

Evolution is taught in the public schools (and presented in the media) not as a theory but as a fact, the "fact of evolution." There are nonetheless many dissidents, some with advanced scientific degrees, who deny that evolution is a fact and who insist that an intelligent Creator caused all living things to come into being in furtherance of a purpose.

In 1981 the state legislature of Louisiana passed a law requiring that if "evolution-science" is taught in the public schools, the schools must also provide balanced treatment for something called "creation-science." The statute was a direct challenge to the scientific orthodoxy of today, which is that all living things evolved by a gradual, natural process- from nonliving matter to simple micro-organisms, leading eventually to man.

Mainstream science does not agree that there are two sides to the controversy, and regards creation-science as a fraud. Equal time for creation-science in biology classes, the Darwinists like to say, is like equal time for the theory that it is the stork that brings babies. But the consensus view of the scientific establishment is not enshrined in the Constitution. Lawmakers are entitled to act on different assumptions, at least to the extent that the courts will let them. Louisiana's statute never went into effect because a federal judge promptly held it unconstitutional as an "establishment of religion." In 1987 the Supreme Court of the United States affirmed this decision by a seven to two majority. The Louisiana law was unconstitutional, said the majority opinion by justice William Brennan, because its purpose "was clearly to advance the religious viewpoint that a supernatural being created humankind."

The Natural Academy of Sciences defined "science" in such a way that advocates of supernatural creation may neither argue for their own position nor dispute the claims of the scientific establishment. That may be one way to win an argument, but it is not satisfying to anyone who thinks it possible that God really did have something to do with creating mankind, or that some of the claims that scientists make under the heading of "evolution" may be false.

The literature of Darwinism is full of anti-theistic conclusions, such as that the universe was not designed and has no purpose, and that we humans are the product of blind natural processes that care nothing about us. What is more, these statements are not presented as personal opinions but as the logical implications of evolutionary science.

Another factor that makes evolutionary science seem a lot like religion is the evident zeal of Darwinists to evangelize the world, by insisting that even non-scientists accept the truth of their theory as a matter of moral obligation. Richard Dawkins, an Oxford Zoologist who is one of the most influential figures in evolutionary science, is unabashedly explicit about the religious side of Darwinism. His 1986 book *The Blind Watchmaker* is at one level about biology, but at a more fundamental level it is a sustained argument for atheism. According to Dawkins, "Darwin made it possible to be an intellectually fulfilled atheist."

When he contemplates the perfidy of those who refuse to believe, Dawkins can scarcely restrain his fury. "It is absolutely safe to say that, if you meet somebody who claims not to believe in evolution, that person is ignorant, stupid or insane (or wicked, but I'd rather not consider that)." Dawkins went on to explain, by the way, that what he dislikes particularly about creationists is that they are intolerant.

We must therefore believe in evolution or go to the madhouse, but what precisely is it that we are required to believe? "Evolution" can mean anything from the uncontroversial statement that bacteria "evolve" resistance to antibiotics to the grand metaphysical claim that the universe and mankind "evolved" entirely by purposeless, mechanical forces. A word that elastic is likely to mislead, by implying that we know as much about the grand claim as we do about the small one.

Irving Kristol is a prominent social theorist with a talent for recognizing ideological obfuscation, and he applied that talent to Darwinism in an essay in The New York Times:

**"It is reasonable to suppose that if evolution were taught more cautiously, as a conglomerate idea consisting of conflicting hypotheses rather than as an unchallengeable certainty, it would be far less controversial. As things now stand, the religious fundamentalists are not far off the mark when they assert that evolution, as generally taught, has an unwarranted anti-religious edge to it."**

That very point was the theme of a remarkable lecture given by Colin Patterson at the American Museum of Natural History in 1981. Patterson is a senior paleontologist at the British Natural History Museum and the author of that museum's general text on evolution. His lecture compared creationism (not creation-science) with evolution, and characterized both as scientifically vacuous concepts which are held primarily on the basis of faith. Many of the specific points in the lecture are technical, but two are of particular importance for this introductory chapter. First, Patterson asked his audience of experts a question which reflected his own doubts about much of what has been thought to be secure knowledge about evolution:

-

Can you tell me anything you know about evolution, any one thing... that is true? I tried that question on the geology staff at the Field Museum of Natural History and the only answer I got was silence. I tried it on the members of the Evolutionary Morphology seminar in the University of Chicago, a very prestigious body of evolutionists, and all I got there was silence for a long time and eventually one person said "I do know one thing- it ought not to be taught in high school."

-

Patterson suggested that both evolution and creation are forms of pseudo-knowledge, concepts which seem to imply information but do not. One point of comparison was particularly striking. A common objection to creationism in pre-Darwinian times was that no one could say anything about the mechanism of creation. Creationists simply pointed to the "fact" of creation and conceded ignorance of the means. But now, according to Patterson, Darwin's theory of natural selection is under fire and scientists are no longer sure of its general validity. Evolutionists increasingly talk like creationists in that they point to a fact but cannot provide an explanation of the means.

Patterson was being deliberately provocative, and I do not mean to imply that his skeptical views are widely supported in the scientific community. On the contrary, Patterson came under heavy fire from Darwinists after somebody circulated a bootleg transcript of the lecture, and he eventually disavowed the whole business. Whether or not he meant to speak for public attribution, however, he was making an important point. We can point to a mystery and call it "evolution," but this is only a label. The important question is not whether scientists have agreed on a label, but how much they know about how complex living beings like ourselves came into existence.

One famous evolutionist who might have been expected to be sympathetic to Kristol's point would be Harvard Professor Stephen Jay Gould. In 1980 Gould published a paper in a scientific journal predicting the emergence of "a new and general theory of evolution" to replace the neo-Darwinian synthesis. Gould wrote that, although he had been "beguiled" by the unifying power of the Darwinist synthesis when he studied it as a graduate student in the 1960s, the weight of the evidence had driven him to the reluctant conclusion that the synthesis, "as a general proposition, is effectively dead, despite its persistence as textbook orthodoxy." The dogmatic teaching of that dead textbook orthodoxy was precisely what Kristol was criticizing.

Now Gould, in his response to Kristol, denied that textbook bias was more prevalent in evolution than in other fields of science, denied that evolutionary science is anti-religious, and insisted that "Darwinian selection... will remain a central focus of more inclusive evolutionary theories." His main point was that Kristol had ignored a "central distinction between secure fact and healthy debate about theory." Biologists do teach evolutionary theory as a conglomerate idea consisting of conflicting hypotheses, Gould wrote, but evolution is also a fact of nature, as well established as the fact that the earth revolves around the sun.

We will examine his arguments for this notion shortly.

Now Darwinists consider evolution to be a fact, not just a theory, because it provides a satisfying explanation for the pattern of relationship linking all living creatures- a pattern so identified in their minds with what they consider to be the necessary cause of the pattern- descent with modification- that, to them, biological relationship means evolutionary relationship. Darwin proposed a naturalistic explanation for the essentialist features of the living world that was so stunning in its logical appeal that it conquered the scientific world even while doubts remained about some important parts of his theory.

And since Darwinian atheists consider Evolution to be a fact, one with so much certainty that it disproves religion - they show that one of the reasons it seems to make sense out of classification (kingdoms, phyla, class, order etc) is that these *aren't* just arbitrary categories of human invention, but *literally* a family.

Biologists before and after Darwin have generally sensed that in classifying they were not merely forcing creatures into arbitrary categories, but discovering relationships that are in some sense real. Some pre-Darwinian taxonomists expressed this sense by saying that whales and bats are superficially like fish and birds but they are essentially mammals- that is, they conform in their "essence" to the mammalian "type."

Similarly, all birds are essentially birds, whether they fly, swim, or run. The principle can be extended up or down the scale of classification: St. Bernards and dachshunds are essentially dogs, despite the visible dissimilarity, and sparrows and elephants are essentially vertebrates.

While this theory does have some explanatory power for evolution via classification, this does not prove the truth of the hypothesis, since there is no irrefutable evidence presented - but rather, it simply “appears to make sense”.

Now Gould’s arguments are highlighted underneath 📌

**Gould argues for the fact of evolution in 3 ways.**

**1:** microevolution being observed in cases like moths becoming black in presence of industrial soot. However microevolution is not something anyone denies - in fact Islam teaches about Adam (AS) and Hawa (Eve) from which people of all races descended. This says nothing about the processes of creating birds, insects and trees in any way. **Gould himself admits macroevolution requires more than the accumulation of micro mutations.**

*“First, we have abundant, direct, observational evidence of evolution in action, from both field and laboratory. This evidence ranges from countless experiments on change in nearly everything about fruit flies subjected to artificial selection in the laboratory to the famous populations of British moths that became black when industrial soot darkened the trees upon which the moths rest. (Moths gain protection from sharp-sighted bird predators by blending into the background.) Creationists do not deny these observations: how could they? Creationists have tightened their act. They now argue that God only created “basic kinds,” and allowed for limited evolutionary meandering within them. Thus toy poodles and Great Danes come from the dog kind and moths can change color, but nature cannot convert a dog to a cat or a monkey to a man.”*

Gould is right: **everyone agrees** that microevolution occurs, including creationists. Even creation-scientists concur, not because they “have tightened their act,” but because their doctrine has always been that God created basic kinds, or types, which subsequently diversified. The most famous example of creationist microevolution involves the descendants of Adam and Eve, who have diversified from a common ancestral pair to create all the diverse races of the human species.

**The point in dispute is not whether microevolution happens, but whether it tells us anything important about the processes responsible for creating birds, insects, and trees in the first place.**

Gould himself has written that even the first step toward macroevolution (speciation) requires more than the accumulation of micromutations. Instead of explaining how the peppered moth variations bear on the kind of evolution that really matters, however, he changes the subject and takes a swipe at creationists.

Other Darwinists such as Mark Ridley argue “all that is needed is to prove evolution is observed micro evolution added to the philosophical doctrine of uniformitarianism which (in the form that

is needed here - that is, constant everywhere and every time) underlies all science. However, this is insufficient evidence, 'scientists do not assume that the rules which govern activity at one level of magnitude necessarily apply at all other levels.' A clear example of this is Newtonian physics, relativity, and quantum mechanics, with their differences. Newtonian physics completely breaks down in the quantum world, and the way the way the laws of physics work with regards to relativity are much different to other disciplines in physics. The key notion here is that **we cannot extrapolate laws through and beyond orders of magnitude and expect them to remain constant throughout.**

**2:** A second argument is the *argument from imperfection* - however this is merely an attack at the idea of God designing life, and **not** a proof of evolution.

**3:** Goulds third proof is with regard to the fossil record. He insists that there are at least 2 instances in the vertebrate sequence where macroevolutionary transformations can be confirmed. One is mammal-like reptiles, which he says is like an intermediate in the reptile to mammal transformation.

The second is the hominids or "ape men" which most scientists accept as predecessors of humans. This evidence is discussed in the document *The Vertebrae Sequence*.

---

This theory of descent with modification made sense out of the pattern of natural relationships in a way that *was acceptable* to philosophical materialists. It explained why the groups seemed to be part of the natural framework rather than a mere human invention- to the Darwinist imagination, they are literally families.

When combined with the theory of natural selection, it explained the difference between the common features that are relevant to classification (homologies) and those that are not (analogies). The former were relics of the common ancestor; the latter evolved independently by natural selection to provide very different creatures with superficially similar body parts that were useful to such adaptive strategies as flight and swimming. In Darwin's historic words:

"All the... difficulties in classification are explained... on the view that the natural system is founded on descent with modification: that the characters which naturalists consider as showing true affinity between any two or more species, are those which have been inherited from a common parent, and in so far, all true classification is genealogical; that community of descent is the hidden bond which naturalists have been unconsciously seeking, and not some unknown plan of creation, or the enunciation of general propositions, and the mere putting together and separating objects more or less alike."

Darwin ended his chapter by saying that the argument from classification was so decisive that on that basis alone **he would adopt his theory even if it were unsupported by other arguments.**

That confidence explains why Darwin was undiscouraged by the manifold difficulties of the fossil record: his logic told him that descent with modification had to be the explanation for the "difficulties in classification," regardless of any gaps in the evidence.

The same logic inspires today's Darwinists, when they shrug off critics who claim that one element or another in the theory is doubtful. "Say what you will against every detail," they respond, "still, nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution."

*Darwin's theory unquestionably has impressive explanatory power, but how are we to tell if it is true? If we define "evolution" simply as "whatever produces classification," then evolution is a fact in the*

*same sense that classification is a fact.* This is another tautology, however, and as such it has no genuine explanatory value. In this form the theory is supported mainly by the semantic implications of the word "relationship." Darwinists assume that the relationship between, say, bats and whales is similar to that between siblings and cousins in human families. Possibly it is, but the proposition is not self-evident.

Descent with modification could be something much more substantial than a tautology or a semantic trick. It could be a testable scientific hypothesis.

The analogy is spurious. We observe directly that apples fall when dropped, but we do not observe a common ancestor for modern apes and humans. What we do observe is that apes and humans are physically and biochemically more like each other than they are like rabbits, snakes, or trees. The ape-like common ancestor is a hypothesis in a theory, which purports to explain how these greater and lesser similarities came about. The theory is plausible, especially to a philosophical materialist, but it may nonetheless be false. The true explanation for natural relationships may be something much more mysterious.

Because Gould draws the line between fact and theory in the wrong place, the distinction is virtually meaningless. The theory to him is merely the theory of natural selection, and the "fact" is the fact that evolution may occur by chance mechanisms without influence from selection. Gould explains the distinction by observing that

- while no biologist questions the importance of natural selection, many now doubt its ubiquity. In particular, many evolutionists argue that substantial amounts of genetic change may not be subject to natural selection and may spread through populations at random.

- As Gould acknowledges, however, Darwin always insisted that natural selection was only one of the mechanisms of evolution, and complained bitterly when he was accused of writing that selection is ubiquitous. The "fact" that Gould describes is therefore nothing but Darwin's theory rightly understood: evolution is descent with modification propelled by random genetic changes, with natural selection providing whatever guidance is needed to produce complex adaptive structures like wings and eyes. \* The creative power of natural selection is then assured because it is a necessary implication of the "fact" that evolution has produced all the wonders of biology. Recasting the theory as fact serves no purpose other than to protect it from falsification.

- \* Readers should not be misled by the daring speculations of a few paleontologists like Gould and Steven Stanley, who flirt with macromutational alternatives to Darwinist gradualism. No genuine alternative to Darwinism is in prospect. From T. H. Huxley's time to the present, there have been paleontologists who acknowledged that the fossil record is inconsistent with strict Darwinism. To mitigate the difficulty, they have tried to describe a saltationist alternative in language the purists could tolerate.



The way that evolution is conventionally taught in schools is undeniably perpetuated as an established irrefutable fact and not a theory. Any alternative to this theory is dismissed since evolution is supposedly the biological foundation of the scientific supports of our reality. This of course, when studied thoroughly, is quite far from the case.

Credit to PM; Ari.