rate that it cannot be observed, but in the past it moved at such a rapid rate that it left no evidence in the fossil record! This is a story made up to fill a gap. Dr. Donald Fisher, New York's state palaeontologist goes on to explain this away in saying that the Precambrian fossils were metamorphosed so the chances of finding fossils would be very remote. Out of this confusing picture on how to identify the base of the Cambrians is to use one of the criteria: the lowest fossil-bearing rocks in Cambria Wales, the lowest trilobite zone, the lowest multicelled organisms, the lower hard shelled organisms, or wherever the committee votes to put it, or perhaps 570 to 650 million years ago or the lowest obviously fossil bearing deposits. So the end results, neither can evolutionists agree on this criterion because there is no evidence whatsoever to show how a single-celled organism might have converted into multicelled organisms. They just appeared complete!

Also problematic, if life had to have had a non-oxygenated atmosphere for spontaneous creation, this would be impossible because once life came into being it would then need oxygen! Evolutionists try to get around this by saying that the early atmosphere is said to have been made up of water vapour and carbon dioxide or 'reduced gasses,' where oxygen had already been locked up in gases such as carbon dioxide. This was essential for their theory of spontaneous life to happen. But now as the theory changes, scientists are explaining how life arose on wet planets with a carbon-dioxide atmosphere laced with traces of ammonia. Yet, another theory proposed by Professor John Maynard Smith spoke about an enzyme which is already developed life but produced no support on how such enzyme came

into being. Again, Fred Hoyle said with oxygen present this would have been impossible. He went ahead and said 2,000 complex enzymes would be required for any kind of organism but not a single one of these could have formed in even 20 billion years. So to conclude this paragraph, evolutionists freely admit that there is no evidence of their evolutionary origin from invertebrates. They admit also that the gap between invertebrates with a hard exoskeleton (outer shell) and vertebrates with a skeleton is the most obvious gap of all.

In regards to the gradualist theory, evolutionists often turn to a fossil bird, 'Archaeopteryx' as evidence of common-ancestry evolution in the case of reptiles changing into birds. This supposedly shows the conversion of scales into feathers. This example obviously had teeth and feathers. Even though they used this as evidence, they also admit that it is not a direct line between reptiles and birds because is preceded by modern bird fossils. Many scientists seem to think that the Archaeopteryx flew even with the smaller wings, thus it seems to be a bird instead of a dinosaur with feathers. Dr. John Ostrom of Yale University thought that the wings were used more for catching insects. Creationists created difficulty when they criticized the evolutionists for their various ideas on how a reptile could have gradually developed the host of coordinated structures of birds. For they often change their stories to whatever suites the moment. John Ostrom said that insect catching idea did its job of convincing the public that birds evolved from reptiles regardless of the fact that there is no scientific evidence of such a transition. In the case of mammals, most evolutionists say that they evolved in parallel to reptiles because they are so different. There is no fossil evidence of an evolutionary transition into mammals. When questioned about lack of evidence concerning the above, Dr. Eldredge, another prominent evolutionist said evolutionary history is all about the interpretation of similarities from an evolutionary viewpoint which are actual sequences of events that took place in evolution. The second aspect of evolution is the body of theory that explain how it takes place. He admits that a lot of false evidence is presented as true in school textbooks that shouldn't be there. There are major differences in reptiles and mammals for jaw structure, ear structure and the list goes on. Further and again each species of mammal like reptiles were found to suddenly appear in the fossil record with no ancestral transition. The same is for the horse. It has been shown in textbooks as a way to demonstrate how evolution has worked to originate a structure, the single toe. But the horse series has not appeared in successive strata. One toed has been found below the three toed and a four toed has been found with 18 pairs of ribs while the next animal had 19 ribs and then it jumps up to 15 ribs and then back to 18 ribs for the modern horse. And the four toed Hyracotherium

doesn't look at all like a horse. This four toed Hyracotherium rabbit like daman is running around in the African bush today. Elephants are the same; elephants are elephants. There is no intermediate evolutionary form that connects it to another. Mankind is classified as a primate because of their eyes but tarsiers, lemurs and tree shrews have similar eyes. The octopus eye, pig heart, and milk of the ass are similar to the structure of mankind. The red blood cells of humans are similar to frogs, fish, and birds than to sheep, but of none of these show any evolutionary relationships. Fossils of shrews have been found but not to any other animal that has binocular vision. The evolutionary family tree of man and other primates have no known fossils that relate them together what so ever. Dr. David Pilbeam of the field of paleoanthropology, an objective scientist, said his view of human origins has changed and doesn't believe any longer that he was likely to hit upon the true or correct story of the origin of man. Also, he admitted that many of the statements on human origins had very little real data to support those statements and ventured even to say that much of what is said in other such areas is also highly speculative. In fact, there are no documented transitional fossils of any animals or insect. The fossil record shows the abrupt appearance and extinction of basic different life forms with no intermediate forms connecting them. It depicts sudden appearance and stasis. An unusual practice among palaeontologists was discovered during certain interviews. They give different names to the same species if it is found in rocks of different geological periods. We have already discussed that various fossil species are found in many different layers of the geological periods. Thus over 70 % of the name species are the same as existing species. Naming fossil species has no rules whatsoever and is done add hock. Some palaeontologists think that this came from some old model making them think that a species would not have lasted longer enough between these periods.

Another theory now surfaced to explain the lack of transition, the monster theory. Every time there was a gap (which seems to be all the time) there was a monster. For example, the suggestion that perhaps, the first bird had hatched from the egg of a reptile. But critics said there was no such evidence to show this. So then they came up with what was called, 'punctuated equilibrium.' That is, evolution didn't happen on the basis of accumulating tiny steps but changes occurred in large and very sudden steps. There were systemic mutations which caused a complete change. These were all monsters happening at one time which became known as the 'hopeful monster theory'. Palaeobiologist Steven Stanley, a professor at Johns Hopkins University, supported punctuated equilibria theory and attacked gradualism. He said that Charles Darwin was a gradualist. So Stanley offered the

rapid-change-within-small-populations proposition. But, at last, he admits to having no mechanism by which this happened. The truth of the matter, Stanley is trying to prop up the theory of common-ancestry evolution which has been refuted by the direct fossil evidence. This new theory has caused problems among evolutionists. Some say that both gradualism and punctuated equilibria are correct explanations. Other evolutionists say that it's a philosophy from the revolutionary concept of Marxism. When Russia was overthrown in 1917, the communists recognized evolution as the solution for the materialistic basis for their world system. Theodosius Dobzhansky encouraged the communists to adapt this position. He left Russia in 1927 and returned to America with his 'neo-Darwinism' or 'modern synthesis' bringing the theory of evolution to respectability in America which included the idea of gene pool and genetic drift. Karl Marx had no scientific basis for his thinking until Darwin came along.

'The present is the key to the past' has been the slogan for geologists and palaeontologists where according to uniformitarianism fossil bearing geologic deposits were slowly and gradually developed over millions of years. This was formulated to counter the belief of a world wide flood. This theory like evolution has been taught in public schools around the world. The creationists argued against this, putting forth their theory of catastrophism. A non-creationist, Immanuel Velikovsky argued against uniformitarianism by his best seller, 'Worlds in Collision.' This book supported catastrophism. Velikovsky wrote, 'Earth in Upheaval,' showing that every civilization had witnessed cosmic disturbances. The book showed that there were large amounts of geological and paleontological evidence showing that catastrophes were the primary mechanism for fossil deposition and formation. This conflicted with Darwinism. And today, conventional astronomers agree with some of his hypotheses. Just look at Mars, for example. Look at Venus and Earth itself. This is generally accepted now and believed that a meteor now killed all the dinosaurs. Of course, creationists believe in a young earth model which would have the flood destroying all the dinosaurs. Now, catastrophism has almost become the accepted status quo with many.

Part II

This essay has shown that Darwin's theory of evolution greatly lacks a scientific foundation. There is no progressive development from a common ancestor. This of course was Darwin's primary contention as compared to deterministic force. Natural selection was supposed to examine the environment of random variants and preserved those best adapted to

changing local environments. But within neo-Darwinism, selection brings about a statistically adapted drift when random changes are performed in a population. This theory creates an unbridgeable gap with the current conception of biology. Further more, neo-Darwinist theory has been modified so much that most of the principles of evolution are now a tautology. Evolutionary mathematicians confirm that the assumed random processes of mutation can not produce the raw material for evolution.

As for as critiques the speculations of 'The Origin of Species' have turned out to be wrong. There are so many flaws in Darwinism that one wonders why it took a hold as completely as it did in the scientific world. These new scientific findings are contradictory to evolutionary theory but are not being told to the educational system and public. But yet, again, to compensate for this they have changed the rules again, scientists are differentiating between evolution as a process and Darwinism as an explanation of explaining the process. But it must be emphasized that those who expound on theories on origins are not being honest if they do not incorporate these principles into their appraisal of the evidence. Just because organisms are able to reproduce and survive in any given situation, doesn't tell us how it was accepted in the first place. Nor does it indicate that their structures all came about by evolution. There has never been a case established where a living organism was observed to change into a basically different organism with different structures. Any genetic workings are so complicated that any random change has only shown deleterious effects. Instead of disorder to order as evolution states, every system in the universe appears to be eventually running down, going to more random states which are toward dis-order. There is absolutely no validation for evolution whatsoever. Even the origin-of-life experiments that have produced a few amino acids have given no indication of how DNA or RNA could have originated spontaneously from non-life.

Darwin's Enigma by Luther Sunderland is right on, concise and to the point. His arguments have been presented from a clear academic basis which very few can argue with. I agree whole heartedly with the theme of Sunderland's book. If nothing else, this article has answered a major question which I've had about evolution, 'why people are fooled by it and accept it?' This is now clear, as shown, it is the only non-theistic theory there is. They accept it because it is anti-Christian. Again, it's a perfect example of how the devil has used people to work his plan against God throughout the world.

Evolutionists and scientists from all over the world are now showing the faults of evolution but they are pro-creationists. But if they are to show any integrity whatsoever, they

have to deny something like this that is so full of lies. Yet, at the same time, they have thought hard of new theories to replace Darwinism without telling the truth to the general public. What's worst, it seems that those of are the governing heads of education do not want to know; simple because there's nothing else except creationism which leads to God. But, still, I wonder how they can keep the truth to themselves when they are saying things like, 'natural selection is an exercise in circular reasoning.' And, 'neither evolution nor creation can be falsified through testing.' One scientist says that scientist will be unable to find the true or correct story of the origin of man and there are no examples of documented transitional fossils of any animal or insect! These statements are from evolutionists, yet the lie goes on that evolution is the key!

I find it extremely difficult to state any suggested improvements or any negatives aspect to this article. It was of the correct length and very informative. It speaks to the common person on the street. You know it might be nice to present a list of all these books in a readme file so that the student can see if he or she could purchase any of these books to add to their library. Thankyou!

References

- Abramson, P. (1998). *A Defence of Creationism*. (30 pages) from www.creationism.org/articles/genesis.htm
- Battan, D. (2006) *The Creation Answers*. (384 pages) from Creation Book Publishers website: <http://www.answersingenesis.org>
- Bradley, W. L. (1995). *Is There Scientific Evidence of the Existence of God? How Recent Discoveries Support a Designed Universe*. (28 pages) from <http://winteryknight.wordpress.com/2011/03/08/walter-bradley-explains-three-scientific-arguments-for-gods-existence/>
- Creation Science by Dr Kent Hovind downloaded from Creation Science Evangelism at www.drdino.com (40 lectures plus notes).*
- Creation Science by various authors downloaded from Seattle Creation Conferences <http://nwcreation.net/videos/> on 30 October 2011 (40 lectures)*
- Creation Science Videos by Ken Ham downloaded on 15 April 2011 from <http://nwcreation.net/videos> (15 lectures).*
- Darwin, C. (1876). *The Works of Charles Darwin and the Origin of Species*. NYU Press; Volume 16 edition (February 15, 2010) (512 pages).
- Gitt, W. (1993). *Did God use Evolution?* US: Master Books ISBN-13: 978-0890514832 (144 pages).
- Griggs, J. F. *Evolution 101*. (50 pages) from <http://www.creationism.org/griggs>
- Lang, W. & V. (1984). *Two Decades of Creationism*. USA: Bible-Science Association and Genesis Institute ASIN: B0006YXH9G (100 pages).

- Morris, H. M. (1974). *Scientific Creationism*. US: Master Books 978-0875523385 (277 pages).
- Morris, H. M. (1988). *Men of Science – Men of God: Great Scientists who believed in the Bible*. USA: Master Books 978-0890510806 (127 pages).
- Morris, H. M. (1997). *Biblical Creation*. US: Baker Books ASIN: B00107B178 (276 pages).
- Price, G. M. (1925). *Predicament of Evolution*. USA: Southern Publishing Assoc. (140 pages) from www.creationism.org
- Smart, L. D. (1995). *Evolution Unmasked*. (95 pages) from http://unmaskingevolution.com/pdf_dl/book/resource.PDF
- Sunderland, L. (1988). *Darwin's Enigma – Ebbing the Tide of Naturalism*. (192 pages) From Master's Books at <http://www.newleafpublishinggroup.com/MB.php>
- Wiebe, G. D. (1997). *Creation vs Evolution* (35 pages) downloaded 2009 from www.wiebefamily.org